

A Study of the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy for Aspiring School Leaders

Rory P. Stapleton

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

APPROVED:

Dr. Glen I. Earthman, Co-Chair

Dr. Travis W. Twiford, Co-Chair

Dr. Rosalie M. Martin, Committee Member

Dr. John Eller, Committee Member

Date of Defense, October 29, 2007

Virginia Beach, Virginia

Key Words: Leadership Academy, Principal Preparation Programs, ISLLC Standards, Program
Evaluation

Copyright 2007, Rory P. Stapleton

A STUDY OF THE CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS' LEADERSHIP ACADEMY FOR ASPIRING SCHOOL LEADERS

by

Rory P. Stapleton

Glen I. Earthman and Travis T. Twiford, Co-Chairmen

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy has met its primary goal of preparing public school administrators to serve the school division. This study is built on research that reveals that there are a number of principal preparation programs available for future school leaders that do not adequately prepare the applicants for leadership roles. Collaborative partnerships between school divisions and colleges and universities are being formed in order to prepare public school leaders for the administrative demands of today's public schools, challenged by the mandates of the No Child Left Behind legislation. In particular, school divisions are forming grow-your-own leadership academies in order to meet the need for filling positions that are being vacated by retiring administrators. This study utilizes mixed-methodologies comprised of quantitative and qualitative data. Eleven completers of the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy who obtained administrative positions in the division during the 2004-2006 school years were a part of the study. In addition, their supervisors participated in the study.

The research highlights, in quantitative data, the survey responses of ten novice administrators who were completers of the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy. Seminars that the novice administrators experienced were based on the six Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Thus, the survey and interview questions were

adapted from the ISLLC standards. Adding richness to the study is the data that was generated in the form of in-depth interviews with the eight principals and five supervisors of the novice administrators. Findings revealed that the novice administrators had an overall perception that the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy prepared them to be school leaders. Although the supervisors felt, that the novice administrators were prepared, there were a few areas where they felt the program was in need of improvement. Additional findings gave school leaders a basis from which to make programmatic decisions that should result in a more effective leadership training program.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandparents who sowed a seed of belief in oneself and determination. There was never a time when my grandparents did not encourage me to strive for the best. Frederica Matilda and James Matthew Beaconsfield Connor exhibited such devotion that strong work ethics were instilled in me. Winifred and Arlington Peets demonstrated unconditional love, so much so that I always felt extremely special.

Thanks for believing in me, for inspiring me, and for giving all that you contributed to my upbringing. Because of you, I am who and what I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Four years ago, I embarked on a voyage. The voyage of obtaining a terminal degree took me through many phases and evoked many emotions. I was fearful and at times extremely anxious. I laughed and cried. I was reflective and cautious. Along the way, there were numerous individuals who worked with me, who studied with me, who inquired about my progress, who thought about me, who encouraged me, and who prayed for me. I am deeply grateful to each one of them.

I must first thank God to whom I prayed on a daily basis for the strength and endurance to complete this journey.

Dr. Twiford, my co-chair and program advisor, guided me each step of the way. From day one, he encouraged me and assured me that it would all be worth it in the end. Never before had I received so much feedback on one project. However, “feedback became my friend”. Dr. Twiford’s wise advice, calm demeanor, and stories helped me to achieve my goal. Thank you for your immense amount of time and dedication.

Dr. Earthman, my co-chair, quickly and graciously picked up my work and began to massage the kinks that would lead to a complete study. His thought-provoking questions led me to become a writer, detailed and careful with each selected word. Thank you for your expertise, your high expectations, and your prompt responses which led to a finished product, worthy of each step that I took.

Dr. Martin, my committee member, offered to me an extremely rich on-campus experience without which I would not have been able to move forward with my research

in the manner that I did. Thanks for designing a summer that was valuable. Thanks for your commitment to me and my work.

Dr. Eller, my committee member, made accessible to me his enthusiasm and his broad range of experience and knowledge in the area of school leadership. Thanks for taking the time to craft for me strategies that I could use to conduct my research. Thank you for your support.

Thanks to every individual who participated in this study, for I could not have completed this task without you. I was encouraged when I realized that you were eager to share your knowledge in order to lead to a more refined Academy. Special thanks to Delegate Hamilton who answered every question I posed.

Nothing I touch is complete without my family and friends. To Henry-Kaye and Tijhuana, thank you for your patience as I studied and wrote. Thanks for insisting that I could do it. To Lilith, my sisters, my brothers, nieces, and nephews, I cannot think of words adequate enough to express my love and appreciation to you for simply believing in me. To my church family, thanks for the smiles, hugs, and, most importantly, prayers. To my many friends, cohort members, especially Drs. Dyke and Worley, coworkers (day and night), and sorority sisters, thanks for continuing to ask about my progress and for being there when I needed more than one shoulder.

“I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.”

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Tables	xiv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
The Problem	5
Description of the Division	5
Description of the Leadership Academy	6
Description and Goals	6
Participant Selection	7
Program Components	7
Roles of Collaborative Partners	8
Program Offerings	9
The Purpose of the Study	9
Research Questions	10
Significance of the Study	10
Definitions of Key Terms	11
Limitations of the Study	12

Overview of the Study.....	13
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature.....	15
Antecedents.....	15
A Nation at Risk and School Leaders.....	15
Goals 2000 and School Administrators.....	16
No Child Left Behind and Principal Preparation Programs.....	16
The Need for School Leaders.....	17
The Standards.....	20
NCATE.....	21
ISLLC.....	22
Principal Preparation Programs.....	24
Identifying Potential Leaders.....	30
Using the SLLA.....	31
The Cohort Component.....	32
The Collaborative Approach.....	34
Leadership Academies.....	39
Kanawha County School Leadership Academy.....	39
New York City Leadership Academy.....	40
Innovations in Education.....	40
Program Evaluation in Education.....	43
The Role of the Evaluator.....	44

Program Evaluation in Principal Preparation Programs.....	46
Meadows Principal Improvement Program.....	48
A Principal Preparation Program in Texas.....	50
Northeast Ohio Principals’ Academy.....	51
A Cohort Program.....	52
A Large Flagship University in the Southeast.....	54
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	58
Research Questions.....	58
Researcher Bias.....	58
Research Design.....	59
Population.....	59
Data Needs.....	60
Procedure for Data Collection.....	61
Instrumentation.....	62
Data Analysis.....	65
Data Triangulation.....	67
Data Display.....	67
Summary.....	67
Chapter 4: Findings of the Study.....	69
Overview of the Study.....	69
Procedures.....	69

Collection of Data.....	72
Demographics of Novice Administrators.....	73
Results of Survey.....	73
Demographics of Respondents.....	74
Gender and Level of School.....	74
Age.....	75
Experience in Education.....	75
Subset Question Number One.....	76
Level of School and Survey Questions.....	77
Level of School and 3 Additional Questions.....	81
Gender and Survey Questions.....	85
Gender and 3 Additional Questions.....	85
Age Range and Survey Questions.....	86
Age Range and 3 Additional Questions.....	90
Years in Education and Survey Questions.....	90
Years in Education and 3 Additional Questions.....	96
Composite of ISLLC Standards.....	96
Results of Interviews.....	100
Demographics of Principals and Supervisors.....	100
Gender and Level of School.....	100
Experience in Education.....	101

Years in Administration.....	101
Subset Question Number Two.....	102
Principals.....	102
Interview Question One.....	103
Interview Question Two.....	104
Interview Question Three.....	104
Interview Question Four.....	105
Interview Question Five.....	106
Interview Question Six.....	107
Interview Question Seven.....	108
Interview Question Eight.....	109
Interview Question Nine.....	110
Interview Question Ten.....	110
Interview Question Eleven.....	111
Interview Question Twelve.....	111
Principals: Comparison of ISLLC Standards.....	112
Subset Question Number Three.....	113
District-Level Supervisors.....	113
Interview Question One.....	114
Interview Question Two.....	115
Interview Question Three.....	116

Interview Question Four.....	116
Interview Question Five.....	117
Interview Question Six.....	118
Interview Question Seven.....	119
Interview Question Eight.....	120
Interview Question Nine.....	121
Interview Question Ten.....	121
Interview Question Eleven.....	122
Interview Question Twelve.....	123
Supervisors: Comparison of ISLLC Standards.....	123
Recommendations for Programmatic Improvements.....	124
Additional Experiences to Include.....	124
Experiences to Eliminate.....	127
Summary.....	128
Chapter 5: Findings, Conclusion, Discussion, Limitations, Recommendations.....	130
Summary.....	130
Findings.....	131
Conclusion.....	135
Discussion.....	136
Recommendations for Program Improvement.....	141
Limitations.....	146

Recommendations for Further Research.....	148
References.....	150
Appendices.....	161
Appendix A: Office of Research Compliance Form.....	162
Appendix B: City Public Schools Institutional Review Board Approval.....	164
Appendix C: Letter to Leadership Academy Program Completers.....	166
Appendix D: Program Completers’ Survey.....	168
Appendix E: Program Completers’ Survey Validation Instrument.....	173
Appendix F: Letter to Supervisors.....	178
Appendix G: Validation of Supervisors’ Interview Questions and Protocol.....	180
Appendix H: Supervisors’ Interview Questions and Protocol.....	185
Appendix I: Data of Principals’ Interviews.....	188
Appendix J: Data of Supervisors’ Interviews.....	191
Vitae.....	194

List of Tables

Table 1	Superintendents’ and Principals’ Responses.....	19
Table 2	Survey Validation Data Reported by Rounds.....	70
Table 3	Interview Questions Validation Reported by Rounds.....	71
Table 4	Gender of Respondents.....	74
Table 5	Gender and School Level in Which You Work Cross Tabulation.....	75
Table 6	Age-Select Range.....	75
Table 7	Experience in Education.....	76
Table 8	Results of Survey Questions.....	78
Table 9	Level of School and Question Cross Tabulation.....	82
Table 10	Level of School and 3 Additional Questions Cross Tabulation.....	85
Table 11	Gender and Question Cross Tabulation.....	87
Table 12	Gender and 3 Additional Questions.....	89
Table 13	Age Range and Question Cross Tabulation.....	91
Table 14	Age Range and 3 Additional Questions Cross Tabulation.....	95
Table 15	Years in Education and Questions.....	97
Table 16	Years in Education and 3 Additional Questions Cross Tabulation.....	99
Table 17	Respondents and ISLLC Standards.....	100
Table 18	Gender and School Level Cross Tabulation.....	101
Table 19	Experience in Education.....	101
Table 20	Years in Administration.....	102

Table 21	Principals' Responses and ISLLC Standards.....	113
Table 22	Supervisors' Responses and ISLLC Standards.....	124

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In an ever-increasing effort to further improve schools and strengthen accountability, the United States Congress mandated the implementation of The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001(NCLB). The NCLB was enacted to ensure that all students are provided with a quality education. This push for school reform in the United States has drawn attention to the way in which teachers and administrators are prepared for their duties (Playko, 1995).

Under NCLB, school divisions, teachers, and building principals in particular are held accountable for the annual results of student performance. In accordance with NCLB, teachers may instruct students only in a subject in which they are highly qualified. The dearth of qualified applicants has educational experts sorely concerned. A survey conducted by the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) highlights that public schools will have searched for approximately two million teachers by the 2006-2007 school year (Gerald & Hussar, 1999). In an effort to fill the void of highly qualified teachers in education, alternative preparation methods have been implemented with the support of policymakers to meet the requirements of preparing more teachers while improving quality (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Several studies (Ferrandino, 2003; Malone, Nelson, & Nelson, 2001; Grimmet & Echols, 2000) indicate that there is a shortage of educators willing to become principals because of the following reasons: sheer unwillingness to do so on the part of educators, increased work load of the position, the managerial nature of administration, or adversarial organizational conditions. While the reasons for declining to accept administrative positions vary, there is a growing concern for a shortage of qualified applicants in public school administration. In fact, it is

predicted that the number of overall vacancies for principal openings will grow by 20% by the year 2008 (Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, & Chung, 2003).

According to Mitgang (2003, p. 1), “Never have public schools counted more heavily on the nation’s nearly 84,000 principals to lead the instructional improvements needed to meet tough new state and federal mandates.” The pressure on principals to meet academic and safety expectations continues to grow, and accountability in every area of school leadership is increasingly higher. Former U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige stated that strong school leaders are “on the front lines in the schools . . . [they] play a critical and important role in developing a vision for high-quality education for every student . . . [and are] an indispensable ingredient for school improvement” (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, p. Foreword). Kaplan, Owings, and Nunnery (2005) concur that a school’s principal is the one who “controls the most important factors affecting a school’s teaching and instructional quality.” Therefore, the quality of the instructional leader is tantamount to the success that the students and the staff members realize.

Since obtaining quality leaders is vital to schools, the preparation of those leading schools is serious business (Siegrist, 1999). Traditionally, colleges and universities have had the responsibility of training school leaders. According to Kent Peterson, “Frequently, principals are moved directly from the classroom to the principalship with little district preparation other than directions to the school” (Peterson, 1986). Despite the increasing complexities of the job, school divisions still seem to believe that novice administrators should perform, on their own, as skillfully as veteran administrators (Holloway, 2004). More knowledgeable educators know that to be a myth. As is the case with many jobs and professions, to gain efficient and effective principals, training must be done (Peterson, 1986).

In a June 1999 speech delivered at a Department of Education Town Meeting, Richard Riley (as cited in Furger, 2000) contends that for the most part, ongoing professional development for the nation's instructional leaders has been the exception, and not the rule. With the amount of multitasking in which school leaders are expected to engage, aspiring and practicing administrators could use additional preparation. Daresh and Playko (1994, p. 36) notes that "the administrative entry year is one that is normally marked by considerable anxiety, frustration, and self-doubt." Thus, the preparation that the aspirant receives would serve to alleviate some of the fears.

Leading School Improvement (SREB, 2001) mentions several tasks that school leaders perform: building consensus, planning programs, designing instruction, working with teacher performance, and working on school improvement efforts. The study highlights the fact that in performing certain tasks, leaders can grow and be developed, and it is through professional development that this is done. Through a focused, well-conceived professional development program, aspiring school leaders can emerge prepared (2001).

Colleges and universities provide one main method of training for principals. Hess and Kelly (2005) conducted a study of syllabi and readings in 210 courses from a national sample of university principal preparation programs. They found that approximately 2% of course content addressed management accountability, recruitment, and hiring, topics principals said they needed to know to do their jobs.

A leadership academy is one way to bridge the gap between the amount of theory taught in colleges and universities and the practicality needed to lead public school divisions across the nation. The National Staff Development Council (2000) encourages school divisions to partner with universities to create district academies that provide practical hands-on training to lead

schools. Of the collaborative relationship between school divisions and colleges or universities, Mary Devin states, “Those who prepare new administrators and those who supervise principal practitioners must work together to redesign preparation programs and develop ongoing support systems for practitioners” (2004, p.70).

Over the past few years, the nation has come to recognize “that schools and school districts can offer practical training and guidance to prospective principals that may not be available from other sources” (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997, p.1). Because of this belief, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 has provided funding in the form of grants to state educational agencies and to local educational agencies. The federal government has granted these agencies the flexibility to creatively prepare quality teachers and effective principals and assistant principals (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). While innovative pathways to school leadership are in the infant stages, Rod Paige, former U.S. Secretary of Education, is convinced that “entrepreneurial school districts . . . have developed promising programs that draw new talent into leadership roles and provide job-embedded preparation and support to ensure the success of . . . leaders in today’s schools” (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, p.v).

So how has that paradigm shifted to prepare building administrators to handle the new role of evolving into strong instructional leader intertwined with capable school manager? As early as May of 2002, the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education invited high-need LEA’s to partner with “at least one nonprofit organization or institution of higher education” to compete for a school leadership award (Department of Education, 2002). Across the nation, 147 school divisions in partnership with 28 universities embraced the opportunity to train their own leaders, using seminars, workshops, traditional and web-based courses, and internships to focus

on such areas as instruction, facilities, curriculum, legal issues, and community relations (Department of Education, 2002).

The Problem

In an age where the increasing demands for qualified and competent principals are at an all-time high, additional methods of preparing principals are in need. University programs dedicated to training quality school leaders tend to focus on prescribed curricula that centers on a vast amount of theoretical knowledge versus the realities that school leaders face on a daily basis (Brown, 2006). Hackman and Alsbury (2005) note that new accreditation and state licensure requirements are calling for administrator preparation programs to restructure their curricula to more fully address the principalship's shifting role expectations and to better prepare aspiring school leaders. The problem, then, is the study of the Leadership Academy for Aspiring School Leaders whose main focus is principal preparation.

Description of the Division

City Public Schools is a large urban school division in southeastern Virginia. Approximately 32,500 students are enrolled in its five high schools, eight middle schools, twenty-six elementary schools, five early childhood centers, and four alternative schools. Demographic information of the division's students follow: 57.4% African American, 32.8% Caucasian, 5.5% Hispanic, 2.6% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1.0% Unspecified, and 0.6% Native American. Other demographic information include 46.5% of students who qualify for free and reduced meals, 12.4% of students identified as special needs, 4.5% of students identified as talented and gifted, and 1.46% of students in need of English as a second language. Of the 5,000 employees in the division, 2,500 are teachers, and 140 are school administrators (City Public Schools, 2005).

Description of the Leadership Academy

Description and Goals

The reality that City Public Schools would face replacing 77 of 113 school leaders within the next five years led the division to implement the leadership initiative titled the Leadership Academy for Aspiring School Leaders. In 2000, the school division produced a 48-clock-hour program that addressed the following topics: leadership style, change, finance, public relations, data analysis, public school law, effective instructional strategies, school safety, and the reality of being a school principal (Hamilton, personal communication, July 10, 2006). The Leadership Academy of FY's 2000-2004 focused on assistant principals who aspired to become principals in City and in an informal manner, addressed the aforementioned topics.

With the inception of the grant from the Virginia Department of Education in 2004, the Leadership Academy became more formalized. After applying for and receiving the grant for the two fiscal years of 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, City Public Schools collaborated with a major university, an educational training corporation, and the HOPE Foundation to build a leadership model around the division's mission and goals. The major university was selected as a partner because of its proximity and because of its educational research efforts. The educational training corporation was selected as a partner because it is a local, private provider of training services and because of the trainers' familiarity with the vision, mission, goals, and culture of the school division. The HOPE Foundation was selected as a partner because of a previous partnership that the foundation had with the school division (Hamilton, personal communication, November 14, 2006). The goals of the collaborative effort are three-fold: (1) "to expand the existing leadership capacity within the school division"; (2) to develop highly qualified leaders in the school

division; and (3) “to enhance the leadership capabilities of the existing school leaders” (City Public Schools, 2004, p. 1).

Participant Selection

The restructured model of the Leadership Academy, a principal preparation program, focuses on developing teachers interested in sharpening their leadership abilities. Participants are selected through a nomination process whereby a City Public School leader, usually the principal, “taps” or nominates the participant to apply for admission. Using informal and formal observations and discussions with previous principals, if necessary, the principal decides who will be “tapped” or recommended to the Leadership Academy. The tapped individual must be a continuing contract teacher and must have shown leadership potential, knowledge of curriculum and instruction, a strong desire to help students, and an interest in assuming more leadership responsibilities. In addition, the teacher must have a master’s degree or must be enrolled in a master’s degree program. It is not a requirement that the master’s degree that the teacher possesses or the master’s program in which the teacher is enrolled be in educational administration and supervision.

The teacher must then submit an application, a letter of interest, a resume, and a letter of recommendation from a practicing City Public School leader, usually the principal. A screening committee consisting of four administrators from the Superintendent’s Senior Staff independently reviews the application packets and selects 25 teachers to participate in each Leadership Academy cohort (City Public Schools, 2004).

Program Components

Components of the year-long initiative include monthly seminars based on the six ISLLC Standards: (1) the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of

learning that is shared and supported by the school community; (2) Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth; (3) Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; (4) Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources; (5) Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; (6) Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). Current and retired administrators are active participants and presenters in the seminars. Other components of the monthly seminars include individual coaching, shadowing experiences, authentic action project work in the school and in the division, attendance at the HOPE Advanced Leadership Summit in 2004 and 2005, and a six-weeks paid summer leadership internship (City Public Schools, 2004).

Roles of Collaborative Partners

City Public Schools provides the training facility and a program coordinator from the division's professional development department who evaluates participants' portfolios and who serves as project manager, monitoring the overall program (City Public Schools, 2004). The major university evaluates the program and provides progress reports and a final cohort report to the division's superintendent. The university also assists with the HOPE Advanced Leadership Summit (City Public Schools, 2004).

The educational training corporation, The Urban Learning & Leadership Center, uses the ISLLC standards to develop the curriculum for the training seminars. The educational training corporation also evaluates the participants and the program, providing progress reports and final

cohort reports to the division's superintendent (City Public Schools, 2004). The HOPE Foundation co-sponsors the Advanced Leadership Summit (City Public Schools, 2004).

Program Offerings

Program participants are offered the following:

- (1) training in a variety of leadership development strategies using researched-based strategies from the ISLLC Standards.
- (2) a waiver for the School Leadership Licensure Assessment used in 14 states plus the District of Columbia.
- (3) statewide certification.
- (4) a six-weeks paid summer internship.
- (5) placement on a registry of highly qualified individuals prepared for future school leadership positions (City Public Schools, 2004).

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to study the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy to determine if it has met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions. City Public Schools has committed to working in collaboration with a major university in southeastern Virginia, an educational training corporation in southeastern Virginia, and the Harnessing Optimism and Potential through Education (HOPE), out of Bloomington, Indiana. Since the major university and the educational training corporation are collaborative partners with the Leadership Academy, a study of the academy conducted by a non-Leadership Academy participant will provide another view of the preparedness of the completers.

Research Questions

The main research question is: Has the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions? Subset questions include the following: (1) Do the novice administrators feel the Leadership Academy has prepared them to be school leaders? (2) Do the building principals feel the Leadership Academy has prepared novice administrators to be school leaders? (3) Do the district level supervisors feel the Leadership Academy has prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders?

Significance of the Study

There are two reasons why the data garnered from this study will be significant. In creating the Leadership Academy for Aspiring Administrators, City Public Schools has stepped forward to serve its own needs. Graduates of the Leadership Academy typically obtain administrative positions in the school division. Thus, the data from this study will be of significant to City Public Schools and to other school divisions seeking to create a similar type program.

Secondly, staff development departments are always seeking ways to improve their approaches to professional development. Since the majority of the emphasis of most staff development departments focuses on teacher improvement, this will provide some guidance on professional development enhancement for school administrators. Further, school boards can review the contents to determine possible collaborative efforts between their divisions and universities for the purpose of better preparing school leaders.

Definitions of Key Terms

For the purpose of this research, definitions placed in this section are included so the reader would have a complete understanding of the terms.

- 1. Alternative Preparation Programs** are programs that provide training for aspiring administrators based upon the completion of a prescribed program of study. The goal of these programs is to draw new talent into administration and to prepare and support them through job-embedded training (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).
- 2. Aspiring Administrators** are teachers receiving training in K-12 school administration.
- 3. Novice Administrators** are assistant principals and district-level administrators in their first through third years of K-12 school administration. A novice administrator is not necessarily supervised by the principal who selects him/her to enter the Leadership Academy.
- 4. Cohort Structure** is a term used to identify fixed groups of students placed together for the purpose of collaborating in their pursuit of common goals (Daresh, 1997).
- 5. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education** or NCATE is a non-profit, non-governmental organization that functions as the accrediting body for colleges and universities. The conglomerate of 30 national associations, recognized by the United States Department of Education, prepares teachers and other professionals to work in elementary and secondary schools (NCATE, 2006).
- 6. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards** or ISLLC Standards were developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers, a body of 24 education agencies. The standards are compatible with the NCATE guidelines and were designed to create a commonality of standards in educational administration and to “stimulate vigorous thought and dialogue about

quality educational leadership among stakeholders in the area of school administration”
(CCSSO, 1996, p. iii).

7. Leadership Academy is a program designed to assist teachers with the preparation needed to assume the role of a principal (Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, 2002).

8. School Leaders Licensure Assessment or SLLA is a required assessment for school leaders’ licensure, as of July 2005. The assessment was first used in 1999 and is now required in 14 states plus the District of Columbia. The states that require the SLLA include the following: Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia (ETS, 2004). The assessment which covers six standards was developed by an advisory committee of school leaders in order to confirm knowledge of important tasks and skills required of beginning principals. It is grounded in research and the ISLLC Standards (ETS, 2004).

9. Tapping is the term used to identify or select a teacher for admission to a leadership academy (City Public Schools, 2004).

Limitations of the Study

Because the research of this study will be focused on one program in one school division, the following limitations are acknowledged:

1. The study is limited because it is an indigenous program to City Public Schools. Due to this limitation, it will not be possible to generalize the findings to principal preparation programs in any other location.

2. The study is limited to completers of the City Public Schools’ Leadership Academy who have been promoted to leadership positions. Therefore, non-completers are not represented in this study. This limits the study in that only the voice of the completers who have obtained

administrative positions will be heard. There is a possibility that those who completed the program may share a more positive description of the program than those who did not complete the program.

3. The study is limited to those schools that have employed program completers. Only those principals and supervisors would be able to respond to the preparedness of the administrators.

4. The study of this program is based on the perceptions of novice administrators who received training from the Leadership Academy and those supervisors of the novice administrators. This study, therefore, is not a complete evaluation because the work of the novice administrators was not evaluated by impartial observers over a period of time.

5. Selection to the Leadership Academy may not be objective since participants must be nominated or “tapped” by their principals. Principals, then, may be predisposed to select those teachers with whom they have worked closely.

Overview of the Study

The research study is divided into five chapters. Chapter One includes an introduction, the statement of the problem, a description of the City Public Schools division, a description of the Leadership Academy, the purpose of the study, the research questions to be addressed, the significance of the study, key terms that have been defined, limitations to the study, and an overview.

Chapter Two includes a review of related literature regarding principal preparation programs. The chapter begins with a review of a national report and two major initiatives in American education. It addresses the need for school leaders and the standards that drive

educational leadership programs. The chapter ends with various approaches to principal preparation and a defined look at program evaluation.

Chapter Three includes the research questions, researcher bias, the research design, and a description of the population. The chapter also includes the data needs, the procedure for data collection, instrumentation, and the procedure for data analysis, description of data display, and a brief summary.

Chapter Four includes the research findings and the analysis of the data, and Chapter Five includes the research summary, conclusions derived from the study, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The intent of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature that relates to principal preparation programs. The research included in this chapter spans over twenty-three years and relates to programs for aspiring administrators; thus, this chapter is comprised of a compilation of studies, articles, papers, reports, and essays, as well as related research from national organizations. The first part of the chapter offers insight into principal preparation programs through the eyes of one report and two initiatives that have impacted United States education. The second portion addresses what the research says about school leadership programs: traditional and alternative. The third and final section reviews program evaluation.

Antecedents

A Nation at Risk and School Leaders

In 1981, the National Commission on Excellence in Education led by T. H. Bell, then Secretary of Education, conducted an examination of education in America. The 1983 report, entitled *A Nation At Risk*, found that the “mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people . . . [should be viewed] as an act of war” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 1). The Commission reported that student achievement, particularly in science and mathematics, did not measure up to the standard of excellence that education leaders had touted. This conclusion, in essence, led to the recognition that improvement in leadership in the nation’s schools was needed (Milstein & Krueger, 1997). The Commission offered several recommendations regarding course content, standards and expectations, and time to improve the teaching of students; however, there were very few recommendations offered to enhance the preparedness of school leaders. In Recommendation E: Leadership and Fiscal Support, the

Commission suggested that principals and superintendents play a crucial leadership role in developing school and community support for the proposed reforms and that school boards offer professional development and support so that school leaders can be effective. The remainder of the suggestions spoke to federal and state officials about their responsibilities in financing and governing the localities (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

Goals 2000 and School Administrators

The National Education Goals Panel, created in 1990 sought to continue the education reform movement in America. Through the research it conducted, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (P.L. 103-227) was signed into law in 1994 (National Education Goals Report, 1993). The eight goals focused on comprehensive reform plans that addressed school readiness, competency in subject areas, school safety, school/home partnerships, professional development, and adult literacy (1993).

The professional development component was derived from The Eisenhower Professional Development Program. Under Section 2301 of the program, professional development is primarily focused on teachers and where appropriate, administrators and pupil services personnel (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965). Goal four of Goals 2000, Title I, Section 102-B (iii) addresses the need for states and school districts to create strategies to attract, recruit, prepare, retrain, and support the continued professional development of teachers, administrators, and other educators, so there is a highly talented work force of professional educators to teach challenging subject matter (National Education Goals Report, 1993).

No Child Left Behind and Principal Preparation Programs

Title II, Part A, Section 2101 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) addresses the need to prepare, train, and recruit high quality teachers and principals. Under Title II of

NCLB, State and local educational agencies are to move toward increased student academic achievement by employing highly qualified teachers, assistant principals, and principals (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). According to Demoulin (1996), the word has gotten out that educators everywhere must be held accountable for the learning of students. The Improving Teacher Quality Act (ITQ), as it is called under No Child Left Behind, provides funding for this teacher improvement act through grants to states which then distributes the funds to the localities and/or eligible partnerships (2005). As of August 2005, the revised regulations of Title II, Part A, Section 2101, states that school divisions and eligible partners that receive grants are able to use funds to provide “for more capable principals and assistant principals to serve as effective school leaders” (U.S. Department of Education, 2005, Purpose, para. 2). What then has caused the nation’s experts to look so critically at school leaders?

The Need for School Leaders

According to Glasman and Glasman (1997), there exist several dimensions to school leadership derived from historical, theoretical, and practice-based research. The compilation of dimensions includes guiding and motivating individuals, providing vision, and having a lasting effect.

Fenwick English, noted educational researcher, stated that leadership in educational administration is vital (English, 1994). If this is the case, then the over 15,000 school districts in the United States must find it difficult to obtain top-notch school leaders for every position. The shortage of qualified candidates for school leadership positions has surfaced in many areas in the United States, at times forcing school divisions to re-advertise for some positions (U.S. Department of Education, 2005; Lashway, 2003; Bloom & Krovetz, 2001).

One Ohio study surveyed 868 teachers, some with administrative licenses and some without (Howley, Andrianaivo, & Perry, 2005). The researchers sought to gain teachers' perspectives on the incentives and disincentives related to the principalship. What they found was that the disincentives significantly outweighed the incentives. While some teachers saw the principalship as having enough incentives to steer them into pursuing such a position, a larger number saw the disincentives as more salient, enough to steer them away from the principalship as a professional aspiration (2005). The result is that many of those from whose ranks principals have traditionally come are not pursuing the position (Tucker & Tschannen-Moran, 2002).

Public Agenda and the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds conducted an in-depth study of 853 randomly-selected public school superintendents and 909 randomly-selected public school principals addressing the frustrations that school leaders face and the projected shortage of superintendents and principals in some areas (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, Foleno, & Foley, 2001). To triangulate the data, the researchers sent questionnaires, conducted twenty-two interviews, and conducted one focus group. The frustration comes out of dedicating too much time on certain areas and not enough time developing teachers for school leadership positions. Table 1 highlights the top three sources of frustration for superintendents and principals and the measure of effectiveness they believe removing poor teachers would have on improving school leadership.

The same frustration holds true for other parts of the world. A study concerning teacher and administrator shortage conducted in British Columbia in 2000 found that "adversarial organizational conditions have aggravated an apparent shortage of school administrators" (Grimmett & Echols, 2000, p. 333). Respondents reported that it was hard to convince experienced teachers to enter school administration. The findings also revealed that of the

13,300 educators slated to retire in 2009, a substantial percentage of them will be school administrators (2000).

Table 1

Superintendents' and Principals' Responses

	Superintendents	Principals
Too Much Politics and Bureaucracy	81%	47%
Lack of Funding	66%	53%
Must Work Around the System	54%	48%
<u>Make it Easier to Remove Bad Teachers</u>	<u>73%</u>	<u>69%</u>

Note. From *Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game*, by Farkas et al., 2001, a report from Public Agenda prepared for the Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds. Copyright 2001 by Public Agenda.

In contrast to the many studies about the shortage of public school administrators, Lee Mitgang (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of three research projects. She emerged with three findings that contrast the notion that “the pipeline for the principalship is running dry, and steps must be taken to lure more candidates in” (2003, p. 2). Finding one notes that there is no statistical evidence to support the theory that there is a nationwide shortage of certified candidates for the principalship in the United States. In fact, there are more certified candidates than there are job openings. Finding two revealed that the most challenging, impoverished districts with lower per pupil expenditures and lower salaries are the ones that find it hardest to attract candidates. Schools seen as academically competitive tend to attract the most applicants. This finding suggests that the lack of applicants depends, to some degree, on the funding that the district and the state provide. Finding three revealed that hiring practices and search criteria make it difficult for some districts to attract sufficient principal candidates. Major barriers such

as certification must be addressed in order for school divisions to attract the quality of principal candidates that they need (2003).

Farkas et al. (2001) reported that superintendents and principals were not concerned about the shortage of school administrators. In fact, of the 1,762 superintendents and principals that responded to their study, 59% of the superintendents and 70% of the principals stated that there was no shortage of principals in their districts. What concerned the superintendents most was the quality of the applicants available (2001).

The Standards

Mitgang (2003) noted that a major barrier to attracting quality principal candidates is principal certification. However, obtaining certification is tied to the standards. The purpose of this section is to discuss the “model standards and assessments for school leaders” developed by various educational organizations and school practitioners in order to guide school improvement (Boeckman, 1999, p. 495). Kaplan, Owings, and Nunnery (2005, p. 31) purport that “school systems need clear, functional performance standards for what principals should be able to do in order to lead schools that foster all students’ high academic achievement.” Therefore, the intent of the development of standards and guidelines is to provide school leaders with an avenue to transform the standards into everyday practice (Boeckman, 1999) thus producing aspirants prepared to lead public schools.

The superintendents’ and principals’ study by Farkas et al. (2001), revealed the following about standards. Forty-seven percent of the superintendents and 34% of the principals felt that higher standards and accountability encourage dedicated principals to stay and encourage the less dedicated ones to leave. While they felt thus, 24% of the superintendents and 44% of the principals also felt that unreasonable standards and accountability measures drive out dedicated

principals. There must be a balance in order for school leaders to totally embrace the standards. A review of the standards follows.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

NCATE, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, was founded in 1954. Five professional groups collaborated to form this body: the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the National Education Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National School Boards Association. NCATE is recognized by the United States Department of Education as the accrediting body for colleges and universities (NCATE, 2006). To remain current with research and practice, NCATE revises its standards every five years. The process for the most recent NCATE standards revision began in 1997 (2006). The committee consulted educators and policymakers and held consultations at professional conferences. The new wave of standards, ratified in 2000, provided guidance for educational professionals to equip students to compete in the 21st century (2006). Prior to 2000, colleges and universities were measured by the quality of the curriculum. The new NCATE standards measure results. Institutions seeking accreditation must meet prescribed preconditions and undergo an accreditation visit. Based on the findings, NCATE then makes the final accreditation decision (2006).

NCATE's standards are comprised of two sections: candidate performance and unit capacity. A summary of the six standards follow:

Under section one, candidate performance, there are two standards:

Standard 1: Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions – candidates must demonstrate knowledge of pedagogy, and must demonstrate the ability to help all students learn.

Standard 2: Assessment system and unit evaluation – information about the candidates are analyzed in order to determine their qualifications. Candidates are expected to assess the unit for improvement purposes.

Section two, unit capacity, entails four standards:

Standard 3: Field experiences and clinical practice – candidates engage in field experiences and clinical practice to better meet students’ needs.

Standard 4: Diversity – candidates are expected to work with a wide array of educators and public school students.

Standard 5: Faculty qualifications, performance, and development – faculty performance is evaluated.

Standard 6: Unit governance and resources – resources are examined to meet the needs of the candidates (NCATE, 2006).

Though these standards primarily govern teacher candidates, “NCATE has scaffolded the ISLLC standards into their accreditation process for educational administration programs” (Kaplan et al., 2005, p. 31). Thus, NCATE and the ISLLC standards are inextricably linked.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)

The ISLLC Standards were created to raise the quality of professionalism within the educational profession, to guide school leaders, and to provide a common set of standards that promotes collaboration among school leaders in various states (CCSSO, 1996). The six research-based standards seek to create a deeper understanding of educational administration in school leaders. These standards are designed so that students and schools will realize increased success with leaders that adhere to the following:

Standard 1: A vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2: A school culture and instructional program that promotes student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3: Management of the organization and resources for safety and efficiency.

Standard 4: Collaborating with family and community members and acquiring resources.

Standard 5: Being fair and acting ethically and with integrity.

Standard 6: Appropriately responding to the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of school leadership (CCSSO, 1996).

A study by Boeckman (1999) used data from a random sample of 17 states where over 500 superintendents participated. Respondents were asked to rate the value they placed on the ISLLC Standards and the extent to which they incorporated the standards into day-to-day practice. While the respondents highly valued the standards, revealing an overall rating of (3.70 on a 4-point scale), the extent to which they incorporated the standards on a daily basis was lower (3.37 on a 4-point scale).

Barnett (2004) conducted a study of university graduates in which respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they practiced the six ISLLC Standards. The two groups, Morehead State University (MSU) graduates and non-Morehead State University (non-MSU) graduates, were comprised of 112 school-based administrators and district-wide administrators. The respondents used a rating scale of one if they never completed the practice or five if they always completed the practice. Overall, the study revealed that the participants felt that they practiced using the standards the majority of the time. A mean score of 4.15 was reported for the MSU graduates and a mean score of 4.07 for the non-MSU graduates.

Howley and Larson (2002) conducted case studies of four universities in the United States. They asked the program chair or coordinator to provide written program materials and

other pertinent documents. The results of the interviews were coded, organized, categorized, recoded, and interpreted. One question regarded the relevance of the NCATE and ISLLC Standards. In essence, the faculties saw the standards as having little relevance on their programs. Furthermore, many faculty members saw the standards as an intrusion.

The ISLLC Standards, “used by 40 states as a platform for preparation programs and licensure”, and NCATE are integrated (Orr, 2006, p. 493). Programs in schools and colleges of educational leadership are expected to frame their curricula around these research-based standards. The intent, of course, is to create the most effective school leaders for America’s children. A review of several principal preparation programs follow.

Principal Preparation Programs

Today’s principals and superintendents are charged with managing and leading schools through an age of intense social change. School leaders are held accountable for the results of high-stakes assessments, for school safety concerns, and are often the source of constant blame for society’s ills (Levine, 2005). In a meta-analysis of 69 studies that involved 2,802 schools containing 1.4 million students and 14,000 teachers, Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) found that the correlation between a school’s principal and the academic achievement of the students is .25. This is translated thus: of the approximately 94,000 principals in the United States, the students in the schools whose principals are rated in the top half based on leadership effectiveness would have a 25% higher passing rate on a test (2005). There is no doubt that all principals would desire to be rated among the top in leadership abilities, especially in today’s data-driven society. So, how are colleges and universities faring as they strive to prepare aspiring principals to meet the many challenges they will face and to be among the best?

Daresh and Male (2000) conducted a study of sixteen school leaders in Britain and the United States. Eight of the participants were head teachers in Britain and eight were principals in the United States. Face-to-face and telephone interviews were conducted. At the time of the interview, the average length that the respondents served as principals was 17 months. What the researchers found was that the British respondents had received no formal preparation for their posts. Seven had traveled through the ranks gaining experience through senior management positions in more than one school, while one had been promoted from a position of deputy head teacher, having served for four terms. In comparison, all of the United States principals had completed a formal university principal preparation program concluding in master's degrees prior to receiving their posts (2000). The mandated courses that they completed were school law, teacher supervision, and personnel management. Most had courses in school finance or budgeting. Similar to their British counterparts, seven had served as assistant principals, while one was promoted from a school counselor's position. All respondents, with and without formal training, felt somewhat prepared for their roles. The researchers conclude that a strong commitment must be made for school leaders to spend time reflecting on personal values, ethical stances, and other critical matters (2000).

To prepare the aspiring administrators with whom they work, Radford University and Virginia Tech University applied the constructivist approach in their principal preparation program as a method of enhancing "concrete experience, collaborative conversation, and reflection" (Smith & Dawson, 1999, Constructivism). Jean Piaget, generally known for constructivism, suggested that knowledge is internalized by a student through accommodation, reframing one's mental representation of the external world to fit new experiences. The other half of constructivist thought is assimilation, aligning one's internal representation of the world

to a new experience. The constructivist theory is based on teacher-supported learning that is initiated and directed by the student (Piaget, 1950). Smith and Dawson (1999) believe that the use of this approach in a principal preparation program would build confidence in the aspirants, would help them to express their ideas, and would serve them as they embark on solving problems individually and as group members. Students at both universities kept reflective journals, participated in extensive internships, prepared presentations and portfolios, and worked with each other and school-based mentors. The students at Radford University experienced the following: transformational leadership philosophy, instructional conversations, conversational guidelines, weekly reflective writings, use of trade and scholarly books, mini-lectures, group work, synthesis of concepts, and choosing a personal platform. The students at Virginia Tech University experienced the following: interdisciplinary learning and constructivism, field-based learning, problem-based learning and internships, journals and portfolios, challenges, and assessing student learning (1999).

Hess and Kelly (2005) in their 2004 study of principal preparation programs, reviewed more than 200 course syllabi, covering 2,500 course weeks to review what preparation programs are asking future principals to learn. The researchers used a stratified sample to identify 31 educational administration programs in the United States, including elite and non-elite institutions. From the 31 different principal preparation programs selected, the researchers collected the syllabi from four mandated core courses. The results were that 30% of course material focused on operational issues (school law, finance, and facilities), 16% focused on managing for results (assessments and accountability), 15% focused on managing personnel, and 12% focused on norms and values. This study of course material in principal preparation programs concluded that principal preparation programs have not kept pace with changes in the

world of education, leaving aspiring school leaders ill-equipped to deal with the challenges in an era of accountability (2005).

A study of principals in Australia and Japan revealed that the preparation of school leaders in these countries greatly vary from the preparation of school leaders in the United States. The study included principals and deputy principals from 130 primary and high schools in Australia. The study also included 130 principals and vice principals in Japan. The participants received a questionnaire that was comprised of open-ended and structured items covering demographic information. Information regarding their preservice experiences, in-service experiences, their duties, responsibilities, goals, and beliefs was also obtained (Gamage & Ueyama, 2004).

Seventy-one percent of the Australian participants responded to the questionnaires. Of the Australian respondents, 66% of the principals reported that they did not have preservice training before becoming a principal. There were no preservice requirements except demonstration of competence as a teacher. Of the principals who received preservice training, 4% received three months of training, 2% received six months, 5% received one year, 9% received two years, and 14% received four years of training (2004).

Forty-five percent of the Japanese participants responded to the questionnaires. The study indicates that most Japanese principals have not pursued preservice training. However, of the 47 Japanese principals who responded to the question regarding preservice training, 33% stated that they had received from one to three months of preservice training and 6.8% received up to two years of preservice training.

The most important topics of preservice training in both countries were these: effective communication and decision making, management of human resources, contemporary

educational leadership, and theory and practice of curriculum development. Although the majority of American states require a minimum of three years of teaching coupled with a master's degree in educational administration from a formal principal preparation program, other countries similar to Australia and Japan still use the apprenticeship approach to identifying prospective school leaders (2004).

While the research appears to be inconclusive regarding the amount and quality of preparation that principals receive, Arthur Levine feels certain that principal preparation programs have not been doing an adequate job. In his research, he conducted case studies of 28 schools and departments of education and conducted site visits at each school. The schools and departments were selected because they reflected the diversity of the nation's education schools. In addition, he surveyed all the deans, chairs, and directors of U.S. education schools and departments (53% responded). By random sampling, he surveyed 5,469 education school faculty members (40% responded), 15,468 education school alumni (34% responded), and 1,800 principals (41% responded) (Levine, 2005). He used a nine-point template to judge the quality of the programs. The nine criteria are purpose, curricular coherence, curricular balance, faculty composition, admissions, degrees, research, finances, and assessment. Levine emerged with four conclusions about educational administration programs.

First, he believes that while the programs are increasing in number, they are decreasing in their quality. Second, he concluded that in an effort to gain stature, research-based universities are racing to award doctoral degrees. Third, he surmised that institutions are competing for students and diminishing program quality. Fourth, he maintained that states and school districts are contributing to the downward spiral of educational administration programs by offering incentives for obtaining advanced degrees. In essence, he referred to the majority of the

programs as inadequate or appalling (Levine, 2005). In reference to alternative principal preparation programs which were not the main focus of the study, Levine states that they are not complete since they are “long on practice and short on theory” (2005, p. 52).

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) (2001) conducted a study of educational leadership and states’ new accountability systems and standards to answer two questions, one of which was “How can we prepare and develop effective school leaders?” They posed the question to a sample of principals who had realized success in raising student achievement. Next, they created a national leadership council to gather their ideas. In addition, they conducted a focus group of 15 exemplary school leaders who had been successful in improving low-performing schools and districts. Last, they posed the questions to other groups that work with and/or support K-12 education. The data revealed six key findings that the education community in every state and every school district could do to prepare and develop effective school leaders:

- Finding One: Tap and develop potential leaders.
- Finding Two: Open the certification process to more successful educators.
- Finding Three: Base professional certification on performance.
- Finding Four: Institute major changes in university leadership preparation programs.
- Finding Five: Offer quality alternatives to traditional university school leadership preparation.
- Finding Six: To maintain certification, require successful participation in continuous learning activities that closely align to school improvement.

The literature paints a view of the myriad of methods that principal preparation programs use to prepare and/or develop aspiring principals. For the most part, the literature reveals that traditional principal preparation programs are in need of refinement. What does the research say about nontraditional principal preparation programs? The discussions of the studies and reviews of principal preparation programs that follow highlight several alternative principal preparation programs, some that result in administrative certification and some that do not. A few studies adhere to the findings of SREB, and others explore innovative methods of principal preparation. One focuses on the SLLA, several uses the cohort as a component, and others use the collaborative approach.

Identifying Potential Leaders

The word “tap” is defined as a deliberate selection of an individual. The process of recruiting talented teacher-leaders as potential school administrators “must be both systematic and purposeful” notes Milstein and Krueger (1997, p. 101). The new wave of school leaders are keeping their eyes on gifted prospective administrators.

The most innovative school leaders prepare for leadership succession. Hargreaves, Moore, Fink, Brayman, and White (2003) conducted a study on leadership succession spanning 20 years. In the study, they conducted more than 250 interviews with teachers and administrators addressing the issue of leadership succession. What they found was that in order to be successful, leaders must plan for their successors. “From the first day of their appointment,” says Hargreaves, “leaders need to give thought to the leadership capacity they will build and legacies they will leave” (Hargreaves, 2005, p. 172). This involves tapping and developing leaders. Farkas et al.(2001, p. 29) found that 84% of superintendents and 67% of

principals reported that “they are actively and deliberately grooming someone on their staff for a more senior leadership position”.

Ardith Harle kept her eyes on the future administrators in the school division in which she worked (Harle, 2000). In 1996, she proposed to the new superintendent a leadership academy geared towards developing teachers who were six credits shy of completing their requirements for administrative licensure. The first academy, 1996-1997, entailed eight after-school seminars framed around the leadership strategies of Richard DuFour and Robert Eaker. Harle selected the seminar format since the research she conducted declared it as an effective method of building knowledge and encouraging professional growth. Participants discussed leadership issues, examined research and best practices, participated in simulations, developed a professional portfolio, and were introduced to the ISLLC standards (2000). Of the nineteen participants, fifteen obtained administrative positions, and three became teacher leaders in their schools.

With that success, Leadership Academies II (1997-1998) and III (1999) were developed and followed the same structure. Twelve of Academy II participants completed the program. Six of those obtained administrative positions, and three became teacher leaders. Six of the nine Academy III participants completed the program, and three obtained administrative positions (Harle, 2000).

Using the SLLA

In the state of California, an individual pursuing a preliminary administrative services credential is allowed to use the passing score on the SLLA as a basis for administrative licensure. In conjunction, individuals must possess his/her state teaching credential, must have taught full-

time for three years, and must have passed the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CCTC, 2003).

A study by Chet Jensen (2005-2006) surveyed California superintendents to inquire about whether or not they were willing to hire principals who obtained their administrative credentials via an exam. One hundred and five superintendents responded to the three-part survey. The researchers used descriptive statistics, frequencies, mean responses, and an analysis of open-ended remarks. The responses were almost even: 52% responded “yes” and 48% responded “no”. While the respondents differed in their opinions on hiring an administrator who obtained licensure via an assessment, they unanimously agreed that the most important qualities they consider before hiring are the unique abilities and characteristics of a candidate (2005-2006).

The Cohort Component

The cohort component is a model to which many university leadership programs and school division leadership academies are converting. Of the cohort model, John Daresh of the University of Texas of El Paso notes that children and adults learn better when they form learning communities (1997). Increasingly, educational administrative programs have moved toward educating students in fixed groups for the purpose of working together and achieving common goals. Daresh contends that fewer and fewer programs will follow the individual model of learning (1997). Rather, universities will change their approach to the cohort model.

One noted program in educational leadership is the Danforth Educational Leadership Program in the University of Washington’s College of Education, developed in 1987. Beginning in 1988, the program operated alongside the College of Education’s administrative credential program (NCATE Standards Report, 2006). In 1992, after much study and data analysis, admission to the principal administrator certification program filters through the Danforth

Educational Leadership Program. The Danforth faculty consists of the university's faculty, field instructors, mentor principals, program administrators, and students. The curriculum framework is a five-quarter, 39-credit hour program that begins with a summer residency and involves instructional modules, seminars, and an internship experience. Most importantly, every component of the leadership program is built around the cohort structure of 20 students, purposely limited and selected each year to ensure the quality of student/faculty interaction that the program promotes (2006).

Lee Teitel (1997) describes the school leadership programs at the University of Massachusetts at Boston (UMB). Teitel shares of the 1995 decision, "We embraced the cohort design because of the structural and organizational benefits it promised and because we expected stronger bonds to form among the students that would lead to increased retention" (1997, p. 66). In 1995, a new Leadership in Urban Schools doctoral program formed its first cohort and two educational administration programs (master's and CAGS) merged and also adopted a cohort model. A second cohort was added in 1996. Both programs follow the same schedule, and both programs are part-time programs: two years for the master's and CAGS, which enrolls 20 students per year, and four years for the doctoral program, which enrolls 12 students per year. Students and faculty completed a written survey describing the potential benefits and problems of the cohort model. Three-fourths of the students responded, and three of the five full-time faculty members responded. The researcher sent a typed summary and an initial draft of the summarized data to the respondents for comments and suggestions (1997).

Five areas of impact emerged from the study. First, participants benefited from the support and connection among students. Students mentioned friendships, networks, and family atmosphere; one stated that the cohort model helped in the decision to stay in the program.

Second, there existed a change in the depth of discussion. The cohesion allowed students to be more comfortable and engage in honest discussions about sensitive issues. Third, there exist the potential for changes in interpersonal relationships. The interdependence of classmates was seen as a potential negative. Students felt they could be stuck for years with weak classmates. However, in this study, the cohort model increased the sense of interpersonal relationships. Fourth, there exist changes in power relationships between students and faculty. The bond that cohort members shared gave them power to renegotiate course load, syllabus, and issues of evaluation. Last, the cohort model affected the program planning and decision making of faculty members. Students reported that in developing their own sense of authority and leadership, they were “less willing to defer to institutional authority” (1997, p. 71). The cohort model is one that is gaining in momentum in the educational community. As the nation moves toward novel methods of licensure for school leaders, the research reveals that across the board, various approaches are being adopted.

The Collaborative Approach

Because most school divisions’ leadership academies collaborate with a college or university, literature on collaborative models are included. Further, the principal preparation program that is the heart of this study uses a collaborative approach.

The most basic definition of collaboration is a partnership between two or more entities for a common goal. A blend of expertise between higher education and K-12 practitioners is vital for school leaders and can only serve to enhance student performance (Livingston, Davis, Green, & Despain, 2001; Wheaton & Kay, 1999). Orozco (1999) in his lecture on collaboration suggests that collaboration is the professional process of the new millennium where groups invest in shared goals, new ventures and solutions, shared resources and risks, and emerge with a

single voice. An SREB (2005) discussion of school and university partnership states the following:

Currently, the research base for district and university collaborations on school leadership program design is thin. Many universities have not viewed local school districts as having the responsibility for preparing future leaders or the valuable knowledge and other resources needed for effective program design and implementation. (p.1) A review of a few partnerships is addressed in this section.

To address the literacy problem, the need for African American special education teachers, and the need for more qualified school leaders, the University of Alabama at Birmingham and the City of Birmingham adopted a Project LEAD (Leaders for Educators Amid Diversity) program (Goldman, Aldridge, & Worthington, 2004). The state of Alabama's special education teacher certification falls under two categories: collaborative teaching (K-6) or collaborative teaching (6-12). The Project targeted general educators of diverse backgrounds. Of the 43 tapped candidates, 32 participants completed coursework, 80 hours of clinical experiences, and 240 hours of practicum experience. A product that participants developed was an inservice entitled "Strategies for Teaching Literacy in Urban Settings". This four-year collaborative effort of co-planning, co-teaching, and co-supervising, resulted in completers' earning extensive training in literacy, a Masters' degree in special education (collaborative teaching) and certification in educational leadership (2004).

Another study shares about the partnership among Halifax County Schools in North Carolina, NASSP, and East Carolina University (Peel, Wallace, Buckner, Wrenn, & Evans, 1998). The two-year program is entitled the Potential Administrator Development Program (PADP). In 1992, 10 educators were selected, and profiles were created from individual

assessments. All participants were enrolled in graduate classes, attended monthly seminars, participated in simulation activities, and were paired with a mentor and a university supervisor. The final year, participants completed a six-week internship spanning various grade levels. At the end of the program, all participants were surveyed. Five participants received administrative positions; one became an instructional specialist; one is a department chair, and two remain as teachers. Two years later, nine of the ten completed another survey regarding the effectiveness of the program. Of the respondents, all but one felt the practical experience was most beneficial; all believed that the mentoring experience was crucial. In addition, the seven who participated in the internship felt that it was instrumental (Peel et al., 1998).

In his criticism of American school leadership programs, Arthur Levine (2005, p. 54) was led to England's National College of School Leadership which he said proved to be "the most promising model" of educational administration programs, since it met eight of the nine possible points of Levine's nine-point template. Under Prime Minister Tony Blair, the NCSL opened in 2000. One does not earn credits or a degree from the NCSL, for it is a leadership development center. The college focuses on school leadership at all levels (Bush, 2006): emergent leadership (for middle managers), established leadership (for assistant heads), entry into headship (for aspiring and first-time head teachers), advanced leadership (for acting head teachers), and consultant leadership (for the purpose of mentoring others into school leadership) (2006). What follows is where the partnership resides. The NCSL places heavy emphasis on field-based learning; therefore, current and recent school principals lead its programs. Though the NCSL has been hailed as one of the most innovative school leadership creations, it has been criticized for its neglect of theory and research. It must be noted, however, that almost half of England's 24,000 principals (47%) have participated in at least one of NCSL's programs (2006).

Another collaborative model exists between Kansas State University College of Education and three Kansas school districts. In 2000, the Professional Administrative Leadership Academy (PALA) provided an alternative to a traditional program of study (Devin, 2004). A brochure was created to advertise the admission requirements and the two-year program requirements. Twenty-four participants were selected for the initial phase of the program, eight from each school district. The university faculty and the three superintendents served as instructors; in addition, the district and the university pooled their financial resources to provide for various expenses. PALA used the ISLLC standards as the basis for its program, and mandated as its final assessment for year one, a portfolio that would be used to assess student mastery, personal reflections, a log of mentoring activities, and a personal interview. At the end of the year two, students were assessed using the final portfolios, service project completion and presentation, mentors' notes, and personal interviews. All of the participants completed the two-year program except for three, one who returned to a traditional principal preparation program and two who completed their degree and certification during the first year of PALA. In one district alone, all eight participants received building or district office administrator positions. Two of the three districts plan to continue with future academies as the partnership met its goal of expanding the pool of qualified candidates for administration (2004).

One superintendent of a large, urban, southern school district partnered with a local university to create a Leadership Training Consortium (LTC) to assist in preparing principals of color for the school district (Bjork & Richardson, 1997). The 26 instructional modules proposed did not exactly match traditional courses; instructional time exceeded accreditation requirements. Assigning courses for the six faculty members was demanding, so district-level experts were used. A struggle between maintaining program integrity and program innovation ensued among

the creators. After years of preparing the program's instructional modules and matching the modules with the state's certification requirements and with NCATE's "Curriculum Guidelines for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership for Superintendents, Principals, Curriculum Directors and Supervisors", LTC was approved as a year-long alternative-certification program. The program was commended for the way in which it differed from established programs. The program is a balance of content and field-based, clinical application. Of the original 20 participants, 15 were promoted to administrative positions (1997). Thus, the debate over alternative administrative preparation and licensure programs remains.

Finally, the collaborative effort of the University of Rhode Island and the Providence School Department is mentioned. In 2002, the Providence Aspiring Principals Program (APP) was created to prepare leaders, according to the creators, the "right way" (SREB, 2005, p. 3). It is important to note that the University of Rhode Island does not have an educational leadership department. This was seen as a benefit since there was no resistance to combat. District leaders and the university worked with the Leadership for Educational Achievement in Districts (LEAD) to design an 18-month program. The LEAD Advisory Board met regularly to help guide the discussions and to help design the new program. The application criteria included a recommendation from a colleague, parent, administrator, and a community or business representative; a professional portfolio; a personal essay; and three years of teaching experience. In addition to course work, applicants engage in action research, assignments in clinical practice, a nine-week internship at two different schools, and a nine-week clinical residency (2005). What is taught to the participants is aligned with the district's improvement plan. The participants are instructed in curriculum and instruction, organization and management, leadership, technology, teacher development, and assessment and accountability. Also, program participants are

mentored by certified administrators (2005). Twenty-three students were admitted in the first cohort. The 16 students admitted in the second cohort had not yet completed the program at the time of the publication of this study. Of the 23 from the first cohort, all had completed the program, and 16 had obtained leadership positions (2005).

Leadership Academies

Tucker and Tschannen-Moran (2002, p. 13) sum up the foundation that leads to the principalship when they note, “Training and experience as a teacher is valuable preparation for the instructional leadership components of a principal’s responsibilities.” The growing number of leadership academies exists to further prepare school leaders.

Kanawha County School Leadership Academy

When the leaders of Kanawha County School division studied the administrative personnel and determined that there would soon be a shortage of school administrators, they decided to partner with faculty members from the Leadership Studies program at Marshall University Graduate School (Cunningham & Hardman, 1999). A leadership academy was then formed. The school division provided funding, personnel, and released time for participants. Seventy current and aspiring administrators entered the first class in the spring of 1995. All participants possessed a valid administrative certificate. Each year, for the next three years, 25 students joined the academy. The academy began with a week-long summer workshop followed by four activities during the next school year. Participants studied topics such as personality types of leaders, vision, personnel management techniques, time and stress management, team building, and human relations skills. Participants were also exposed to a number of nationally-known speakers. After two years in the academy, participants were then able to enter an apprenticeship in the form of two separate, week-long experiences with practicing

administrators. Thirty-four of the 36 new administrators employed in the Kanawha County Public Schools were completers of the academy (1999).

New York City Leadership Academy

As part of their transformational strategy to improve the preparation of aspiring principals, Michael Bloomberg and Joel Klein launched the New York City Leadership Academy (APP) (Donlevy, 2004). In order to be eligible for participation in the APP, candidates must have a 3.0 minimum GPA in their undergraduate or graduate work and must have at least five years of work experience with at least three years as a K-12 teacher. Participants must make a commitment to work in the New York City Public Schools for at least five years. Participants undergo 15 months of paid professional development which occurs in three phases. The first phase is two months of intensive summer preparation of problem-based learning scenarios and the development of the knowledge, skills, and disposition needed to be a school leader. The second phase is an entire school year of residency where participants work at a school for four days and engage in work sessions on the fifth day of each week. The third and final phase consists of two months during the summer where they analyze student and teacher performance and prepare to open a school. First-year principals who are program completers are offered support in the form of coaching, retreats, technology-based collaboration, and workshops. Since its inception, more than 75% of the completers lead New York City's public schools (2004).

Innovations in Education

The U.S. Department of Education (2004) in its Innovations in Education series, featured six leadership academies: First Ring Leadership Academy in Ohio, initiated in 2003; the Leadership Academy and Urban Network for Chicago (LAUNCH) in Illinois, initiated in 1998; New Jersey EXCEL in New Jersey, initiated in 2003; the Boston Fellowship in Massachusetts,

initiated in 2003; New Leaders for New Schools in New York, Illinois, D.C., Tennessee, and California, initiated in 2000; and the Principals Excellence Program in Kentucky, initiated in 2002. For the study, these programs were selected using a site search of “alternative leadership preparation” and other descriptors. This yielded 60 potential sites. A second round of screening narrowed the sites to 18, and a third round yielded the six finalists that scored a minimum of 20 out of 24 possible points. The researcher also took into consideration a range of geographic locations. The research team collected data using two-day site visits and personal interviews. A narrative report format was used to report the findings (2004).

The curriculum of all six programs was derived from either local or state-mandated performance-based standards. All six programs use the ISLLC standards. All six programs use a cohort group structure. Four programs require a minimum of a bachelor’s degree, and two required master’s degrees. Two programs require a minimum of three years of teaching experience; two require a minimum of five years of teaching experience; and the other three vary in requirements ranging from a three-year commitment to holding or being eligible to hold administrative credentials. All candidates demonstrated successful leadership experience, effective skills in communication, relationship-building skills, data analysis and interpretation skills, strategic thinking and problem solving skills (2004).

The length of the programs ranges from 12 months to 36 months. Four of the programs call for a summer residency: the time spans from one to five weeks. Two of the programs offer two years of support after receiving an administrative position; the others do not mention continued support (2004).

Three of the leadership programs, one that began in 2002 and two that began in 2003, shared no quantifiable results. The study revealed that of the 188 LAUNCH completers, 64

assumed assistant principals' positions and 65 assumed principalships. The researchers found that one NJ EXCEL program completer's action research project improved students' scores by 30%. Last, the researchers found that 35% of completers from the New Leaders for New Schools program assumed assistant principals' positions, and that 60% assumed principalships (2004).

The commonalities of the qualitative data in regards to staff and participants' perceptions of the programs follow:

1. A strong core belief that all students can and will learn.
2. Strong support from the school division's superintendent.
3. A well-designed, research-based, job-embedded curriculum.
4. Consistent and frequent feedback.

In summary, principal preparation programs vary in scope, breadth, and depth. The literature reveals the variety of programs that exist in the United States and abroad, and it also shows that while research studies on alternative principal preparation programs are few, the programs are on the rise. In June of 2006, the U.S. Conference of Mayors passed a resolution encouraging "the use of high quality alternative programs that recruit, train, support, and retain teachers, principals, and superintendents" (National Center for Alternative Certification, 2006). An SREB (2005, p. 2) case study contends that "it is impossible to provide quality school-based experiences that engage aspiring principals in developmental continuum . . . without the district's commitment to principal preparation . . ."

Principal preparation programs are vital to the new wave of school leaders. As high stakes accountability measures continue to impact public education, the role of the public school principal continues to dramatically change. Thus, principals require a new preparation and

should be guided by highly competent, professional, and ethical mentors (Virginia Department of Education, 2003). In addressing Virginia's needs, a commission was created in 2002, to review, study, and reform educational leadership (2003). The 12 recommendations that the Task Force espouses all revolve around reforming the preparation provided in school leadership programs to reflect authentic practice in schools.

Program Evaluation in Education

The reformation of any type of program calls for program evaluation that uses data to support consistent practice or to enact change. Traditionally, education has not been viewed as a field informed by evaluation. The fields of science and medicine tend to dominate in the area of evaluation. Three national laws changed the way in which education viewed evaluations. Just 42 years ago, President Johnson signed into law the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This law was the first to mandate annual evaluations of a federal educational program, Title I. Another national educational evaluative program of note is the 1998 Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration that offered funds to schools that implemented practices and programs that had been rigorously evaluated. Last is the federally enacted No Child Left Behind Act which places a premium on the evaluation of programs using high-quality research practices (Borman, 2002).

Blank (2002, p. 87) contends that educational standards, accountability, and systemic approaches . . . have emerged in the past decade as favored policy tools for promoting world-class public education for all students. State and federal governments have invested large amounts of money in developing standards, high-stakes assessments, professional development, and other capacity-building resources and expertise to improve the quality of education.

According to Webster's dictionary, the definition of evaluate is "to determine or assess the value or worth of". The American Educators' Encyclopedia (Dejnozka & Kapel, 1982) outlines program evaluation as the assessment of the value, worth, or merit of a particular educational program. One cannot fully assess the value or worth of a program without critical evaluation. Jack Trammell states that evaluation must gauge outcomes and must also be an ongoing justification for the program to exist (Trammel, 2005). Stufflebeam, Madaus, and Kellaghan (2000) notes that "the value of program evaluation must be judged in terms of its actual and potential contributions to improving learning, teaching, and administration" (p. 18). The purpose of the evaluation that will be conducted in this study is to analyze the worth of the City Public Schools Leadership Academy for Aspiring Leaders.

The Role of the Evaluator

Harklau and Norwood assert that "program evaluators hold the power to affect the very nature and future of the phenomena they investigate" (2005, p. 278). In conducting an evaluation, the researcher is encouraged to be an outsider who practices neutrality and objectivity in order to minimize bias (Gallego, Rueda, & Moll, 2005). The credibility of research in which the researcher practices insider-outsider roles is often suspect (Harklau & Norwood, 2005). Ethnographic program evaluators who live among their subjects as they conduct fieldwork tend to experience such skepticism.

In one such study by Harklau and Norwood (2005), the researchers became participant-observers. The purpose of the study was to evaluate a program designed to boost the college ambitions of traditionally underrepresented students in area middle schools. For four years, the researchers examined approximately 200 students and 30 program workers. The researchers participated in every class, in breakfast and lunch, in games, in staff meetings, in field trips, etc.

This study did not highlight the results; rather, it focused on the roles of the researchers. The researchers noted that they were seen as lurkers, gazers, spies and that their roles could be seen as contradictory and problematic to stakeholders (2005). The researchers, however, saw the study as an opportunity to provide a rich description of a program to include their mutual roles.

Another look at the role of the evaluator follows. Gallego, Rueda, and Moll (2005) states that neutrality and objectivity in evaluation is key for the express purpose of minimizing bias. A study of the National Professional Qualifications for Headship (NPQH) by Patricia Collarbone (1998), evaluated the Needs Assessment process of the London Assessment Centre. The candidates were those aspiring to school headships. The Needs Assessment was conducted over two years and included two cohorts of aspirants. Each center conducted its own research, and center managers evaluated their own practices. Center managers created their own questionnaires and conducted focus group discussions. This practice was approved so that the center managers could have a hand in improving aspects of their own centers and so that they could directly participate in evaluating the process and procedures having been the ones to originally design them. Of the 354 candidates who responded to the questionnaire, 90% found the Needs Assessment process to be professional, rigorous, constructive, and developmental. Improvements in the areas of action planning, clarity in the procedures of the NPQH, training and development, and cost must be addressed (1998).

What, then, should a researcher use to evaluate an administrator preparation program? Christy and McNeil (2000) believe that measures of internal quality and external measures of accountability are critical. Measures of internal quality include program reputation, student selectivity, faculty resources, and research activity. Program reputation is linked to the power that a diploma from a particular college or university holds, the reputation of the faculty, and the

enthusiasm of graduate students. Student selectivity is linked to student test scores, student grade point average, student-faculty ratio, and the number of degrees granted. Faculty resources include the ratio of full-time Ph.D. and master's candidates to full-time faculty, the percent of faculty awarded fellowships, the number of doctoral and master's degrees granted, and the amount of resources available for research and publishing. Last, research activity refers to private and public research expenditures conducted by the school (2000).

External measures of accountability include requirements of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education or NCATE and the State Department of Education. For the purpose of this study, the most important aspect that these bodies require of completers of an administration and supervision program is the School Leaders Licensure Assessment or the SLLA which is grounded in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium or ISLLC Standards (Christy & McNeil, 2000).

Program Evaluation in Principal Preparation Programs

Most modern leadership programs undergo accountability measures by adhering to the NCATE standards, considered an external review. However, program evaluation is moving towards more of a performance-based, outcome model that will involve participation of all stakeholders and will also involve evidence of faculty qualifications, assessment pass scores, visits to learning sites, surveys of students, and conversations with students and mentors (Chenworth, Carr, & Ruhl, 2002).

Dr. Thomas Guskey (1998) asserts that there are three types of evaluation. The first is planning evaluation which occurs before the program begins. This type of evaluation offers an understanding of what is to be accomplished, the procedures to be used, and a look at the way in which success will be determined. The second is formative evaluation which takes place during

the operation of the program. This type of evaluation provides ongoing information about whether or not things are proceeding as previously planned and about whether or not progress is being made. The third type of evaluation is summative evaluation which occurs at the completion of the program. This type of evaluation provides information regarding the overall merit of the program and assists in providing crucial data about the program's future.

Fortune and Hundley (2006) note that the main purpose of program evaluation should not be punitive but should be conducted for the sole purpose of improving the program. The five-step inquiry process focuses on the investigation of accountability, the ascertainment of effectiveness, the study of the program impact, operation analysis, and utility of the data. The measure of accountability tests the design, the timelines, and the program targets. To measure effectiveness is to test to determine if the objectives were accomplished. The test on program impact reveals whether the objectives affected the needs that the program was designed to meet. In analyzing the operation of the program, one can ascertain the flow of the program, whether the financial and human resources are being properly utilized. Last, the utility analysis determines whether or not the evaluation tool has an impact on program improvement (2006).

As leadership programs move more towards evaluating their impact on graduates and on the schools their graduates lead, two types of program evaluation strategies have emerged. The "critical friends" process is one where programs compile evidence of effective leadership preparation and solicit experts in leadership preparation to serve as critical friends in providing feedback for program improvement. (The City Public Schools' Leadership Academy uses this model for program improvement.) Another strategy is "collaborative evaluation" where leadership programs from various universities compare program practices and engage in collective analysis and review (Orr, 2006).

Much of the innovative, alternative principal preparation programs growing around the nation have yet to engage in systemic evaluation. Most of the evaluation procedures that the programs undergo are self-evaluative (Chenoweth, Carr, & Ruhl, 2002). Hackman and Alsbury (2005) assert that the data compiled from self-evaluation of programs tend to be limited in that they only show individuals' perceptions rather than program efficacy that ensures that participants have attained program goals and have internalized the content and the skills. In their discussion of program evaluation, Clark and Clark (1997) shared that leadership programs are to engage in formal, continuous evaluation. The evaluation should include an examination of purpose and belief, an examination of knowledge base, an examination of instructional practices, an annual review of the development of professional learning communities, and an annual review of student selection procedures. What follows is the description of evaluation procedures in five principal preparation programs.

Meadows Principal Improvement Program

In an effort to improve the principalship in the state of Texas, East Texas State University developed two functional components created for a principal improvement program: a preservice component for aspiring principals and an inservice component for practicing principals. For the purposes of this study, the researcher will focus on the preservice component designed to provide skilled teachers (called Meadows Fellows) with the leadership skills necessary to become competent instructional-oriented principals. The preservice component is 15 months in duration and includes two summers of course work and a full-time internship at a school site for nine months (Vornberg, 1992). The purpose of the preservice program evaluation is to study the impact of the program and to arrive at suggestions for improvement. The participants of the preservice evaluation include 88 Meadows Fellows and regular interns of the East Texas State

University principal preparation program. The audience includes the Texas state department of education, administrative preparation programs, and Texas school districts. The limitations include the generalizability to principal preparation programs that use the cohort model and the purposeful selection of the program participants (1992). The procedures include a completion of three items: the Instructional Leadership Activities, Beliefs, and Characteristics of Principals of Effective Secondary School questionnaire (ILES) designed to measure the frequency in which principals engage in seven instructional leadership activities and the perception of the importance of the activities in providing instructional leadership; a revised Leadership Behavior Questionnaire designed to measure the leadership dimensions of consideration for subordinates and initiating structure; and a modified Work Environment Scale (WES) designed to measure nine areas of the academic environment of the program (1992). The findings follow:

1. On the ILES, the Meadows Fellows and the regular interns reported that all seven instructional leadership activities were important and that more should be done to develop the activities. In addition, the Meadows Fellows reported higher engagement than the regular interns in three of the seven instructional activities.
2. On a revised Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), the Meadows Fellows reported a higher perception of two leadership qualities compared to the regular interns. There was no significant difference in the data related to the other leadership qualities.
3. The Meadows Fellows' perception of the program was exceptionally high in four of the nine areas where their scores fell in the top 2%. In the remaining five areas, the Fellows scored about the same as the regular interns (1992).

The implications are that the Meadows preservice program greatly impacts aspiring principals. The Meadows Fellows are open and involved with building subordinates, and they perceive their overall work environment as generally better than the regular principal preparation interns (1992).

A Principal Preparation Program in Texas

In response to the call for change in principal preparation programs, The University of Texas at Arlington in collaboration with the Dallas /Fort Worth metroplex school districts developed a reform based educational leadership program. The goal of the leadership program is to equip future educational leaders to guide schools through educational reform by providing a balance of seminars and internship experiences. The participants are trained at field-based, learner-centered sites (Wilmore, McNeil, & Townzen, 1999). The purpose of the evaluation is to determine whether or not the program, after year one, is meeting its reform goals. The participants include administrative interns, mentor principals, and other school administrators associated with the intern and mentor principal. There were a total of 32 participants. The audience for the evaluation includes school districts across Texas, the state department of education, and Texas colleges and universities with principal preparation programs. The limitation of the evaluation is that it is based on a small target population of administrative interns, mentor principals, and other school administrators (1999). The procedures include full time university course work for one month before (focus is leadership development) and after (focus is futuristic leadership development) the academic year. During the academic year, interns are full time administrative interns in a K-12 school. Their salaries are paid by their school districts. There are weekly all-day seminars, field trips, and guest speakers, oral and

written comprehensive exams, and satisfactory score on the Texas ExCet (1999). Three main foci emerged for this evaluation:

- (1) Is the program doing what it says it would do? The evaluators created a compliance goal.
- (2) Is the program offering effective and relevant professional development? The evaluators created a professional development-training goal.
- (3) Is the program cost effective? The evaluators created a benefits-cost effectiveness goal.

A 24-item, five-point Likert scale questionnaire was developed using the three goal areas. A rating of three or above was considered a positive rating. The findings indicate that the questions to all goals received a rating of 93.8% or higher (1999). Implications are that it might be of benefit to increase the number of participants involved in a similar study in order to test reliability.

Northeast Ohio Principals' Academy

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine the workability and effectiveness of a pilot entry year program for principals and assistant principals in Northeast Ohio in 2000. The participants include 25 mentors, 25 entry year administrators, the superintendent of an educational service center, one or two representatives from each of the colleges and universities in Northeast Ohio that have principal preparation programs, and committee co-chairs. The audience for the evaluation includes the members of the Northeast Ohio Principals' Academy, the Ohio Department of Education, and the state's school districts. They were faced with developing an effective entry year program for new administrators that meets state requirements. Limitations include the fact that the evaluation was designed after the program began; thus, data

relating to the earlier stages of the program were recorded using the participants' recollections. Also, the portfolios, a major component of the entry year program, were not yet completed at the time of the evaluation. Therefore, data on completed portfolios could not be studied (Trenta & Covrig, 2000). The evaluation procedures include a review of the Coordinating Committee meeting minutes and other documents, a review of the Coordinating Committee members' responses to nine open-ended questions, a review of facilitators' responses to interview questions, and an analysis of the mentors' and entry year administrators' responses to a questionnaire. The researchers used both quantitative and qualitative methods. The findings of the evaluation follow:

1. The planning by diverse participants lent to early buy-in from all stakeholders.
2. The facilitators served as excellent middle agents for mentors, entry year administrators, and the Coordinating Committee.
3. The high attendance at general and local meetings was crucial.
4. Realistic goal setting and clear objectives must be improved.
5. Electronic communication must be more effectively utilized to assist with goal attainment (2000).

The researchers utilized an array of procedures to arrive at the conclusions that they did. According to Guskey (1998), this can be considered a thoughtful evaluation due to the combination of quantitative and qualitative methodology involved.

A Cohort Program

Virginia school divisions collaborated with university professors and superintendents from three large school systems and planned course content for an educational leadership preparation program. The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the

curriculum. The second purpose was to pilot an approach to program evaluation (Tucker, Henig, & Salmonowicz, 2005). The participants are 27 students in an 18-month cohort program. The audience includes school divisions in Virginia, the Virginia Department of Education, and principal preparation programs that adhere to a cohort structure. The limitations include self-evaluation as a method of assessment, the fact that the participants were not randomly selected, and the generalizability to principal preparation programs that use the cohort model. For the pretest, the researchers used survey questions aligned with the ISLLC standards, and for the posttest, the researchers used survey items based on the work of Dipaola and Tschannen-Moran (2003). The surveys were composed of 44 items using a 3-point Likert scale for level of importance and using a 4-point Likert scale for level of preparation. In addition, three open-ended questions were asked regarding the participants goals as future principals and about the advantages and disadvantages of the cohort program. Descriptive statistics and paired t-tests were used to analyze the data. Nineteen of the 27 participants responded to the pre- and post-program survey for a 70% response rate. The findings of the study follow:

1. At the beginning of the study, 66% of the participants rated administrative functions as highly important compared to 89% at the end of the program.
2. At the beginning of the study, the majority of the participants rated themselves highly prepared to perform 7% of the tasks compared to 34% of the tasks at the end.
3. For the open-ended questions, the most frequently cited benefits at pre- and post-tests were that of collegiality and location of the courses.
4. For the open-ended questions, the most frequently cited drawbacks at pre- and post-tests were that of balancing family, work, and school. Infrequent contact with professors was seen as a drawback at the beginning of the study.

Since there were notable shifts in the perceptions of the participants over the 18-month period, more consideration is warranted to fully evaluate the program. The findings reveal a statistical significance in the level of preparation in the four major areas ($p < .05$). A qualitative approach would answer questions regarding the unanswered why's (Tucker, Henig, & Salmonowicz, 2005).

A Large Flagship University in the Southeast

Knowles defined pedagogy as the art and science of teaching and andragogy as the art and science of helping others to learn (Knowles, 1984). Evaluating a transformative framework (which affects the way people see themselves and their world) and the andragogical processes of critical reflection, rational discourse, and policy praxis (translating an idea into action) calls for a new way of seeing (Brown, 2006). School leadership is second only to teacher quality among school-related factors that affect student learning.

Therefore, if current and future educational leaders are expected to foster successful, equitable, and socially responsible learning and accountability practices for all students, then substantive changes in educational leadership preparation and professional development programs are required (2006, p.705).

What is also required is for preservice leaders to actually connect theory to practice.

The purpose of this evaluation is to study the effects of an alternative, transformative andragogy that might address the need for changes in the way educational leaders are prepared and developed. The hope is to cultivate administrators who have the ability to lead for social justice and equity. The participants include 40 graduate students, two cohorts of preservice leaders enrolled as full-time, two-year master's students. The audiences are faculties of and students enrolled in principal preparation programs and school divisions of the Southeast

(Brown, 2006). The limitations that may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings are (1) the sample size was small; (2) it was difficult to separate whether the participants' experiences were due to the instructor's personal style and/or the course material, or the transformative andragogical strategies enacted; and (3) it is difficult to thoroughly document change in assumptions and perspective of an individual. The methodology used in this evaluation were both quantitative (a quasi-experimental approach was used) and qualitative. The procedures include cultural autobiographies, life histories, diversity workshops, diversity presentations and panels, cross-cultural interviews, reflective journals, etc. The pretest-posttest design required students to complete a 63-item Likert scale questionnaire to assess their attitudes toward multicultural education. The Cultural and Educational Issues Survey (Version B) was used and a paired t-test was conducted. Using the reflective journals (40 students x 20 entries), the researcher looked for and documented patterns of ideas (2006). The findings of the evaluation follow:

1. The score at posttest indicates a favorable change in participants over time (14 points). At pretest, the mean score was 123.300. At posttest, the mean score was 109.375. The range of scores is 59 to 295. The smaller values are associated with the more favorable positions.
2. Journal entries were read three times by the researcher. All 40 participants reported some type of perceived change due to the participation in the transformative educational course. Two students wrote more objectively and descriptively than reflectively and subjectively (Brown, 2006).

In summary, the five program evaluations sought to determine whether or not the programs were practicing the tenets of their missions to arrive at program goals. All five

programs sought to equip future school leaders with the skills necessary to be considered competent. The participants in all five programs include aspiring principals. The audiences for all five evaluations include state departments of education and students and faculties of principal preparation programs. The limitations for two of the evaluations include the generalizability to principal preparation programs that follow the cohort model; two others used purposeful selection of participants, while the others were directed at participants enrolled in the principal preparation programs. Other limitations include the small sample size or target population: four of the five evaluations focused on fewer than 50 participants, while one focused on fewer than 100 participants. One evaluation was limited because of data that relied on participants' memories and because of a missing major component, the portfolio. Finally, one evaluation used the method of self-evaluation, and the other experienced the difficulty of evaluating the assumptions of human beings. The methodologies used include purely quantitative, used by three evaluators, and a mixed-method approach, used by two of the evaluators. The findings for four of the evaluations are that experience in the principal preparation program was positive and very beneficial. Only one evaluation resulted in a moderate degree of positive data; thus, that evaluation calls for further investigation (Brown, 2006; Trenta & Covrig, 2000; Tucker, Henig, & Salmonowicz, 2005; Vornberg, 1992; Wilmore, McNeil, & Townzen, 1999).

In summary, the primary question of the study on the City Public Schools Leadership Academy follow: Has the Leadership Academy for Aspiring School Leaders met its goal of producing prepared administrators for school leadership positions. The review of program evaluation in the five principal preparation programs has a direct bearing on the direction of the study of the City Public Schools Leadership Academy. Tucker, Henig, and Salmonowicz assert that "the gold standard for evaluation of [principal] preparation programs would be tangible

evidence of school improvement where graduates serve as leaders” (2005, p. 28). The study on the City Public Schools Leadership Academy is not designed to evaluate school improvement, primarily because the completers of the program are yet novices. It is, however, designed to evaluate the professional development offered to aspiring school leaders, as perceived by the novices, to determine if it is arriving at its end product: preparing administrators for school leadership positions. Thomas Guskey (1998, Guidelines, para. 1) notes, “Good evaluations of professional development don’t have to be costly. Nor do they demand sophisticated technical skills. What they do require is the ability to ask good questions, and a basic understanding about how to find valid answers.” This is what the study of the City Public Schools Leadership Academy for Aspiring School Leaders aims to accomplish.

Jack Trammel (2005) notes that the evaluation of a program must gauge outcomes and must be an ongoing justification for the program to exist. The evaluation of the Leadership Academy is designed to do just that. It is designed to measure the preparedness of the novice administrators. The study is outcome-based and is designed to highlight the preparedness or lack of preparedness of the program completers. The novice administrators are now able to assess the worth of the program after receiving an administrative position. Thus, the study of the Leadership Academy will be summative in nature and will draw from the review of literature on principal preparation programs and from the research of evaluations conducted in principal preparation programs. The researcher will use a mixed-methods approach and will rely partially on surveys for data. As suggested by Guskey (1998), the researcher aims to ask good questions using structured interviews to acquire additional data.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Chapter Three includes the methodology and various procedures that were used to study whether the Leadership Academy met its goal of producing effective administrators. This chapter includes the research questions, the research design, and a description of the population. The chapter also includes the data needs, the procedure for data collection, instrumentation, and the procedure for data analysis, description of data display, and a brief summary.

Research Questions

The review of literature focused on the preparedness of public school leaders. In studying the City Public Schools Leadership Academy, the main research question follow: Has the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions? Subset questions include the following: (1) Do the novice administrators feel the Leadership Academy has prepared them to be effective school leaders? (2) Do the building principals feel the Leadership Academy has prepared novice administrators to be effective school leaders? (3) Do the district- level supervisors feel the Leadership Academy has prepared the novice administrators to be effective school leaders?

Researcher Bias

All studies are susceptible to biases since researchers tend to believe a particular outcome is correct (Hohmann-Marriott, 2001). To control for bias, however, qualitative researchers must be aware of any personal biases and report those potential biases (Drisko, 1997). Since the researcher has been employed with City Public Schools for 19 years, the potential for bias exists. The researcher was not a participant of the City Public Schools Leadership Academy. However, it is prudent to note that being an employee of the school division that one studies tends to make

the data more accessible. In clarifying the potential for bias, preconceived notions regarding the outcome of the study are separated (Drisko, 1997).

Research Design

The design that this study utilized was a mixed methodology that included quantitative and qualitative research techniques. Trammel (2005, p.35) notes that “in an evaluation . . . a mixture of data collection methods is necessary for practical reasons as well as for philosophical reasons – no single type of evaluative activity completely captures the essence of why and how the center operates.” The researcher was primarily concerned with discovering whether or not the completers of the Leadership Academy who have obtained administrative positions believe they were prepared to be school leaders or are considered prepared school leaders by their supervisors. The researcher was also interested in determining if the completers felt the program had prepared them for school leadership positions. The quantitative data included the following: (1) Demographic variables about the completers (sex, age, school level, and years of experience) as well as data describing whether the completers felt the program prepared them for their administrative roles; (2) Descriptive data detailing whether the principals and supervisors believed the novice administrators had been prepared for their administrative roles. The quantitative data was derived from the program completers’ survey. The qualitative data was derived from personal interviews with the supervisors.

Population

The participants in this study were all novice administrators (assistant principals and central office administrators) who completed the Leadership Academy during FY’s 2004-2006. The participants were identified using a list of Leadership Academy participants obtained from the Professional Development Department of City Public Schools. Only the Leadership

Academy completers who had obtained administrative positions with City Public Schools were invited to be participants in this study. The completers were selected because the problem in this study was to determine if the newly-appointed administrators felt the academy prepared them for their roles. The population for this study was 11- the total number of teachers who completed the Leadership Academy during FY 2004-2006 and obtained administrative positions in City.

In addition, the following groups of individuals who were included in the response populations were the principals and the district-level supervisors. Because of the number of completers, it was possible for the researcher to study the entire population. All 11 program completers who obtained administrative positions in the school division were asked to complete an online survey. The researcher conducted in-depth interviews of the eight principals in whose schools the newly-appointed administrators work. Two supervisors were interviewed because two novice administrators worked at the central administration office. In addition, the three Directors of Elementary and Secondary Education in the City Public Schools were interviewed since they directly observe and know the work of the novice administrators. A total of 13 interviews were conducted.

Data Needs

The type of data needed was a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data in order to provide the richest blend of data. The quantitative data needed included demographic data of all the participants. From the program completers, the researcher requested age, gender, the level of school in which they were employed, and the years of experience. Quantitative data was also derived from the program completers' survey. The program completers' survey requested that the participants respond to each item regarding the preparedness they received as members of the Leadership Academy. The survey asked participants to use a Likert scale indicating their level of

agreement or level of disagreement to each statement: Strongly Agree=SA, Agree=A, Disagree=D, and Strongly Disagree=SD. The items were adapted from the ISLLC standards, the primary basis of the Leadership Academy.

The qualitative data was compiled from the supervisors' interview questions. Two demographic questions were posed: the length of time in education and the length of time as a public school administrator. The principals' and supervisors' interview questions asked that the participants reveal their knowledge of the preparedness of the administrators who work for them, examples of such preparedness, and any recommendations to produce more prepared administrators. All this information was needed in order to fully describe the preparedness or lack thereof of the Leadership Academy completers who obtained administrative positions in City Public Schools.

Procedure for Data Collection

To proceed with data collection, the researcher embarked on two types of procedures. An application was submitted to the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board requesting exempt status to conduct research using human subjects. After approval was granted from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Appendix A), an application was sent to the City Public Schools with the required abstract of the study and a request to conduct the research project, which included a survey of the novice administrators and interviews with the principals and the supervisors.

As soon as consent was obtained from the school division (Appendix B), an electronic mail was sent to the program completers. The electronic mail consisted of a formal letter of introduction briefly explaining the study, briefly explaining how the participant was selected (see Appendix C), and inviting the participant to complete the Program Completers' Survey (see

Appendix D). As the respondents completed the survey, they received an electronic note of thanks. Within two weeks, non-respondents were sent another electronic mail reminding them of the survey and providing the link to the survey. Again, respondents were thanked upon completion of the survey. Within a week, non-respondents received a telephone call asking for an opportunity to clarify any barrier that might have prohibited them from completing the survey to this point and a verbal request that they proceed with the completion of the survey.

Likewise, as soon as consent was obtained from City Public Schools (Appendix B), a brief review of the study was sent to each principal and the supervisors. Next, interview dates were set with the principals and the supervisors, directors of elementary and secondary education. An electronic mail consisting of a formal letter of introduction briefly explaining the study and briefly explaining how the participant was selected was sent. These individuals were asked to contact the researcher by phone to determine a time and place for the interview to take place (Appendix F). Contacting the researcher to determine the interview time and place served as an indication of consent to participate in the study. At the time of the interview, the principals and supervisors received the interview protocol and interview questions (Appendix G). The researcher used an audiotape and took notes as part of the interviews in order to most accurately collect the data.

Instrumentation

The Program Completers' Survey (Appendix D) was used to solicit data from the Leadership Academy completers. A demographic portion was included in order to obtain background information. All items on the survey were adapted from the ISLLC Standards; there were three brief questions at the end of the survey that pertain to other experiences in which program completers engaged: mentorship, internship, and the HOPE Summit. The items on the

instrument were ones that would allow the respondent to answer to the degree to which the program prepared him/her to be an administrator. The Likert Scale used allowed the participant to respond to each item indicating his/her level of agreement or disagreement: Strongly Agree=SA, Agree=A, Disagree=D, and Strongly Disagree=SD.

The interview questions (Appendix H) were formed in an attempt to retrieve thick, rich data from the supervisors using an open-ended, semi-structured method. This particular interview approach was selected to reduce bias and to maintain similarity in the sequencing of the questions. The researcher used the ISLLC Standards to create the interview questions. All interview questions were directly linked to six ISLLC Standards' domains with the specific purpose of allowing the participant an opportunity to share an analysis of the Leadership Academy. Each of the six standards was used to create two questions for a total of 12 interview questions. Interview questions one and seven were derived from ISLLC standard one; two and eight from ISLLC standard two; three and 12 from ISLLC standard three; four and 10 from ISLLC standard four; five and nine from ISLLC standard five; and six and 11 from ISLLC standard six.

The purposeful link of the supervisors' interview questions and the items of the program completers' survey was formed so that answers to the interview questions and the survey statements could be easily associated. All supervisors were asked identical questions and, if needed, additional prompts; however, because of the semi-structured approach, additional data that emerged from the interviews were included in the study.

To validate the Program Completers' Survey, a validation tool (Appendix E) used in a study by Dale Margheim (2001) was used. The tool asked for an individual to validate the domain in which each item fits, to rate how strongly each statement associated with the domain,

and to rate the clarity of each statement. Administrators in a Ph.D. program participated in the instrument validation. Any modifications to the instrument was made based on the feedback, and after receiving an 80% rating on all parts of the instrument, the content validation data was reported. In addition, a pilot study using administrators who completed the Leadership Academy prior to 2004 and using several other practicing administrators was conducted. The purpose of the pilot study was to determine if the questions on the instruments seemed to measure what they were intended to measure (Creswell, 1994). Modifications were made based on the feedback.

Additionally, validation of the Supervisors' Interview Questions and Protocol (Appendix G) and a pilot study using the Supervisors' Interview Questions and Protocol (Appendix H) was conducted. Administrators who do not supervise the Leadership Academy completers included in the study were invited to participate in the validation of the instrument and in the pilot study. Modifications were made based on the feedback offered (Creswell, 1994).

Because the researcher was employed in the school division, it is critical that bias and objectivity be addressed. Simply put, "Bias must be controlled if the results of study are to seem truthful" (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2000). In the review of literature, Gallego, Rueda, and Moll (2005) asserts that neutrality and objectivity in research is a significant entity if the study is to be free from bias. To guard against bias, the researcher used the ISLLC Standards (1996), common standards for all school leaders used by 40 states for principal preparation programs and public school administrative licensure (Orr, 2006, p. 493). An adaptation of the ISLLC Standards was used to create survey items and interview questions in order to gather the data. Christy and McNeil (2000) stressed that external measures of accountability are crucial in studying administrator preparation programs. One important aspect of a principal preparation

program, says Christy and McNeil (2000) is the completion of the SLLA, grounded in the ISLLC Standards. The study of the City Leadership Academy is based on the ISLLC Standards.

In addition, to reduce bias, the gathering of data should be conducted in the same manner, referred to as consistency in test administration (Creswell, 1994). It is possible to affect the results of the data by inconsistent administration of a survey or interview. Thus, all surveys were administered electronically, and all interviews were conducted face-to-face.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was derived from a mixed-method approach. Analysis of the quantitative data first included descriptive statistics derived from the demographic variables of the respondents and from the results of the on-line survey. The variables included the school level on which the administrators work (elementary, middle, high), gender, age, and the length of time in education. Using a statistical software tool, the variables of level, gender, age, and years of experience were coded as follows:

School:	<u>Level</u>	<u>Code</u>
	Elementary	E
	Middle	M
	High	H
	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Code</u>
Sex:	Male	1
	Female	2
Age:	<u>Range</u>	<u>Code</u>
	20-30	Age1
	31-40	Age2
	41-50	Age3

	51+	Age 4
Years	<u>Experience</u>	<u>Code</u>
	1-3 Years	Exp1
	4-10 Years	Exp2
	11-20 Years	Exp3
	21+ Years	Exp4

The data garnered using the demographic variables was used in analyzing how participants from elementary, middle, and high school responded, how males versus females responded, how participants of various ages responded, and how participants with various years of experience responded to the preparedness received from the Leadership Academy. To run descriptive statistics and calculate and compare means, extreme scores, and standard deviation, all variables were transferred to a statistical software tool.

Analysis of the qualitative data consisted of a narrative design. All audio taped interviews were transcribed. The researcher's notes were reviewed with the transcription to guard against missing data. In keeping with the member check process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), a copy of the completed transcript was sent to interview participants requesting that they verify the data they provided. The constant comparative method of grouping and regrouping for refinement was then used to arrive at patterns and themes that were categorized and placed in domains.

With the data in domains, the researcher was able to extract emergent themes. The emergent themes were used to draw conclusions regarding how the principals viewed the preparedness the novice administrators received from the Leadership Academy. Also, the researcher was able to use emergent themes to determine how the supervisors viewed the preparedness that the novice administrators received from the Leadership Academy. The themes

that emerged allowed the researcher to report any similarities and/or differences that surfaced (Creswell, 1994). It was possible that the principals responded differently to the questions than the supervisors since the principals interacted with the novice administrators on a daily basis. Any differences in responses were reported in a table format and were detailed in text.

Data Triangulation

Triangulation is a method used when multiple data sources have been implemented to carry out a study. The process is used to neutralize bias (Jick, 1979). Data for this study was drawn from the survey of the novice administrators, from the interviews of the principals, and from the interviews of the district-level supervisors.

Data Display

The results of the quantitative data are displayed in table format to show frequencies, means, and standard deviations. The results of the instrument validation and that of the pilot studies are displayed in table format. The results of the qualitative data are displayed in both table and narrative form. The categories and domains are displayed in tables and the remainder is written in rich text.

Summary

This chapter outlined the methodology used in the design, collection, analysis, and display of the data for the study that sought to determine whether the City Public Schools Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions. Also, a description of the population, and a description of the research instrument were included. In addition, the procedure for data analysis and the data display were discussed.

The researcher described how the research questions were formulated, the procedure used for validation, and the tools used to interview the participants. The researcher decided on a mixed-method approach in order to provide a substantive blend of quantitative and qualitative data.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not City Public Schools' Leadership Academy for Aspiring Leaders met its goal of producing administrators prepared for school leadership positions. Subset questions addressed in the study were: (1) did the novice administrators in City Public Schools feel the Leadership Academy prepared them to be effective school leaders; (2) did the building principals feel the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be effective school leaders? And (3) did the district-level supervisors feel the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be effective school leaders?

Procedures

In preparing for data collection, the Program Completers' Survey Instrument was validated, (Appendix E). To accomplish that, three rounds of survey validation were used. Administrators in a Ph.D. program completed the survey validation. In the first round, 11 of the 34 items (32%) received an 80% or higher rating in the identification of the ISLLC Domains. For Domain Association, 100% of the items received a rating of strong or very strong. During the second round of the survey validation, 20 of the 34 items (59%) received an 80% or higher rating in the identification of the Domains. For the third and final round of survey validation, 100% of the items received a rating of 80% or above in the identification of the Domains. After each round, slight modifications were made to each statement not receiving an 80% or higher rating in Domain identification until all survey items received the 100% rating (See Table 2).

Table 2
Survey Validation Data Reported by Rounds

Statement	Validation Round 1	Validation Round 2	Validation Round 3
Item #1.	54%	64%	100%
Item# 2.	8%	50%	80%
Item #3.	15%	93%	-
Item #4.	0%	71%	99%
Item#5.	85%	-	-
Item #6.	100%	-	-
Item #7.	0%	43%	80%
Item #8.	54%	100%	-
Item #9.	0%	64%	94%
Item #10.	100%	-	-
Item #11.	8%	86%	-
Item#12.	100%	-	-
Item #13.	54%	71%	80%
Item #14.	69%	86%	-
Item #15.	54%	80%	-
Item #16.	100%	-	-
Item #17.	69%	100%	-
Item #18.	100%	-	-
Item #19.	80%	-	-
Item #20.	62%	64%	100%
Item #21.	8%	86%	-
Item #22.	80%	-	-
Item #23.	62%	100%	-
Item #24.	31%	100%	-
Item #25.	8%	71%	80%
Item #26.	62%	100%	-
Item #27.	92%	-	-
Item #28.	54%	93%	-
Item #29.	0%	80%	-
Item #30.	0%	64%	80%
Item #31.	100%	-	-
Item #32.	8%	80%	-
Item #33.	62%	80%	-
Item #34.	85%	-	-

**All statements are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.

After receiving the 100% rating on all survey items, the survey questions were loaded onto an online survey site located at SurveyMonkey.com. The survey was entered with parameters that prohibited the program completers from skipping a question. Thus, the respondents were prohibited from advancing to the next page of the survey until all questions were answered.

A validation of the Supervisors' Interview Questions and Protocol took place with administrators who did not supervise the Leadership Academy program completers (Appendix G). Each validation session took place in the administrator's office and lasted approximately 30-35 minutes. Two rounds of interview questions' validation were needed to arrive at the required 80% Domain Identification for all questions. Slight modifications were made to items two and seven in order to arrive at the 80% required rating (See Table 3). Item Clarity and Indication of Bias (in this case no bias was detected) received a 100% rating during the first round of validation.

Table 3
Interview Questions Validation Reported by Rounds

Question	Validation Round 1	Validation Round 2
Question #1	100%	-
Question #2	25%	80%
Question #3	100%	-
Question #4	100%	-
Question #5	100%	-
Question #6	100%	-
Question #7	50%	80%
Question #8	100%	-
Question #9	100%	-
Question #10	100%	-
Question #11	100%	-
Question #12	100%	-

Upon receipt of the IRB approval letter from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, City Public Schools was contacted requesting permission to conduct research in the school division. Once permission was granted, a pilot study using the survey instrument was conducted (Appendices C & D). The pilot study participants were sent a letter detailing the study. The letter included a link to the SurveyMonkey website which they used to access the instrument.

Five administrators who do not supervise completers of the Leadership Academy completed the survey. Three of the administrators have two-three years of experience, and two of the administrators participated in the Leadership Academy prior to 2004. The selection of these administrators was orchestrated since a three would more likely provide responses similar to that of a novice administrator, and a two had Leadership Academy experience.

The respondents of the pilot study reported that one word in the introductory letter and one word in the survey, #41, needed to be corrected. Otherwise, the pilot study respondents reported that the letter was succinct, that the link easily took them to the survey website, and that the instrument was user friendly. The respondents also reported that the survey took a minimal amount of time to be completed, approximately 10-15 minutes. The estimate of time was needed to supply to the actual participants.

Collection of Data

Data collection took place over the course of one month. The novice administrators received via email a letter detailing the purpose of the study, why they were selected to participate, and an invitation to complete the on-line survey (Appendix C). The first online invitation yielded five responses (5 of 11 for 45%); the second online invitation, which occurred after two weeks, yielded an additional four responses (9 of 11 for 82%); the third and final telephone invitation, which occurred after one week, yielded one additional response (10 of 11 for 92%). Once all questions were addressed, an electronic note of thanks appeared on the screen for the respondents.

The principals and supervisor were sent an email detailing the purpose of the study, why they were selected to participate, and requesting that they make contact to orchestrate a time and place for the interview to be conducted (Appendix F). Two of the supervisors made contact

immediately to set up a time and place for the interviews. The remaining 11 were contacted by phone to schedule the interviews. Nine of the interviews took place on the scheduled date (69%), and four had to be rescheduled (31%). At the time of the interview, every participant was given a copy of the Supervisors' Interview Questions and Protocol form (Appendix H) while the questions were read and recorded. Again, in keeping with the member check process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the interviews were then transcribed and sent to the participants via email so that they could verify the accuracy of the transcriptions. None of the supervisors contacted with the request that changes be made to the transcripts.

Demographics of Novice Administrators

The variables of gender and level of school in which a novice administrator works were the first considerations for the study. The variables of age and experience in education could not be determined until the novice administrators responded to the survey. The entire population of Leadership Academy completers for the 2004-2006 school years who received administrative positions in City Public Schools is N=11. The novice administrators included four males (36%) and seven females (64%). One male is employed at the elementary school level (25%); one male is employed at the middle school level (25%); and two males are employed at the high school level (50%). Four females are employed at the elementary school level (57%); one female is employed at the middle school level (14%); and two females are employed at the central administration office (29%). The survey yielded a 92% response rate. One novice administrator was not able to complete the survey because of timing and obligations.

Results of Survey

The data were transferred from the survey collection site, SurveyMonkey. The data were collected in Excel format. The data were then merged to a statistical software tool, SPSS. Next,

the variables were recoded from string type to numeric type. The survey questions were assigned numbers: Q1-Q37. The variables of gender, age, level of school, and experience in education were recoded to numeric values: Gender (Male=1, Female=2), Age (20-30=1, 31-40=2, 41-50=3, 51+=4), Level of School (Elementary=1, Middle=2, High=3), and Experience in Education (1-3 years=1, 4-10 years=2, 11-20 years=3, 21+ years=4). The response values were also recoded: (Strongly Agree=4, Agree=3, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=1) and (Yes=1, No=2). In analyzing the data, descriptive statistics including frequencies and cross tabulations were run.

Demographics of Respondents

Gender and Level of School

Ten novice administrators responded to the survey (N=10). Of the survey respondents, six (60%) are female and four (40%) are male (Table 4). Three females (30%) are employed at the elementary school level; two (20%) are employed at the central administration office, both of whom work primarily at the elementary school level; and one (10%) is employed at the middle school level. One hundred percent of the male administrators responded to the survey. Thus, one male (25%) is employed at the elementary school level; one male (25%) is employed at the middle school level; and two males (50%) are employed at the high school level (Table 5).

Table 4
Gender of Respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	4	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Female	6	60.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Table 5
Gender * School-Level in Which You Work Cross Tabulation

		School-Level in Which You Work			Total
		Elementary	Middle	High	
Gender	Male	1	1	2	4
	Female	5	1	0	6
Total		6	2	2	10

Age

For the variable of age, there was a wide range for the novice administrators. Of the respondents, two or 20% fell in the range of 20-30 years; four or 40% fell in the range of 31-40 years; two or 20% fell in the range of 41-50 years; and two or 20% fell in the range of 51+ years (Table 6). Both the median and mode for age fell in the range of 31-40 years.

Table 6
Age-Select Range

N	Valid	10			
	Missing	0			
Mean	2.40				
Std. Deviation	1.075				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-30 Years	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	31-40 Years	4	40.0	40.0	60.0
	41-50 Years	2	20.0	20.0	80.0
	51+ Years	2	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Experience in Education

Though the novice administrators have one-two years of experience in administration, their years of experience in education are great in number. Two respondents (20%) have worked in education between 4-10 years; seven respondents (70%) have worked in education between 11-20 years; and one respondent (10%) has worked in education for more than 21 years (Table

7). The mean for experience in education is 2.90 or fell in the 11-20 range with a standard deviation of .568.

Table 7
Experience in Education

N	Valid	10			
	Missing	0			
Mean		2.90			
Std. Deviation		.568			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4-10 Years	2	20.0	20.0	20.0
	11-20 Years	7	70.0	70.0	90.0
	21+ Years	1	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	10	100.0	100.0	

Results of Survey

Subset Question Number One

In arriving at the main research question, the first subset question was addressed: Did the novice administrators feel the Leadership Academy prepared them to be school leaders? There were 37 total questions asked of the novice administrators. There were 34 initial questions in which the respondents were to use a Likert Scale to respond: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The questions were based on the six ISLLC standards that the participants studied in the seminars that they attended. Every respondent selected Agree or Strongly Agree for 28 of 34 questions. For 6 of 34, the choice of Disagree was selected. The choice of Strongly Disagree was not selected (See Table 8). The results reveal that the novice administrators viewed the Leadership Academy as a program that met its goal in preparing them for school leadership positions.

Three additional questions were posed to the novice administrators regarding the preparation that they received. In addition to the seminars, all novice administrators experienced

a mentorship component, an internship component, and participated in the HOPE Summit. The novice administrators were to select “Yes or No” in response to the three questions. For additional questions one and two, nine of ten novice administrators felt that the components added to their preparedness for school leadership positions (See Table 8 Bottom). For additional question three, seven of ten novice administrators felt that the component added to their preparedness for school leadership positions. It must be noted that one respondent did not feel that the mentorship or the internship prepared him/her to be an administrator. Three respondents did not feel the HOPE Summit prepared them to be administrators.

Level of School and Survey Questions.

A cross tabulation of the questions and the level of school in which the novice administrators work was run to compare the responses of elementary, middle, and high school respondents (See Table 9). Six novice administrators worked with the elementary schools; two worked in the middle schools, and two worked in the high schools. Novice administrators on the middle level Agreed or Strongly Agreed with all of the items. The high school novice administrators agreed with all but one item where one novice administrator disagreed with item 12. This item deals with the preparation to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for the students. The elementary novice administrators agreed or strongly agreed with all but 6 items (Items 10, 12, 18, 31, 32, 34). The other five items deal with the following: Item 10-recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff; Item 18-working within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities; Item 31-identifying and addressing barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture; Item 32-exercising ethics and integrity in fulfilling all contractual obligations; and Item 34-providing opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.

Table 8

Results of Survey Questions

Research Question: Has the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions?

Subset Question 1: Did the novice administrators feel the Leadership Academy prepared them to be school leaders?

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Leadership Academy demonstrated for me how to develop a plan in which objectives and strategies to achieve the school's vision and goals are clearly articulated.	70%	30%		
2. The Leadership Academy provided me with ways to strengthen my school by engaging in political, social, and economical communication with key stakeholders.	50%	50%		
3. The Leadership Academy helped me to understand the fairness and ethics in opening the school to public scrutiny for the purpose of improvement.	50%	50%		
4. The Leadership Academy taught me the importance of advocating a school culture and instructional program centered on professional development that promotes student learning.	60%	40%		
5. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage financial, human, and material resources.	30%	70%		
6. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to establish and nurture partnerships with community members.	40%	60%		
7. The Leadership Academy stressed the need to communicate progress toward the vision and mission by involving all stakeholders in school improvement efforts.	70%	30%		
8. The Leadership Academy taught me the ethics and integrity involved in serving as a positive role model for students, staff, and community members.	70%	30%		
9. The Leadership Academy showed me how to manage my time in order to maximize the attainment of organizational goals.	40%	60%		
10. The Leadership Academy presented me with methods of recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff.	40%	50%	10%	
11. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to collaborate with family and the community to help me responsibly and efficiently manage public resources and funds.	30%	70%		
12. The Leadership Academy taught me to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for students.	40%	40%	20%	
13. The Leadership Academy showed me how to use the school district's vision to shape the educational programs, plans, and activities of my school.	50%	50%		
14. The Leadership Academy highlighted for me the importance of developing a vision of life-long learning with and among stakeholders.	70%	30%		

Table 8 (continued)	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	15. The Leadership Academy guided me in managing the operation of a school's facility ensuring that it is safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing.	40%	60%		
	16. The Leadership Academy reinforced the need for me to involve family members in the educational experiences of students.	60%	40%		
	17. The Leadership Academy stressed for me the ethics of using my influence and office for the benefit of the stakeholders and not for personal gain.	60%	40%		
	18. The Leadership Academy prepared me to work within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities.	20%	70%	10%	
	19. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that multiple opportunities for learning are made available to all students.	70%	30%		
	20. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to nurture the school's culture and instructional program by considering all students and staff members in developing learning opportunities.	60%	40%		
	21. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to participate in ongoing dialogue of a political, social, economical, and legal nature with representatives of diverse community groups.	40%	60%		
	22. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of being visible in the community and actively participating in school and community events.	40%	60%		
	23. The Leadership Academy prepared me to enhance the culture and instructional program of the school by utilizing varied forms of technology in teaching and learning.	40%	60%		
	24. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of assessing the school culture and climate on a regular basis in order to promote the success of all students.	60%	40%		
	25. The Leadership Academy taught me to manage the safety of the school by resolving conflicts in a timely manner and by utilizing conflict resolution skills where appropriate.	40%	60%		
	26. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to act with fairness and integrity in protecting the rights of students and staff members.	60%	40%		
	27. The Leadership Academy prepared me to communicate the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	60%	40%		
	28. The Leadership Academy showed me how to develop a school's vision and goals by utilizing assessment data related to student learning.	50%	50%		
	29. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to create a school environment that operates culturally, legally, politically, and economically on behalf of students and their families.	40%	60%		
	30. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to utilize my knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development to inform management decisions.	70%	30%		
	31. The Leadership Academy helped me to identify and address barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture and climate.	40%	50%	10%	

Table 8 (continued)	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	32. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to exercise ethics and integrity in fulfilling all contractual obligations.	60%	30%	10%	
	33. The Leadership Academy helped me understand the importance of developing the school's mission and goals by utilizing relevant demographic student and parent data.	70%	30%		
	34. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to provide opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.	60%	30%	10%	
**All statements are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.					
Additional Questions About Preparation		Yes		No	
	1. Did the mentorship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	90%		10%	
	2. Did the internship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	90%		10%	
	3. Did participating in the HOPE Summit prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	70%		30%	

For all of the six items, one novice administrator disagreed with the statements. There was no perceptible pattern of content for the six items. The one commonality is that two novice administrators, one on the high school and one on the elementary school level, selected Disagree for the aforementioned Item 12.

Level of School and 3 Additional Questions.

Likewise, a cross tabulation of the three additional questions and the level of school in which the novice administrators work was run to compare the responses of elementary, middle, and high school respondents (See Table 10). For all three questions, all of the middle school novice administrators felt the mentorship, the internship, and the HOPE Summit, additional components of the Leadership Academy, prepared them for their current administrative duties.

Likewise, all of the high school novice administrators felt that the mentorship and the internship prepared them for their current administrative duties. One high school novice administrator felt the HOPE Summit prepared them for their current administrative duties while one did not. Finally, five of the elementary novice administrators felt the mentorship and the internship prepared them for their current administrative duties while one elementary novice administrator did not. For the HOPE Summit, four of the elementary novice administrators felt that the component prepared them for their current administrative duties while two did not.

Table 9
Level of School*Question Cross Tabulation/Percentage Responding

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Leadership Academy demonstrated for me how to develop a plan in which objectives and strategies to achieve the school's vision and goals are clearly articulated.	Elem. 83 Middle 50 High 50	Elem.17 Middle 50 High 50		
2. The Leadership Academy provided me with ways to strengthen my school by engaging in political, social, and economical communication with key stakeholders.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 50		
3. The Leadership Academy helped me to understand the fairness and ethics in opening the school to public scrutiny for the purpose of improvement.	Elem. 67 Middle 0 High 50	Elem. 33 Middle 100 High 50		
4. The Leadership Academy taught me the importance of advocating a school culture and instructional program centered on professional development that promotes student learning.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 50	Elem.33 Middle 50 High 50		
5. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage financial, human, and material resources.	Elem. 50 Middle 0 High 0	Elem. 50 Middle 100 High 100		
6. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to establish and nurture partnerships with community members.	Elem. 50 Middle 0 High 50	Elem. 50 Middle 100 High 50		
7. The Leadership Academy stressed the need to communicate progress toward the vision and mission by involving all stakeholders in school improvement efforts.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 100	Elem.33 Middle 50 High 0		
8. The Leadership Academy taught me the ethics and integrity involved in serving as a positive role model for students, staff, and community members.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 0		
9. The Leadership Academy showed me how to manage my time in order to maximize the attainment of organizational goals.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 100		
10. The Leadership Academy presented me with methods of recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0	Elem.33 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 17 Middle 0 High 0	
11. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to collaborate with family and the community to help me responsibly and efficiently manage public resources and funds.	Elem. 50 Middle 0 High 0	Elem. 50 Middle 100 High 100		

Table 9 (continued)	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	12. The Leadership Academy taught me to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for students.	Elem. 50 Middle 0 High 50	Elem. 33 Middle 100 High 0	Elem. 17 Middle 0 High 50	
	13. The Leadership Academy showed me how to use the school district's vision to shape the educational programs, plans, and activities of my school.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 50		
	14. The Leadership Academy highlighted for me the importance of developing a vision of life-long learning with and among stakeholders.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 0		
	15. The Leadership Academy guided me in managing the operation of a school's facility ensuring that it is safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 100		
	16. The Leadership Academy reinforced the need for me to involve family members in the educational experiences of students.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 50		
	17. The Leadership Academy stressed for me the ethics of using my influence and office for the benefit of the stakeholders and not for personal gain.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 50		
	18. The Leadership Academy prepared me to work within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities.	Elem. 33 Middle 0 High 0	Elem. 50 Middle 100 High 100	Elem. 17 Middle 0 High 0	
	19. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that multiple opportunities for learning are made available to all students.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 0		
	20. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to nurture the school's culture and instructional program by considering all students and staff members in developing learning opportunities.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 50		
	21. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to participate in ongoing dialogue of a political, social, economical, and legal nature with representatives of diverse community groups.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 100		
	22. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of being visible in the community and actively participating in school and community events.	Elem. 50 Middle 0 High 50	Elem. 50 Middle 100 High 50		
	23. The Leadership Academy prepared me to enhance the culture and instructional program of the school by utilizing varied forms of technology in teaching and learning.	Elem. 50 Middle 0 High 50	Elem. 50 Middle 100 High 50		

Table 9 (continued)	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	24. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of assessing the school culture and climate on a regular basis in order to promote the success of all students.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0		
	25. The Leadership Academy taught me to manage the safety of the school by resolving conflicts in a timely manner and by utilizing conflict resolution skills where appropriate.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 100		
	26. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to act with fairness and integrity in protecting the rights of students and staff members.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 50	Elem.33 Middle 50 High 50		
	27. The Leadership Academy prepared me to communicate the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0		
	28. The Leadership Academy showed me how to develop a school's vision and goals by utilizing assessment data related to student learning.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 50		
	29. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to create a school environment that operates culturally, legally, politically, and economically on behalf of students and their families.	Elem. 50 Middle 0 High 50	Elem.50 Middle 100 High 50		
	30. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to utilize my knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development to inform management decisions.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 0		
	31. The Leadership Academy helped me to identify and address barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture and climate.	Elem. 50 Middle 50 High 0	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 17 Middle 0 High 0	
	32. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to exercise ethics and integrity in fulfilling all contractual obligations.	Elem. 67 Middle 0 High 100	Elem.17 Middle 100 High 0	Elem. 17 Middle 0 High 0	
	33. The Leadership Academy helped me understand the importance of developing the school's mission and goals by utilizing relevant demographic student and parent data.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 100	Elem. 33 Middle 50 High 0		
	34. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to provide opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.	Elem. 67 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 17 Middle 50 High 50	Elem. 17 Middle 0 High 0	

**All statements are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate

School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.

Table 10
Level of School*3 Additional Questions Cross Tabulation/Percentage Responding

Additional Questions About Preparation	Elementary	Middle	High
1. Did the mentorship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 83	Yes = 100	Yes = 100
	No = 17	No = 0	No = 0
2. Did the internship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 83	Yes = 100	Yes = 100
	No = 17	No = 0	No = 0
3. Did participating in the HOPE Summit prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 67	Yes = 100	Yes = 50
	No = 33	No = 0	No = 50

Gender and Survey Questions.

A cross tabulation of the questions and gender was run to compare the responses that females gave as opposed to males. Four of the novice administrators are males, and six are females. The data revealed that for the 34 initial questions, the males responded more positively than the females (See Table 11). For 31 of 34 questions, a larger percentage of the males responded with Strongly Agree. There were eight questions where all four males selected the response of Strongly Agree. There were no questions where all six females selected the same response. There were three questions where a larger percentage of the males selected the response Agree (75%) rather than Strongly Agree (25%). For 11 questions, two of the males selected Strongly Agree and the other two selected Agree. For one question (Item 3), 50% of both males and females selected Strongly Agree and the other 50% selected Agree. For six questions (Items 10, 12, 18, 31, 32, 34), one female selected the response of Disagree while for one question (Item 12) one male selected the response of Disagree.

Gender and 3 Additional Questions.

A cross tabulation of the three additional questions and gender was run to compare the responses that females gave as opposed to males (See Table 12). For the mentorship and

internship components, all four males felt the experiences prepared them for the current administrative duties; five of the females felt those same components prepared them while one did not. For the HOPE Summit, three of the males felt that component prepared them for their current administrative duties; four of the females felt that same component prepared them while two did not.

Age Range and Survey Questions.

A cross tabulation of the questions and age was run to compare the responses of the novice administrators in the four age groups (20-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years, and 51+ years) (See Table 13). Two of the novice administrators were in the age range of 20-30 years; four in the age range of 31-40 years; two in the age range of 41-50 years; and two in the age range of 51+ years. The data revealed that for the 34 initial questions, the novice administrators in the 20-30 age range responded more positively than the novice administrators of any other age group. For 31 of 34 (91%) questions, the novice administrators in the age range 20-30 responded Strongly Agree.

Table 11
Gender*Question Cross Tabulation/Percentage of Male and Female Responding

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The Leadership Academy demonstrated for me how to develop a plan in which objectives and strategies to achieve the school's vision and goals are clearly articulated.	Male 75 Female 33	Male 25 Female 67		
2. The Leadership Academy provided me with ways to strengthen my school by engaging in political, social, and economical communication with key stakeholders.	Male 75 Female 67	Male 25 Female 33		
3. The Leadership Academy helped me to understand the fairness and ethics in opening the school to public scrutiny for the purpose of improvement.	Male 50 Female 50	Male 50 Female 50		
4. The Leadership Academy taught me the importance of advocating a school culture and instructional program centered on professional development that promotes student learning.	Male 75 Female 50	Male 25 Female 50		
5. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage financial, human, and material resources.	Male 25 Female 33	Male 75 Female 67		
6. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to establish and nurture partnerships with community members.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
7. The Leadership Academy stressed the need to communicate progress toward the vision and mission by involving all stakeholders in school improvement efforts.	Male 100 Female 50	Male 0 Female 50		
8. The Leadership Academy taught me the ethics and integrity involved in serving as a positive role model for students, staff, and community members.	Male 100 Female 50	Male 0 Female 50		
9. The Leadership Academy showed me how to manage my time in order to maximize the attainment of organizational goals.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
10. The Leadership Academy presented me with methods of recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 50	Male 0 Female 17	
11. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to collaborate with family and the community to help me responsibly and efficiently manage public resources and funds.	Male 25 Female 33	Male 75 Female 67		
12. The Leadership Academy taught me to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for students.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 25 Female 50	Male 25 Female 17	
13. The Leadership Academy showed me how to use the school district's vision to shape the educational programs, plans, and activities of my school.	Male 75 Female 33	Male 25 Female 67		
14. The Leadership Academy highlighted for me the importance of developing a vision of life-long learning with and among stakeholders.	Male 100 Female 50	Male 0 Female 50		
15. The Leadership Academy guided me in managing the operation of a school's facility ensuring that it is safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
16. The Leadership Academy reinforced the need for me to involve family members in the educational experiences of students.	Male 75 Female 50	Male 25 Female 50		
17. The Leadership Academy stressed for me the ethics of using my influence and office for the benefit of the stakeholders and not for personal gain.	Male 75 Female 50	Male 25 Female 50		
18. The Leadership Academy prepared me to work within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities.	Male 25 Female 17	Male 75 Female 67	Male 0 Female 17	
19. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that multiple opportunities for learning are made available to all students.	Male 100 Female 50	Male 0 Female 50		

Table 11 (continued)	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	20. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to nurture the school's culture and instructional program by considering all students and staff members in developing learning opportunities.	Male 75 Female 50	Male 25 Female 50		
	21. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to participate in ongoing dialogue of a political, social, economical, and legal nature with representatives of diverse community groups.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
	22. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of being visible in the community and actively participating in school and community events.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
	23. The Leadership Academy prepared me to enhance the culture and instructional program of the school by utilizing varied forms of technology in teaching and learning.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
	24. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of assessing the school culture and climate on a regular basis in order to promote the success of all students.	Male 100 Female 33	Male 0 Female 67		
	25. The Leadership Academy taught me to manage the safety of the school by resolving conflicts in a timely manner and by utilizing conflict resolution skills where appropriate.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
	26. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to act with fairness and integrity in protecting the rights of students and staff members.	Male 75 Female 50	Male 25 Female 50		
	27. The Leadership Academy prepared me to communicate the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	Male 100 Female 33	Male 0 Female 67		
	28. The Leadership Academy showed me how to develop a school's vision and goals by utilizing assessment data related to student learning.	Male 75 Female 33	Male 25 Female 67		
	29. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to create a school environment that operates culturally, legally, politically, and economically on behalf of students and their families.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 67		
	30. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to utilize my knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development to inform management decisions.	Male 100 Female 50	Male 0 Female 50		
	31. The Leadership Academy helped me to identify and address barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture and climate.	Male 50 Female 33	Male 50 Female 50	Male 0 Female 17	
	32. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to exercise ethics and integrity in fulfilling all contractual obligations.	Male 75 Female 50	Male 25 Female 33	Male 0 Female 17	
	33. The Leadership Academy helped me understand the importance of developing the school's mission and goals by utilizing relevant demographic student and parent data.	Male 100 Female 50	Male 0 Female 50		
	34. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to provide opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.	Male 75 Female 50	Male 25 Female 33	Male 0 Female 17	

Table 12
Gender * 3 Additional Questions/Percent Responding

	Male	Female
1. Did the mentorship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 83
	No = 0	No = 17
2. Did the internship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 83
	No = 0	No = 17
3. Did participating in the HOPE Summit prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 75	Yes = 67
	No = 25	No = 33

There were only three questions (Items 6, 9, 18) where one of the novice administrators in the age range 20-30 selected the response of Strongly Agree while the other one selected Agree.

Thus the younger novice administrators did not select Disagree for any of the questions.

There were eighteen questions where three of the novice administrators in the age range 31-40 selected the response of Strongly Agree and one selected the response of Agree. For four questions, all of the novice administrators in the age range 31-40 selected the response of Agree. There was one question (Item 12), where two of the novice administrators in the age range 31-40 selected the response of Disagree. There were four questions (Items 18, 31, 32, 34), where one of the novice administrators in the age range 31-40 selected the response of Disagree.

For 30 of 34 questions, one of the novice administrators in the age range 41-50 selected Strongly Agree while the other one selected Agree. There were three questions (Items 1, 4, 6) where all of the novice administrators in the age range of 41-50 selected Strongly Agree or Agree. There was one question (Item 10) where one of the novice administrators in the age range of 41-50 selected the response of Disagree.

There were 19 of 34 questions where one the novice administrators in the age range of 51+ selected the response of Strongly Agree and one selected Agree. For 15 of 34 questions, all

of the novice administrators in the age range of 51+ selected the response of Agree. There were no questions where the novice administrators in the age range of 51+ selected the response of Disagree.

Age Range and 3 Additional Questions.

Similarly, a cross tabulation of the three additional questions and age was run to compare the responses of the novice administrators in the four age groups (See Table 14). For the mentorship, the internship, and the HOPE Summit, all of the novice administrators in the age range of 20-30 years, 41-50 years, and 51+ years felt the components and the experience prepared them for their current administrative roles. Three of the novice administrators in the age range of 31-40 years felt that the mentorship and the internship prepared them for their current administrative roles while one did not. Contrastingly, one of the novice administrators in the age range of 31-40 felt that the HOPE Summit prepared them for their current administrative roles while three did not.

Years in Education and Survey Questions.

A cross tabulation of the questions and the amount of years that the novice administrators worked in education was run to compare the responses from the three different options in years of service. Two novice administrators had worked in education between 4-10 years; seven had worked in education between 11-20 years, and one had worked in education for 21+ years. The data revealed that for the 34 initial questions, the novice administrator with 21+ years in education responded most positively. (See Table 15).

Table 13
Age Range * Question Cross Tabulation/Percentage Responding

Statement		20-30 Yrs.	31-40 Yrs.	41-50 Yrs.	51+ Yrs.
1. The Leadership Academy demonstrated for me how to develop a plan in which objectives and strategies to achieve the school's vision and goals are clearly articulated.	Strongly Agree	100	50	0	50
	Agree	0	50	100	50
2. The Leadership Academy provided me with ways to strengthen my school by engaging in political, social, and economical communication with key stakeholders.	Strongly Agree	100	25	50	50
	Agree	0	75	50	50
3. The Leadership Academy helped me to understand the fairness and ethics in opening the school to public scrutiny for the purpose of improvement.	Strongly Agree	100	25	50	50
	Agree	0	75	50	50
4. The Leadership Academy taught me the importance of advocating a school culture and instructional program centered on professional development that promotes student learning.	Strongly Agree	100	25	100	50
	Agree	0	75	0	50
5. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage financial, human, and material resources.	Strongly Agree	100	0	50	0
	Agree	0	100	50	100
6. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to establish and nurture partnerships with community members.	Strongly Agree	50	0	100	50
	Agree	50	100	0	50
7. The Leadership Academy stressed the need to communicate progress toward the vision and mission by involving all stakeholders in school improvement efforts.	Strongly Agree	100	75	50	50
	Agree	0	25	50	50
8. The Leadership Academy taught me the ethics and integrity involved in serving as a positive role model for students, staff, and community members.	Strongly Agree	100	75	50	50
	Agree	0	25	50	50
9. The Leadership Academy showed me how to manage my time in order to maximize the attainment of organizational goals.	Strongly Agree	50	50	50	0
	Agree	50	50	50	100
10. The Leadership Academy presented me with methods of recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff.	Strongly Agree	100	25	50	0
	Agree	0	75	0	100
	Disagree	0	0	50	0

Table 13 (continued)	Statement		20-30 Yrs.	31-40 Yrs.	41-50 Yrs.	51+ Yrs.
11. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to collaborate with family and the community to help me responsibly and efficiently manage public resources and funds.	Strongly Agree		100	0	50	0
	Agree		0	100	50	100
12. The Leadership Academy taught me to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for students.	Strongly Agree		100	0	50	50
	Agree		0	50	50	50
	Disagree		0	50	0	0
13. The Leadership Academy showed me how to use the school district's vision to shape the educational programs, plans, and activities of my school.	Strongly Agree		100	25	50	50
	Agree		0	75	50	50
14. The Leadership Academy highlighted for me the importance of developing a vision of life-long learning with and among stakeholders.	Strongly Agree		100	75	50	50
	Agree		0	25	50	50
15. The Leadership Academy guided me in managing the operation of a school's facility ensuring that it is safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing.	Strongly Agree		100	25	50	0
	Agree		0	75	50	100
16. The Leadership Academy reinforced the need for me to involve family members in the educational experiences of students.	Strongly Agree		100	75	50	0
	Agree		0	25	50	100
17. The Leadership Academy stressed for me the ethics of using my influence and office for the benefit of the stakeholders and not for personal gain.	Strongly Agree		100	50	50	50
	Agree		0	50	50	50
18. The Leadership Academy prepared me to work within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities.	Strongly Agree		50	0	50	0
	Agree		50	75	50	100
	Disagree		0	25	0	0
19. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that multiple opportunities for learning are made available to all students.	Strongly Agree		100	75	50	50
	Agree		0	25	50	50
20. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to nurture the school's culture and instructional program by considering all students and staff members in developing learning opportunities.	Strongly Agree		100	50	50	50
	Agree		0	50	50	50
21. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to participate in ongoing dialogue of a political, social, economical, and legal nature with representatives of diverse community groups.	Strongly Agree		100	25	50	0
	Agree		0	75	50	100

Table 13 (continued)	Statement		20-30 Yrs.	31-40 Yrs.	41-50 Yrs.	51+ Yrs.
22. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of being visible in the community and actively participating in school and community events.	Strongly Agree		100	25	50	0
	Agree		0	75	50	100
23. The Leadership Academy prepared me to enhance the culture and instructional program of the school by utilizing varied forms of technology in teaching and learning.	Strongly Agree		100	0	50	50
	Agree		0	100	50	50
24. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of assessing the school culture and climate on a regular basis in order to promote the success of all students.	Strongly Agree		100	50	50	50
	Agree		0	50	50	50
25. The Leadership Academy taught me to manage the safety of the school by resolving conflicts in a timely manner and by utilizing conflict resolution skills where appropriate.	Strongly Agree		100	25	50	0
	Agree		0	75	50	100
26. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to act with fairness and integrity in protecting the rights of students and staff members.	Strongly Agree		100	75	50	0
	Agree		0	25	50	100
27. The Leadership Academy prepared me to communicate the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	Strongly Agree		100	50	50	50
	Agree		0	50	50	50
28. The Leadership Academy showed me how to develop a school's vision and goals by utilizing assessment data related to student learning.	Strongly Agree		100	50	50	0
	Agree		0	50	50	100
29. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to create a school environment that operates culturally, legally, politically, and economically on behalf of students and their families.	Strongly Agree		100	25	50	0
	Agree		0	75	50	100
30. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to utilize my knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development to inform management decisions.	Strongly Agree		100	75	50	50
	Agree		0	25	50	50
31. The Leadership Academy helped me to identify and address barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture and climate.	Strongly Agree		100	25	50	0
	Agree		0	50	50	100
	Disagree		0	25	0	0
32. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to exercise ethics and integrity in fulfilling all contractual obligations.	Strongly Agree		100	50	50	50
	Agree		0	25	50	50
	Disagree		0	25	0	0

Table 13 (continued)	Statement		20-30 Yrs.	31-40 Yrs.	41-50 Yrs.	51+ Yrs.
33. The Leadership Academy helped me understand the importance of developing the school's mission and goals by utilizing relevant demographic student and parent data.	Strongly Agree		100	75	50	50
	Agree		0	25	50	50
34. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to provide opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.	Strongly Agree		100	75	50	0
	Agree		0	0	50	100
	Disagree		0	25	0	0

**All statements are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate

School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.

Table 14
Age Range * 3 Additional Questions Cross Tabulation/Percentage Responding

Additional Questions About Preparation	20-30 Years	31-40 Years	41-50 Years	51+ Years
1. Did the mentorship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 75	Yes = 100	Yes = 100
	No = 0	No = 25	No = 0	No = 0
2. Did the internship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 75	Yes = 100	Yes = 100
	No = 0	No = 25	No = 0	No = 0
3. Did participating in the HOPE Summit prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 25	Yes = 100	Yes = 100
	No = 0	No = 75	No = 0	No = 0

For 100% of the questions, the novice administrator with 21+ years in education selected the response of Strongly Agree or Agree. For 10 of 34 questions, five of the novice administrators with 11-20 years in education selected the response of Strongly Agree while two selected Agree. For three questions, two of the novice administrators with 11-20 years in education selected the response of Strongly Agree while five selected Agree. There were six questions where four of the novice administrators with 11-20 years in education selected the response of Strongly Agree while three selected Agree. For nine questions, three of the novice administrators with 11-20 years in education selected the response of Strongly Agree while four selected Agree. There were five questions (Items 10, 18, 31, 32, 34) where one of the novice administrators with 11-20 years in education selected the response of Disagree. For one question (Item 12), two of novice administrators with 11-20 years in education selected the response of Disagree. For 33 of 34 questions, one of the novice administrators with 4-10 years in education selected the response of Strongly Agree while one selected Agree. There was one question (Item 18), where all of the novice administrators with 4-10 years in education selected the response of Agree.

Years in Education and 3 Additional Questions.

A cross tabulation of the three additional questions and the amount of years that the novice administrators worked in education was run to compare the responses from the three different options in years of service (See Table 16). All of the novice administrators with 4-10 years in education and with 21+ years in education felt that the mentorship, the internship, and the HOPE Summit prepared them for the duties in their current administrative roles. Viewing their experiences differently, were the novice administrators with 11-20 years in education. Six of them felt that the mentorship and the internship components prepared them for the duties in their current administrative roles while one did not. Four novice administrators of that same group felt that the HOPE Summit prepared them for the duties in their current administrative roles while three did not.

Composite of ISLLC Standards.

A composite was run to compare the responses of novice administrators to ISLLC standards. The six ISLLC standards were the core of the seminars used to instruct the novice administrators in the Leadership Academy. Novice administrators strongly agreed that the Leadership Academy prepared them well for their current administrative duties using the ISLLC standards one through six (See Table 17). The Means of their responses ranged from 1 to 6. Means ranging from 3 to 6 novice administrators agreed that the Leadership Academy prepared them well for their current administrative duties using ISLLC standards one through six.

Table 15

Years in Education * Questions/Percentage Responding

Statement		4-10 Yrs.	11-20 Yrs.	21+ yrs.
1. The Leadership Academy demonstrated for me how to develop a plan in which objectives and strategies to achieve the school’s vision and goals are clearly articulated.	Strongly Agree	50	71	100
	Agree	50	29	0
2. The Leadership Academy provided me with ways to strengthen my school by engaging in political, social, and economical communication with key stakeholders.	Strongly Agree	50	43	100
	Agree	50	57	0
3. The Leadership Academy helped me to understand the fairness and ethics in opening the school to public scrutiny for the purpose of improvement.	Strongly Agree	50	43	100
	Agree	50	57	0
4. The Leadership Academy taught me the importance of advocating a school culture and instructional program centered on professional development that promotes student learning.	Strongly Agree	50	57	100
	Agree	50	43	0
5. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage financial, human, and material resources.	Strongly Agree	50	29	0
	Agree	50	71	100
6. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to establish and nurture partnerships with community members.	Strongly Agree	50	71	100
	Agree	50	29	0
7. The Leadership Academy stressed the need to communicate progress toward the vision and mission by involving all stakeholders in school improvement efforts.	Strongly Agree	50	71	100
	Agree	50	29	0
8. The Leadership Academy taught me the ethics and integrity involved in serving as a positive role model for students, staff, and community members.	Strongly Agree	50	71	100
	Agree	50	29	0
9. The Leadership Academy showed me how to manage my time in order to maximize the attainment of organizational goals.	Strongly Agree	50	43	0
	Agree	50	57	100
10. The Leadership Academy presented me with methods of recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff.	Strongly Agree	50	43	0
	Agree	50	43	100
	Disagree	0	14	0
11. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to collaborate with family and the community to help me responsibly and efficiently manage public resources and funds.	Strongly Agree	50	29	0
	Agree	50	71	100
12. The Leadership Academy taught me to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for students.	Strongly Agree	50	29	100
	Agree	50	43	0
	Disagree	0	29	0
13. The Leadership Academy showed me how to use the school district’s vision to shape the educational programs, plans, and activities of my school.	Strongly Agree	50	43	100
	Agree	50	57	0
14. The Leadership Academy highlighted for me the importance of developing a vision of life-long learning with and among stakeholders.	Strongly Agree	50	71	100
	Agree	50	29	0

Table 15 (continued)		4-10 Yrs.	11-20 Yrs.	21+ Yrs.
Statement				
15. The Leadership Academy guided me in managing the operation of a school's facility ensuring that it is safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing.	Strongly Agree	50	43	0
	Agree	50	57	100
16. The Leadership Academy reinforced the need for me to involve family members in the educational experiences of students.	Strongly Agree	50	71	0
	Agree	50	29	100
17. The Leadership Academy stressed for me the ethics of using my influence and office for the benefit of the stakeholders and not for personal gain.	Strongly Agree	50	57	100
	Agree	50	43	0
18. The Leadership Academy prepared me to work within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities.	Strongly Agree	0	29	0
	Agree	100	57	100
	Disagree	0	14	0
19. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that multiple opportunities for learning are made available to all students.	Strongly Agree	50	71	100
	Agree	50	29	0
20. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to nurture the school's culture and instructional program by considering all students and staff members in developing learning opportunities.	Strongly Agree	50	57	100
	Agree	50	43	0
21. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to participate in ongoing dialogue of a political, social, economical, and legal nature with representatives of diverse community groups.	Strongly Agree	50	43	0
	Agree	50	57	100
22. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of being visible in the community and actively participating in school and community events.	Strongly Agree	50	43	0
	Agree	50	57	100
23. The Leadership Academy prepared me to enhance the culture and instructional program of the school by utilizing varied forms of technology in teaching and learning.	Strongly Agree	50	29	100
	Agree	50	71	0
24. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of assessing the school culture and climate on a regular basis in order to promote the success of all students.	Strongly Agree	50	57	100
	Agree	50	43	0
25. The Leadership Academy taught me to manage the safety of the school by resolving conflicts in a timely manner and by utilizing conflict resolution skills where appropriate.	Strongly Agree	50	43	0
	Agree	50	57	100
26. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to act with fairness and integrity in protecting the rights of students and staff members.	Strongly Agree	50	71	0
	Agree	50	29	100
27. The Leadership Academy prepared me to communicate the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	Strongly Agree	50	57	100
	Agree	50	43	0
28. The Leadership Academy showed me how to develop a school's vision and goals by utilizing assessment data related to student learning.	Strongly Agree	50	57	0
	Agree	50	43	100
29. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to create a school environment that operates culturally, legally, politically, and economically on behalf of students and their families.	Strongly Agree	50	43	0
	Agree	50	57	100

Table 15 (continued)	Statement		4-10 Yrs.	11-20 Yrs.	21+ yrs.
30. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to utilize my knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development to inform management decisions.	Strongly Agree		50	71	100
	Agree		50	29	0
31. The Leadership Academy helped me to identify and address barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture and climate.	Strongly Agree		50	43	0
	Agree		50	43	100
	Disagree		0	14	0
32. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to exercise ethics and integrity in fulfilling all contractual obligations.	Strongly Agree		50	57	100
	Agree		50	29	0
	Disagree		0	14	0
33. The Leadership Academy helped me understand the importance of developing the school's mission and goals by utilizing relevant demographic student and parent data.	Strongly Agree		50	71	100
	Agree		50	29	0
34. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to provide opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.	Strongly Agree		50	71	0
	Agree		50	14	100
	Disagree		0	14	0

**All statements are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.

A mean of one novice administrator disagreed to the preparedness using ISLLC standards two, four, five, and six. None of the novice administrators strongly disagreed to the preparedness they received as compared by ISLLC standards.

Table 16

Years in Education * 3 Additional Questions Cross Tabulation/Percentage Responding

Additional Questions About Preparation	4-10 Years	11-20 Years	21+ Years
1. Did the mentorship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 86	Yes = 100
	No = 0	No = 14	No = 0
2. Did the internship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 86	Yes = 100
	No = 0	No = 14	No = 0
3. Did participating in the HOPE Summit prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?	Yes = 100	Yes = 57	Yes = 100
	No = 0	No = 43	No = 0

Table 17
Means of Novice Administrators' Responses * ISLLC Standards

ISLLC Standards	# of Ques. Per Standard	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. A vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community	7	6	4	0	0
2. A school culture and instructional program that promotes student learning and staff professional growth.	7	6	3	1	0
3. Management of the organization and resources for safety and efficiency.	5	4	6	0	0
4. Collaborating with family and community members and acquiring resources.	5	4	5	1	0
5. Being fair and acting ethically and with integrity.	5	6	3	1	0
6. Appropriately responding to the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of school leadership.	5	4	5	1	0

Results of Interviews

Demographics of Principals and Supervisors

Gender and Level of School

Of the eight principals and five district-level supervisors (N=13), nine are females (69%), and four are males (31%) (See Table 18). Seven of the females are employed on the elementary level (78%), one is employed on the high school level (11%), and one works with all levels (11%). One male is employed on the elementary school level (25%), one on the middle school

level (25%), one on the high school level (25%), and one on the middle and high school level (25%).

Table 18
Gender * School Level Cross Tabulation

		Cases					
		Valid		Missing		Total	
		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Gender * School Level		13	100.0%	0	.0%	13	100.0%
		School Level					Total
		Elementary	Middle	High	Middle&High	Elem,Middle&High	
Gender	Male	1	1	1	1	0	4
	Female	7	0	1	0	1	9
Total		8	1	2	1	1	13

Experience in Education

The number of years in education among the principals and supervisors ranged from 15-36 years (See Table 19). The standard deviation is .870. The median is 18 years, and the mode is 15 years.

Table 19
Experience in Education

N	Valid	13			
	Missing	0			
Mean		1.62			
Std. Deviation		.870			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15-20 Years	8	61.5	61.5	61.5
	21-30 Years	2	15.4	15.4	76.9
	31+ Years	3	23.1	23.1	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

Years in Administration

One additional demographic question posed to the principals and supervisors was the number of years spent in administration. This question was posed to shed light on the experience

in administration that the supervisors of the novice administrators had themselves. Years in administration would allow the principals and supervisors to use their experience in responding to the preparedness of the novice administrators. Thus, it was found that the number of years in administration among the principals and supervisors ranged from four years to 22 years (See Table 20). The mean was 11 years, and the standard deviation was .855 ; the median was 10 years, and the mode was eight years.

Table 20
Years in Administration

N	Valid	13			
	Missing	0			
Mean		1.69			
Std. Deviation		.855			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4-10 Years	7	53.8	53.8	53.8
	11-16 Years	3	23.1	23.1	76.9
	17-22 Years	3	23.1	23.1	100.0
	Total	13	100.0	100.0	

Results of Interviews

Subset Question Number Two

Principals

The second subset question was: Did the building principals feel the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders. The building principals (N=8) were interviewed and asked a total of twelve questions. Since the Leadership Academy trained the novice administrators in seminars using the ISLLC standards, the questions were derived using the same standards. A total of two questions were created from each of the six ISLLC standards, for a total of twelve questions. The questions required the principals to state whether or not they felt their assistant principal(s) was/were prepared in prescribed areas that highlighted

the knowledge they possessed, their dispositions, and/or their performance of several indicators (CCSSO, 1996). The principals were also to offer an example that caused them to respond in the manner that they did, or they were to describe an instance where they witnessed the novice administrator performing the action in question. Reference Appendix I for raw data from the principals' interviews.

Interview Question One.

Interview question number one asked principals if they felt their assistant principal was prepared in the area of communicating and modeling the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members. Seven of eight principals felt their novice administrators were prepared in this area. The principals stated that they felt the novice administrators were well prepared to articulate the vision and mission of the school division. A recurrent theme was examples of the novice administrators modeling the vision and mission of the school division in their daily interactions with students, parents, staff, and community members. They also stated that communicating the vision and mission of the school division was practiced daily in the decisions that were being made.

One of eight principals did not feel that the novice administrators in his charge were prepared in communicating the vision and mission of the school division. The principal reported that the administrators were not confident or shy. For example, the principal noted that at several programs that occurred at the school, the novice administrators were not prepared enough to address the public or guest consultants. The principal noted that he had to perform the task assigned to the novice administrators.

Interview Question Two.

Interview question number two asked principals if they felt their assistant principal was prepared in the area of considering diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in making decisions. Again, seven of eight principals responded their novice administrators were prepared. The recurrent theme here was that the novice administrators considered diversity when dealing with discipline issues and assigning consequences for infractions. The principals believed that the novice administrators seemed to be keenly aware of the need to be mindful of the suspensions of black males, a concern of the school division. They mentioned the awareness of the need to close the achievement gaps of gender and ability. Last, they cited examples of the novice administrators' considering diversity with hiring practices, assigning staff members to receive training, and in communicating and working with students and family members regardless of their heritage or economic status.

One of eight principals did not feel the novice administrator in his/her charge was prepared in the area of considering diversity. The principal believed that the administrator did not fully understand diversity as it pertained to schools. The principal reported that much of the diversity in his/her school came from the military presence in the area where the school is located versus race relations, gender, or ability considerations. He/She stated that the novice administrator had no knowledge of how to deal with the military. The principal responded that the preparation that the administrator received for this area came from the guidance that he himself provided.

Interview Question Three.

Interview question number three asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and

resolving problems in a timely manner. Five of eight principals stated that their novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme surrounded the positive way in which the novice administrators handled matters with disgruntled parents. Principals mentioned that although parents at times spoke in loud, harsh, upset tones, the novice administrators responded in a professional manner. Also mentioned was the way in which the novice administrators took the time to listen to all sides of a situation from parents and students. They reported that the novice administrators properly assessed the situations at hand before making decisions. Last, they added that the novice administrators were a big help in dealing with staff members and in helping them resolve issues in their classrooms or in the buildings with other adults.

Three of eight principals reported that their novice administrators were not prepared in the area of practicing effective conflict resolution skills. The principals stated that the novice administrators needed to gain more experience in this area. They believed their novice administrators did not prioritize their work load and/or were weak in multitasking; therefore, situations were not addressed in a timely manner. The principals also stated that their novice administrators were too afraid to make decisions and sought advice on minute situations.

Interview Question Four.

Interview question number four asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of securing community resources to help the school solve problems and achieve goals. Five of eight principals reported their novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was that the novice administrators had done a “nice job” in working with business partners and local universities. The principals believed that the experiences with which the novice administrators came to the table had helped the schools immensely in this area.

The novice administrators were able to locate TV personalities and professionals in the community to support the schools in classes and in assemblies.

Three of eight principals indicated that their novice administrators were not prepared in this area. In this area, they reported that the novice administrators had to be hand-held and were not “self-initiated”. The principals stated that the novice administrators did not have a sense of how to go about securing community resources. The novice administrators left it up to the building principals to take care of this matter for the schools.

Interview Question Five

Interview question number five asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of responding fairly, respectfully, and in a timely manner to students, parents, staff, and community members. All eight principals reported that their novice administrators treated students, parents, staff, and community members respectfully. The principals stressed that there were no complaints in that area. The novice administrators were polite in their tones and calm in their responses.

Seven of eight principals stated that their novice administrators were fair and respectful. The recurrent theme was the novice administrators’ calm, focused, and objective manner in handling situations. Principals mentioned that neither the educational background nor the economic status of the family members had an effect on how the novice administrators dealt with situations. They reported that their novice administrators handled situations with professionalism. One principal reported that the novice administrator was not always fair in the administration of discipline. The principal shared that he/she had to go back and make adjustments to the consequences that students had been assigned. Thus, he/she believed that the novice administrators lacked preparedness in this area.

Six of eight principals reported that their novice administrators were timely in their response to their stakeholders. The principals stated that their novice administrators were prompt in getting back with parents, staff, and community members even if they hadn't entirely resolved the issues. They contacted the stakeholders via phone or email and shared about the situation or alerted the stakeholder that the situation or question was being investigated and that they would follow up with a resolution or answer. Two principals mentioned the 24-Hour policy that their schools use. This policy calls for novice administrators to contact the stakeholder within 24 hours to "acknowledge receipt" of the phone call or email and to answer any questions. The principals mentioned that though there may have been minor slips in this area, for the most part, the novice administrators were prepared.

Two of eight principals stated that their novice administrators were not timely in their responses to stakeholders. They cited examples of parents contacting them and sharing of the novice administrators' politeness, but sharing that the timeliness was a problem. One principal shared that the comment "I didn't get a chance to do that" was a response from the novice administrator when asked about being timely. Both principals stated that much improvement was needed in this area.

Interview Question Six

Interview question number six asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of communicating with a diverse body of decision makers outside the school community. Five of eight principals reported that their novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the notation of the novice administrators' great communication skills and the very "diplomatic and professional" in the manner in which they communicated with others. The principals were confident that their novice administrators could

communicate with anyone. They cited examples of their novice administrators communicating with businesses, agencies, central office administrators, educators in other school divisions, and at conferences.

One of eight principals stated that his/her novice administrators were not prepared in this area. He/She noted that they had been given opportunities to work with decision makers outside the school community, but that they had not grown. He believed that given another year, they may “evolve”.

Two of eight principals stated that they had not observed any evidence of their novice administrators being prepared in this area. One principal noted that because timeliness was a concern for the novice administrator, the opportunity was not given to the novice administrators. The principal stated that the novice administrator needed to grow in that area before he/she would offer the opportunity to work closely with others outside the school community.

Interview Question Seven

Interview question number seven asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of using student demographic and assessment data to drive decisions. Seven of eight principals stated that their novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the novice administrators’ work with school improvement plans and the use of data to make decisions about the future of the school. Principals noted the novice administrators’ work with SOL (Standards of Learning) data and making decisions to make AYP (Annual Yearly Progress). They mentioned the novice administrators’ work with grade distribution and assessment data and using the quarterly reports to make decisions about instructional practices and the master schedule. Principals mentioned discipline data and making decisions to help teachers and students. Last, they mentioned attendance data and making

decisions to improve student attendance. While one principal knew that the novice administrator was prepared to use data, he stated that the timeliness of working with the data and sharing the data with the staff members needed improvement.

One of eight principals reported that his/her novice administrator was not prepared in using student demographic and assessment data to drive decisions. He/She stated that the discipline and attendance data were not utilized the way that he/she had hoped. The principal noted that he/she would like to be able to hire assistants who are able to jump in and “run with the data from the very beginning”.

Interview Question Eight.

Interview question number eight asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of using technology in teaching and learning and remaining abreast of current trends in education. All eight principals reported that their novice administrators were very current with the various trends in education. They noted that their novice administrators were eager to learn and to try new strategies they had learned from research.

Seven of eight principals stated that their novice administrators were prepared in the area of using technology in teaching and learning. The recurrent theme was the use of PowerPoint and Excel to teach in staff development sessions. The principals mentioned the novice administrators’ use of technology in their work with the high-stakes testing results and sharing with the staff for instruction and school improvement purposes. The principals also gave examples of the novice administrators’ using technology in the daily operations of the school to include transportation and building use requests.

One of eight principals reported that the novice administrators in his/her charge were not prepared in the area of using technology in teaching and learning. The principal noted that while

he/she had witnessed a couple of presentations, he/she had not seen a whole lot done in this area. The principal stated that this was an area where the novice administrators were “evolving a little bit”.

Interview Question Nine.

Interview question number nine asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of protecting the rights of students and staff members and practicing confidentiality with school information. All eight principals reported that their novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the practice of confidentiality with disciplinary situations involving students and staff members and of the confidentiality with very personal information shared by staff members. The principals mentioned that not once had the confidentiality of the students and/or staff members been compromised. They noted that for the most part, only the novice administrator and the principal knew of the situations.

Interview Question Ten.

Interview question number ten asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of establishing partnerships with community members and being active and visible in community events. Five of eight principals stated their novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the mention of the novice administrators’ activity and presence at community events. They cited examples of their novice administrators’ attending school events such as PTA or PTSA meetings and events, community events such as Relay for Life and work with veterans, and division orchestrated events. Again, the principals mentioned the partnerships that the novice administrators were successful in establishing with local businesses and universities for the benefit of the school.

Three of eight principals reported that their novice administrators were not prepared in the area of establishing partnerships and being active and visible in community events. None of the three principals had seen evidence of the novice administrators' attempt to form a partnership with any outside agency on behalf of the school. The principals mentioned that the time and commitment needed to be effective in this area was lacking.

Interview Question Eleven.

Interview question number eleven asked the principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of working within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities to improve opportunities for students. All of the principals responded that the novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the novice administrators' knowledge of and work with special education. The principals stated the novice administrators followed the laws and policies "to the letter". They reported that IEP's, especially in dealing with accommodations to assist students with their academics, due process with disciplinary issues, and Child Studies were given high priority. They also mentioned the fact that the novice administrators effectively followed the policies of the school division in dealing with policies for various courses, programs, attendance, and disciplinary matters.

Interview Question Twelve.

Interview question twelve asked principals if they felt their assistant principals were prepared in the area of practicing effective communication skills and sharing responsibility leading to ownership and accountability. Seven of eight principals stated their novice administrators were prepared in the area of practicing effective communication skills and sharing responsibility. They reported their novice administrators practiced effective communication skills with parents, students, and staff members. The recurrent theme here was the principals'

providing evidence of a shared leadership style that the novice administrators practiced. They spoke of the novice administrators developing leaders among faculty and staff members and practicing shared-decision making. Two principals stated that although their novice administrators were prepared, they felt that the novice administrators needed to grow a bit more in the area of sharing responsibility and being accountable.

One of eight principals stated that the novice administrators in his/her school were not prepared in this area. The principal indicated that they were not effective communicators because, as he/she put it, "They don't communicate their expectations". The principal noted, however, that they were working on that deficit. The principal also indicated that the novice administrators lacked preparedness in the area of sharing responsibility but stated that the novice administrators were developing in this area as well.

Principals: Comparison of ISLLC Standards.

The constant comparative method was used to compare the responses of the principals by ISLLC standards. Principals reported that the Leadership Academy prepared the majority of the novice administrators for their current administrative duties using ISLLC standards one through six (See Table 21). The Means of scores ranged from 1 to 7. For preparedness, principals reported a mean of 7 for ISLLC standard one; 7 for ISLLC standard two; 6 for ISLLC standard three; 5 for ISLLC standard four; 7 for ISLLC standard five; and 7 for ISLLC standard six. For lack of preparedness, principals reported a mean of 1 for ISLLC standard one; 1 for ISLLC standard two; 2 for ISLLC standard three; 3 for ISLLC standard four; 1 for ISLLC standard five; and 1 for ISLLC standard six. Thirty-eight percent of the principals responded that the novice administrators were not prepared in ISLLC standard four, collaborating with family and community members and acquiring resources. Twenty-five percent of the principals responded

that the novice administrators were not prepared in ISLLC standard three, managing the organization and resources for safety and efficiency. Eighty-seven percent of the principals reported that the novice administrators were prepared in the remaining ISLLC standards one, two, five, and six.

Table 21
Means of Principals' Responses * ISLLC Standards

ISLLC Standards	# of Quest. Per Standard	Prepared	Not Prepared
1. A vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community	2	7	1
2. A school culture and instructional program that promotes student learning and staff professional growth.	2	7	1
3. Management of the organization and resources for safety and efficiency.	2	6	2
4. Collaborating with family and community members and acquiring resources.	2	5	3
5. Being fair and acting ethically and with integrity.	2	7	1
6. Appropriately responding to the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of school leadership.	2	7	1

Subset Question Number Three

District-level Supervisors

The third subset question was did the district-level supervisors (N=5) feel the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders. The identical format that was

used to interview the building principals was the same format used to interview the five district-level supervisors. At the time of the interview, they were provided with a copy of the Supervisors' Interview Questions and Protocol (See Appendix H), and they were asked the exact twelve questions that the principals were asked. The questions required the district-level supervisors to state whether or not they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrators was/were prepared in prescribed areas that highlighted the knowledge they possessed, their dispositions, and/or their performance of several indicators (CCSSO, 1996). In the same manner, the district-level supervisors were also to offer an example that caused them to respond in the manner that they did, or they were to describe an instance where they witnessed the administrator(s) performing the action in question. In answering the interview questions, three supervisors responded based on the individual novice administrators whom they oversaw. One supervisor made responses in reference to three novice administrators; another supervisor made responses in reference to two different novice administrators; one made reference to one novice administrator; another made reference to one novice administrator; and one supervisor made responses in reference to four novice administrators. This pattern of supervision made it so that different supervisors who oversaw more than one novice administrator split their responses depending on the question.

Interview Question One.

Interview question number one asked the supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of communicating and modeling the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members. Five of five supervisors reported that nine of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. A recurrent theme was in examples of the administrators' communicating the initiatives of

the school division to parents, to the staffs, and to community members in parent meetings, in school newsletters, in monthly staff development sessions, in school improvement meetings, in school audits, and in Central Office meetings. They mentioned that the novice administrators modeled the mission and vision of the school division and had a clear vision of the goals. In addition, the supervisors used words and phrases such as these to describe the novice administrators: “articulate, communicates effectively, and doing a phenomenal job.” Of note is one of the supervisors who stated that two of the novice administrators needed to improve their communication skills and their modeling of the vision and mission of the division. The supervisor stated that one novice administrator in particular need to work on strengthening other areas in order to improve the work situation.

Interview Question Two.

Interview question number two asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of considering diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in making decisions. Five of five supervisors responded that ten of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. A recurrent theme was in examples of the novice administrators’ using research on assessment data and discipline data to adjust practices and open doors to programs for a more diverse body of students. They mentioned the fact that the novice administrators review the trends in regards to subgroups and make sound decisions. They noted the novice administrators’ focus on diversifying the staff and the programs and activities that occur at the schools to reflect different cultures. Last, they mentioned the diversity of the memos and telephone communications. One supervisor stated that one novice administrator was not prepared to make decisions with regards to diversity. The supervisor noted that the novice administrator “struggles with making decisions that makes sense.”

Interview Question Three.

Interview question number three asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and resolving problems in a timely manner. Four of five supervisors reported that six of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. A recurrent theme of the four supervisors was the evidence of the novice administrators' communicating with students, parents, and staff members to resolve conflicts. The terms "excellent job in resolving their problems", "good listening skills and sage communication skills," and handling situations "like a champ" were used. The supervisors referenced situations where the novice administrators reflected with teachers on areas of concern and provided suggestions "in a nonthreatening, supportive way." One supervisor highlighted a novice administrator who put structures in place to assist a staff member, who documented, and who made a tough decision regarding the staff member's future while "protecting the integrity of the staff member."

Two supervisors reported that four of the novice administrators were prepared and had the skills to resolve conflicts, but that they were either too silent or not timely in their responses. They mentioned that the novice administrators needed to work on their verbal skills and on their organizational skills. One supervisor stated that one of the novice administrators was not prepared and did not have the skills to effectively resolve conflicts. The supervisor believed that the novice administrator lacked confidence and allowed outside concerns to detract his attention from his profession.

Interview Question Four.

Interview question number four asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of securing community resources to help the

school solve problems and achieve goals. Five of five supervisors responded that six novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the fact that the novice administrators had worked with community agencies that “added value” to the schools in which they worked. The novice administrators worked with clubs in the community, presenting ideas and structures for students. They also linked with a local university to solicit information about various programs and to request use of space. In addition, they worked with parent groups who would visit the school to teach ESL to parents in need of those services.

Two supervisors responded that they did not have enough evidence to determine whether or not five of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. They noted that they had no first-hand evidence, nor had they been given any information from the principals to be able to make that judgment. They mentioned that they knew of the principals’ work in securing community resources, but they did not believe it was fair to answer whether or not the five novice administrators were prepared in securing community resources since they had no evidence.

Interview Question Five.

Interview question number five asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of responding fairly, respectfully, and in a timely manner to students, parents, staff, and community members. Five of five supervisors stated that ten of the eleven novice administrators responded fairly and respectfully to students, parents, staff, and community members. They reported that the novice administrators thoroughly investigated situations before arriving at the most informed decision. They believed that the novice administrators were extremely respectful, especially with parents who were irate. They were present in instances where the novice administrators were calm and did not respond

defensively. A recurrent theme was the fairness in the novice administrators. The supervisors mentioned instances where the novice administrators used the curriculum and data to assist them in responding fairly to teachers' and parents' concerns, and most importantly, "to be fair especially for our children." On the other hand, one supervisor stated that one novice administrator was not prepared in this area. The supervisor noted that the administrator did not respond fairly in situations and that there had been complaints about this administrator.

With regards to being timely, five supervisors reported that nine of the novice administrators were prepared. The supervisors used words such as quick and prompt to describe the way in which the novice administrators responded to situations. Conversely, one supervisor reported that two novice administrators were not prepared in being timely. The supervisor had evidence of budget issues that were not handled in a timely manner, which resulted in rushed purchases at the last minute. The supervisor reiterated the fact that the complaints received were in regards to the untimely manner in which situations had been addressed.

Interview Question Six.

Interview question number six asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of communicating with a diverse body of decision makers outside the school community. Five of five supervisors responded that nine of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. The supervisors stated that the novice administrators communicated well and frequently with decision makers outside the school community. The recurrent theme was the communication with personnel in other school divisions. The novice administrators had led efforts involving projects in conjunction with other school divisions and had done an excellent job in doing so. In addition, the supervisors cited evidence of the novice

administrators' communication with City school board personnel, businesses in the community, and with other educational agencies.

One supervisor stated that there was not enough evidence to determine whether or not two of the novice administrators were prepared. The supervisor noted that the principal had relayed information that the novice administrators had participated in the preparation for a national visit, but that once the visit occurred, the novice administrators failed to participate in any kind of communication. They did not share about their school's practices nor did they share about strategies that the school used to increase student achievement. The principal conveyed all the information and fielded all the questions. The supervisor noted that it was "a real challenge for that team to gel".

Interview Question Seven.

Interview question number seven asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of using student demographic and assessment data to drive decisions. Five of five supervisors reported that eight of the 11 novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the use of the assessment and student demographic data that the novice administrators use on a regular basis to make decisions regarding school improvement. The supervisors noted that the novice administrators used the data to determine the percentage of students being successful, which students were being successful, and in what area students were experience success or failure. The novice administrators also used the data to determine the placement of students, which programs to expand, and which programs to collapse. The novice administrators were said to be prepared to study the data, to analyze it, and to look at gaps and create immediate and long-range intervention plans for success.

One supervisor reported that for the three of the novice administrators, there was no evidence to determine if they were or were not prepared to use student demographic and assessment data to drive decisions. For two of the novice administrators, the supervisor had seen evidence that their school was working with data, but had seen no evidence from the novice administrators or from their principal that they had a hand in anything data driven. For the third novice administrator, the supervisor noted that there had not been any discussion with regards to data and the program that the novice administrator oversees. Therefore, the supervisor could not determine whether or not the novice administrator was prepared in the area of using student demographic and assessment data.

Interview Question Eight.

Interview question number eight asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of using technology in teaching and learning and remaining abreast of current trends in education. Five of five supervisors reported that nine of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme was the use of Excel to disaggregate data and to arrive at decisions and the use of other web-based resources to instruct teachers for professional development purposes. The supervisors further mentioned evidence of technology use in studying educational trends and in conducting research to remain abreast of current trends in education for school improvement purposes.

One supervisor reported that for two of the novice administrators, there was no evidence of the use of technology in teaching and learning and of remaining abreast of current trends in education. The supervisor stressed that lack of evidence did not indicate that the novice administrators were not prepared.

Interview Question Nine.

Interview question number nine asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of protecting the rights of students and staff members and practicing confidentiality with school information. All five of the supervisors responded that nine of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme here dealt with the confidentiality of staff members who were being either transferred from one site to another. It was mentioned that transfers are discussed openly with administrators in order to make the most informed decision about where an individual would best be utilized. The supervisors noted that the novice administrators had done an excellent job of understanding the importance of keeping certain information confidential. The supervisors also cited evidence of the novice administrators' being very professional with student information. They noted that while the novice administrators were compelled to report certain information, there was evidence of their doing so while protecting the rights of the students and their parents.

One supervisor reported that for two novice administrators, there was not evidence "to support or refute" their preparedness in the area of protecting the rights of students and staff members and practicing confidentiality with school information. While the supervisor noted that there were no complaints indicating that the novice administrators were not prepared, the supervisor had no first-hand knowledge that they were.

Interview Question Ten.

Interview question number ten asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of establishing partnerships with community members and being active and visible in community events. All five of the supervisors responded that nine of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. The supervisors'

responses revealed a recurrent theme of the novice administrators establishing partnerships and being active and visible with programs involving other school divisions and with local colleges and universities. The supervisors gave evidence of the novice administrators' work on No Child Left Behind projects, bonding with the community to raise money for research, working with businesses and clubs, and being very visible in athletic and academic events in the community.

One supervisor reported that for two of the novice administrators, there was no evidence of the novice administrators being active or visible at community events. In addition, the supervisor had not seen any evidence of the novice administrators establishing partnerships in the community.

Interview Question Eleven.

Interview question number eleven asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of working within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities to improve opportunities for students. All five of the supervisors responded that all 11 novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme deals with following the local policies and guidelines with regards to the Rights and Responsibilities Handbook for the school division and in following federal law dealing with special education services. The novice administrators were said to follow the local policies in handling student discipline and were all said to follow the federal law in ensuring that students with disabilities were treated fairly. The supervisors provided evidence such as the novice administrators' referring to policy manuals, orchestrating eligibility committees and child studies, and working to include diverse population of students in programs. In this area, the novice administrators were said to do these things "as a natural part of their job[s]."

Interview Question Twelve.

Interview question twelve asked supervisors if they felt their assistant principal(s) or administrator was/were prepared in the area of practicing effective communication skills and sharing responsibility leading to ownership and accountability. All five of the supervisors reported that nine of the novice administrators were prepared in this area. The recurrent theme centers around the novice administrators' practice of operating as a "collective unit" with their staffs and other subordinates, "facilitating and distributing leadership", and communicating goals and visions, and enhancing skills. The novice administrators were said to work well in the professional learning communities of their schools, and they were said to empower others around them by sharing responsibility. The supervisors noted that the novice administrators worked collaboratively with their administrators in running their buildings.

One supervisor reported that two of the novice administrators were not prepared in this area. The supervisor stated that the novice administrators experienced challenges with their communication skills. The supervisor noted that it was difficult to "draw the information out of them." The supervisor further mentioned that they were probably not very vocal individuals and that their challenges with communicating with others could be due to their personality types.

Supervisors: Comparison of ISLLC Standards.

The constant comparative method was used to compare the responses of the supervisors by ISLLC standards. Supervisors reported that the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators for their current administrative duties using ISLLC standards one through six. The Means ranged from 1 to 5. Five supervisors reported that the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators using ISLLC standards one, two, four, five, and six. Four supervisors reported that the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators using ISLLC standard

three. One supervisor responded that the Leadership Academy did not prepare novice administrators well for their current administrative duties using the ISLLC standard three.

Table 22
Means of Supervisors' Responses * ISLLC Standards

ISLLC Standards	# of Quest. Per Standard	Prepared	Not Prepared
1. A vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community	2	5	0
2. A school culture and instructional program that promotes student learning and staff professional growth.	2	5	0
3. Management of the organization and resources for safety and efficiency.	2	4	1
4. Collaborating with family and community members and acquiring resources.	2	5	0
5. Being fair and acting ethically and with integrity.	2	5	0
6. Appropriately responding to the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of school leadership.	2	5	0

Recommendations for Programmatic Improvements

Additional Experiences to Include

Part two of the interviews asked the principals and supervisors the following question: if you had to include additional experiences in the Leadership Academy so that the participants could emerge more prepared for school leadership positions, what would you include? Several recommendations were made:

Recommendation 1: Include more activities and conversations on the effective use of community resources and building partnerships. Partnerships with businesses and universities assist K-12 schools with meeting human and financial needs that are not always available through the use of traditional funding streams. A possible activity may be to have the participants research the resources in the community and devise a listing of those businesses, the resources they are capable of providing, and the contact information.

Recommendation 2: Include conversations around the importance of being active and visible in school and community events. This is a commitment to building relationships with stakeholders that will benefit the schools especially in the area of reducing discipline problems.

Recommendation 3: Provide opportunities for participants to review data (assessment data, high-stakes testing data, discipline data, attendance data) and to practice making suggestions for school improvement. The difference in reviewing classroom data and making decisions versus reviewing school wide data and making decisions is a comparison that assistant principals will have to master.

Recommendation 4: Include more conversations and activities dealing with financial accountability. Schools need principals **and** assistant principals who are able to effectively deal with budgets and grants. They need to understand line items and the various types of funding that are allocated to educational institutions.

Recommendation 5: Include more activities dealing with tough decision making and dealing with difficult people. While much of the effectiveness in this area comes with field experience, assistant principals need as much practice in dealing with difficult people in order to assist the principal and in order to improve the climate of the school. Have the participants sit in on parent

conferences so they could obtain a feel of the challenges of the position. Fully explain the complexities of the job.

Recommendation 6: Include activities highlighting the organization of effective meetings.

Assistant principals often are the designees for the principals. They do not seem to be prepared in this area. Have them create meeting agendas, faculty memos, and role play a conference with a teacher with poor observations.

Recommendation 7: Include discussions on transitioning from a teacher to an administrator.

Discuss the role change that needs to take place, the most effective and professional way to do that, and include some conversation on why it must be done.

Recommendation 8: Include more case studies and more in-basket activities dealing with practical application or the daily operations of a school. Since scheduling, discipline, and testing are three of the biggest roles of assistant principals, spend a significant amount of time covering these topics. A recommendation is to have the participants work within their schools during the actual school year on these items, not just shadowing, but actually working in these roles.

Recommendation 9: Include a more comprehensive understanding of Special Education.

Assistant principals need to be grounded in the special education process for the benefit of the students and for the sake of compliance of federal law.

Recommendation 10: Include a more rigorous screening process for applicants. Create more detailed scenarios to which applicants would respond. Include an interview component to the entrance requirements. This would give the committee an opportunity to “delve into how these individuals think.”

Recommendation 11: Include conversations about the monitoring of initiatives implemented in the building. Assistant principals often lag in the area of monitoring new initiatives. More

discussions on the most effective way to determine “that practices are changing” are sorely needed.

Recommendation 12: Detail for every participant what they need to do to secure an administrative position in City Public Schools. Be honest with the candidates about themselves and about the expectations of the school division so that they do not leave the academy with a false sense of immediately obtaining an administrative position.

**The recommendations are not listed in order of importance.

Experiences to Eliminate

Part three of the interviews asked the principals and supervisors to reflect on experiences that they would eliminate from the Leadership Academy for the purpose of fine-tuning the program. Three of the thirteen principals and supervisors made two suggestions:

Elimination 1: Eliminate the monthly meetings that occur during the school day. Principals felt that although once per month did not seem like much, the participants, all teachers, were then absent from work on other days for personal reasons. The absences made fluid instruction tough for the students and for the schools. Students were left with substitutes, especially around testing times. A suggestion was to have the seminars on Saturdays or maybe two evenings rather than one entire instructional day.

Elimination 2: Eliminate having new principals recommend teachers for the Leadership Academy. Have new principals wait at least a year before making recommendations or have new principals make recommendations with the endorsement of former principals or assistant principals. This would allow for the most informed recommendations to be made so that the division would be training those best suited to be administrators.

Summary

Chapter four obtains the results of ten novice administrators to the thirty-four- question survey and to the three additional questions. The quantitative data presented in the chapter highlights the responses of the novice administrators to questions regarding the preparation that the City Public Schools Leadership Academy provided to them. The results were presented in tables and in narrative form. The data presented analyzes how the novice administrators from elementary, middle, and high school responded, how males versus females responded, how novice administrators of various age groups responded, and how novice administrators with various years of experience in education responded.

In addition, chapter four includes the results of the thirteen interviews of the principals and supervisors of the novice administrators who responded in reference to the eleven novice administrators invited to participate in the study. The qualitative data including emerging themes was presented in table and narrative form. The interview questions focused on whether or not the principals and supervisors felt the City Public Schools Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators for school leadership positions. The principals and supervisors responded to twelve initial questions and two additional questions.

The data in chapter four also includes results of how the novice administrators, the principals, and the supervisors responded to the questions compared to the six ISLLC standards. This data was also presented in table and narrative form.

Chapter five includes a summary in addition to conclusions, observations, recommendations for program improvement, and recommendations for further study. The summary, conclusions, and observations analyzed the findings in relation to the research

question: has the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy met its goal of preparing public school administrators for school leadership positions?

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes an overview, summary of the findings, and conclusions. Following the conclusions, observations, recommendations for program improvement, and recommendations for further research will be highlighted.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether City Public Schools' Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions. The research utilized a blend of qualitative and quantitative data gathered from a survey and interviews. Triangulation of data was accomplished by surveying the novice administrators, interviewing the principals, and interviewing the district-level supervisors. The entire population of novice administrators from the 2004-2006 cohorts of the Leadership Academy (N=11) who had obtained an administrative position were invited to participate in the survey. They were purposefully selected because they had obtained administrative positions in City Public Schools. Ten of the novice administrators responded to the survey, yielding a 92% return rate. In addition, the principals and supervisors of the novice administrators (N=13) were interviewed in order to gain a perspective of how well the novice administrators were prepared by the Leadership Academy. Saturation was reached by analyzing the data using the responses in several categories: elementary, middle, and high school responses; male versus female responses; age group responses; years of experience in education responses; and a comparison of ISLLC standards responses.

Findings are presented in response to each research question. The main research question that guided this study was: Has the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy met its goal of

producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions? Subset questions were: (1) Did the novice administrators feel the Leadership Academy prepared them to be school leaders; (2) Did the building principals feel the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders; and (3) Did the district level supervisors feel the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders?

The survey and interview questions used to answer the research questions were based on the ISLLC standards (CCSSO, 1996, p. iii). The six ISLLC standards were the basis of the Leadership Academy training seminars used to prepare the novice administrators. The questions were created to provide a link between the survey questions and the interview questions.

Findings

Finding number one is that the novice administrators indicated that the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy prepared them for school leadership positions. There were 34 substantive questions and three additional questions posed to the novice administrators. The three additional questions referenced the preparedness provided through the internship experience, the mentorship experience, and the HOPE Summit. The novice administrators selected either Strongly Agree or Agree on 28 of the 34 initial questions. This represented an 82% agreement for these items indicating the novice administrators felt the Leadership Academy adequately prepared them to be school leaders. An analysis of the independent variables of gender, age, level of school, and experience in education revealed that regardless of the variable, the novice administrators felt prepared to be administrators.

The second finding is that there were four novice administrators (three elementary and one high school) who expressed disagreement on six questions of the survey instrument. This represents an 18% response rate of disagree for the initial questions. The six questions dealt with

the subjects of: student and staff celebrations, the legal and political system, policies and laws, school culture and climate, contractual obligations, and collaboration with the community. This indicates that these individuals thought the program did not adequately prepare them in these areas.

The third finding is that the use of the ISLLC standards in the seminars prepared the novice administrators for school leadership positions. Nine of 10 novice administrators either strongly agreed or agreed that they were prepared for school leadership using the ISLLC standards for the seminars. One of 10 novice administrators indicated that he/she was not prepared in four of the six areas of the ISLLC standards. Thus, based on the data, the novice administrators thought the use of the ISLLC standards as the basis of the leadership seminars lead to their preparedness.

The fourth finding is that the three additional components of the Leadership Academy which were the mentorship, the internship components that the novice administrators experienced, and the HOPE Summit that the novice administrators attended were perceived as being very helpful to the novice administrators in preparing them to become school leaders. A total of 90% of the novice administrators agreed that the mentorship and the internship components prepared them for their leadership positions, and a total of 70% agreed that the HOPE Summit prepared them for their leadership positions. One novice administrator noted that neither the mentorship, internship, nor the HOPE Summit prepared him/her for the school leadership position. Two other novice administrators responded that the HOPE Summit did not prepare them for their school leadership positions. The novice administrators did not indicate whether or not the entire HOPE experience did not prepare them for school leadership positions or whether or not parts of the experience proved to be worthwhile.

The fifth finding is that the building principals reported that the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders. For every interview question posed, 63% or greater of the building principals agreed that the novice administrator(s) was/were prepared. Six of 8 principals stated the novice administrators were prepared when compared to the requirements of the six ISLLC standards. The building principals said that the novice administrators were knowledgeable in the area of administration and supervision, were articulate, had excellent writing ability, were perceptive, and dealt well with students, their families, faculty and staff, and community members.

Of the 12 questions posed, there were three areas where three of the building principals reported that three novice administrators were not prepared. The first area was practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting, and resolving problems in a timely manner. The principals said that the three novice administrators were either not confident in their abilities and/or did not practice their skills in a timely manner. The second area was securing community resources to help the school solve problems and achieve goals. The principals reported that three of the novice administrators were not prepared to connect with the community in order to secure resources. The third area was establishing partnerships with community members and being active and visible in community events. The principals said that three of the novice administrators were not prepared to form partnerships nor were they prepared to dedicate the amount of hours needed to actively and visibly participate in community events. The data that support this comes in the words of one principal, "I have found the candidate to weak in being timely. And I don't know if it has to do with scheduling, multitasking, things like this" (Transcript 7, p.3). And in the words of another principal, "I'm not so sure that the candidates

are aware of how much time and commitment there is, that is needed rather, to do just those things, being involved in the community” (Transcript 1, p.5).

The sixth finding is that the district-level supervisors reported that the City Public Schools’ Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators for school leadership positions. Of the twelve questions posed regarding the evaluation of the novice administrators, the supervisors said that 6-10 of the novice administrators were prepared in various areas. Four of 5 supervisors said the novice administrators were prepared when compared to the six ISLLC standards. Like the building principals, the supervisors believed that the novice administrators were effective communicators, used good listening skills, were thorough, and “added value” to the schools in which they worked.

Similar to the building principals, the supervisors reported that one of the novice administrators was not adequately prepared in the area of practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting, and resolving problems in a timely manner. The supervisors responded that the novice administrator needed more opportunities to practice these skills in order to assist with this deficit.

The seventh finding is that while the principals and supervisors said that the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators for school leadership positions, there was one area where they both reported that 4-5 novice administrators were not prepared. The principals felt that 37% of the novice administrators were not prepared in the area of practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and resolving problems in a timely manner. The supervisors stated that 45% of the novice administrators were not prepared in these same areas. There was one principal who supervised two of the novice administrators and one supervisor who supervised four of the novice administrators. According to the principal and the supervisor,

two of the novice administrators were either not prepared and/or needed improvement in several areas (Questions 1-6, 8, 10, 12). A principal noted, “. . .I would like to see improvement in that area. . . so sometimes we’ve had issues where some things have gone on for a period of time that it should have been ended earlier” (Transcript 1, p.2). However, both the supervisor and the principal noted that two of the novice administrators exhibited lack of preparedness. The principal and the supervisor attributed this more to individual differences rather than to a shortcoming of the leadership preparation program. The supervisor stated, “I can’t attribute that to the Leadership Academy. I can just attribute that to the individual differences that we all exhibit through our own personalities” (Transcript 2, pp.1-2). Thus, the areas where the supervisors reported the novice administrators lacked preparedness were quite different from the areas where the novice administrators felt they lacked preparedness. In analysis of the ISLLC standards, the only common rubric used for all three groups of respondents was the one standard where both the principals and the supervisors agreed that one or more novice administrator lacked preparedness: ISLLC standard three, management of the organization and resources for safety and efficiency. There was no one area where all three groups of respondents agreed that more preparation for school leadership was needed.

Conclusion

After careful review of the data presented in chapter four, the following conclusion is offered: While some adjustments in program activities may make the Leadership Academy more effective in preparing future administrators, the overall conclusion in response to the data is that the Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators for school leadership positions and is a successful program.

Discussion

Finding number one is that the novice administrators agreed that the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy prepared them for school leadership positions. For 28 of 34 questions the response of Agree or Strongly Agree was selected. A conversation about the Hawthorne Effect must be considered here. Research reveals that when study participants are aware that they are a part of an experiment, unexpected outcomes occur (Merrett, 2006). The novice administrators knew that they were a part of a study of the Leadership Academy. Some study participants are not made aware of the intricacies of the study of which they are a part until the conclusion of the study. The unexpected outcome that resulted in this study is the high percentage of satisfaction that the novice administrators experienced in the Leadership Academy. In that the novice administrators were made aware of every aspect of this study, they may have felt compelled to report high ratings of the Leadership Academy sensing that they were "receiving extra attention" (Merrett, 2006, p. 144). The research on the Hawthorne Effect supports the high percentage of positive responses that the novice administrators reported. Practical research of Kanawha County School Leadership Academy, New York City Leadership Academy, and Innovations in Education also supports the positive response that the novice administrators had to the City Public Schools Leadership Academy (Cunningham & Hardman, 1999; Donlevy, 2004; U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Similar to the City Public Schools Leadership Academy, the leadership academies in the research, supported by school divisions, operated in a similar fashion that resulted in the perception of highly successful programs. The commonalities of the ISLLC standards used in the seminars, and/or the mentorship and internship experiences for the development of participants support the novice administrators' perceptions that the Leadership Academy is a success.

Finding number two is that four of the novice administrators indicated that the program did not prepare them in regards to six questions or that the program did not prepare them sufficiently. The novice administrators may have selected disagree for a variety of reasons. They may have felt that the Leadership Academy did not prepare them in the particular area. Another reason may be that they may not have realized success in dealing with particular issues and so may have responded that they were not prepared. One last reason may be that they may not have had the opportunity to oversee a particular area and so may have responded that they are not prepared, not truly knowing whether or not they are prepared. The fact that the four novice administrators responded with disagree to six of the initial survey questions is cause for the Leadership Academy to review these areas as ones in need of improvement.

The third finding is that the use of the ISLLC standards in the seminars prepared the novice administrators for school leadership positions. The research on principal preparation programs that use the ISLLC standards as a focus for their programs supports the noted finding. In the studies of Boeckman (1999) and Barnett (2004), respondents highly valued the ISLLC standards and used them in day-to-day practice. Other studies support the fact that standards are needed to guide aspirants and to encourage accountability among principals (Kaplan, Owings, and Nunnery, 2005; Farkas et al, 2001).

The fourth finding is that the three additional components of the Leadership Academy, the mentorship, the internship, and the HOPE Summit that the novice administrators attended, were perceived as being very helpful to the novice administrators in preparing them to become school leaders. While the data reveal that the novice administrators' experiences were fruitful, there were three novice administrators who did not agree that the additional experiences were meaningful. The novice administrators may not have had a worthwhile experience with their

mentors and/or may not have relished the duties assigned to them as summer interns. In addition, the three novice administrators who stated that the HOPE Summit did not prepare them to be school leaders may not have had significant roles assigned to them for the HOPE Summit and/or may not have seen the connection that preparing for a leadership summit has to do with the everyday duties of a public school administrator. Should the Leadership Academy provide a clearer delineation of the purpose of the HOPE Summit, how the work relates to school leadership, and how the work can be used to enhance school leaders, the three novice administrators may have felt better served.

Overall, the data show that components of the Leadership Academy that involved a more active role on the part of the novice administrators resulted in the much higher percentage of satisfaction perceived than the seminars. The mentorship component called for the principals who tapped the novice administrator to serve as a mentor for the year that the novice administrator was going through the program. During that year, the aspiring administrator was included in the everyday workings of a building principal, shadowing the principal and/or completing various tasks assigned by the principal. Likewise, the six-week internship component required the aspiring administrator to experience the duties of an administrator during the summer, usually during summer school. Last, the HOPE Summit engaged the aspiring administrator in the preparation of a leadership summit where attendees include administrators from around the nation and the world. Aspiring administrators assisted in all aspects of the summit from the reservation of hotels to the creation of leadership modules and sessions. Perhaps the novice administrators felt that these duties were not related to the work of the principal.

Research confirms the finding that the more practical the experience, the more beneficial the experience. Several studies that highlighted principal preparation programs or leadership academies placed an emphasis on practicality and field-based learning (Peel, Wallace, Buckner, Wrenn, & Evans, 1998; Levine, 2005; Cunningham & Hardman, 1999; Donlevy, 2004; and U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Similar to the observations of this study, they all conclude that field-based learning results in a better preparedness of administrators for school leadership positions.

The fifth finding is that the building principals stated that the City Public Schools' Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders. However, of the 12 questions posed, there were three areas where three of the building principals reported that three novice administrators were not prepared. These areas focused on practicing effective conflict resolution skills, securing community resources, and establishing partnerships with community members.

The data show, then, that one key ingredient to resolving problems with student conflict is being timely in the approach. Many times parents do not complain about the consequence issued to a child but would often complain about the lack of timeliness in which the matter was resolved. Data in the words of a supervisor supports this: "You know, that's an area where if anything, that's where I get complaints from parents. And the timeliness of it is what the parents will argue about. . . they may know how to resolve conflicts but the timeliness is something that they're not always as, I want to say, on top of it as they should be" (Transcript 9, p.2).

Sharing with novice administrators how to go about securing community resources and establishing partnerships would greatly benefit schools. Often, the principals are not able to venture beyond the walls of the school or the central administration in order to secure resources

from business or community partners. However, since novice administrators are frequently assigned disciplinary duties, they typically do not develop a solid sense of how to secure time, talent, or finances from the local sector. Therefore, these are areas where the Leadership Academy could dedicate more of an emphasis.

Additional data reveals that working with community members helps to create a positive school atmosphere. One principal adds, “I don’t think they are aware of how much that impacts how you deal with kids and how you deal with other issues they come to the school with. In the community, people see you out there and get to know you and you’re aware of their expectations, they’re aware of yours, it will cut down on a lot of issues” (Transcript 1, p.5). In addition, several studies support the finding that building partnerships, in particular with universities, and/or the ability to use the resources of the community strengthen the preparation that aspiring leaders receive. Studies in Alabama, North Carolina, Kansas, and Rhode Island concur that collaborative efforts lead to well-rounded administrators (Goldman, Aldridge, & Worthington, 2004; Peel, et.al, 1998; Devin, 2004; and SREB, 2004).

The sixth finding is that the district-level supervisors reported that the City Public Schools’ Leadership Academy prepared the novice administrators for school leadership positions. However, findings six and seven highlighted the fact that three of the novice administrators were not prepared in the area of practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and resolving problems in a timely manner. This commonality leads to the observation that practicing effective conflict resolution skills and doing so in a timely manner may not be a skill that can be taught. This seems to be a skill that develops through on-the-job experiences. One principal adds, “. . .dealing with conflicts sometimes takes practice, takes

patience” (Transcript 1, p.2). As administrators learn and grow, they refine their approach to certain duties that are assigned to them.

Recommendations for Program Improvement

The principals and district-level supervisors made recommendations regarding additional experiences for both the novice administrators and their mentors to include in the Leadership Academy program so that the participants could emerge more prepared for school leadership positions. The observations regarding the recommendations follow.

Recommendation 1: A list of Leadership Academy components and experiences to which the novice administrators will be exposed should be developed and communicated to the building principals and district-level supervisors. In addition, a list of performance indicators that the novice administrators will need to have as a part of their mentorship and internship experiences should be created and shared with the building principals and the district-level supervisors.

The incumbent principals and supervisors need to have a solid understanding of the Leadership Academy and what it offers to the aspiring principals. Four of the principals and supervisors were not cognizant of the program offerings. They said things like, “I’m not sure of all the activities...I don’t know how the design is set up. . . I don’t know what the program is.” While they were familiar with what good leadership skills looked like and could comment on the preparedness of their administrator, they were not quite sure of the components of the Leadership Academy.

City Public Schools’ should consider making it mandatory that each building principal and district-level supervisor attend a training session that highlights the Leadership Academy and what it offers to aspiring principals before they could serve as a mentor. There is no doubt that this would make it easier for principals to better streamline whom they recommend to the

academy. It would also make it more beneficial for building principals and supervisors to hold conversations with their novice administrators around what they know was what taught to them.

Recommendation 2: Institute a planning session with newly-appointed administrators who are Leadership Academy graduates and their principals in conjunction with the Leadership Academy coordinator to discuss the various areas that the Leadership Academy has identified as areas needing focus to develop a structured set of responsibilities for the novice administrators.

While more conversations around building partnerships, effectively using community resources, the importance of being visible and active in the community, making tough decisions, organizing effective meetings, transitioning from a teacher to an administrator, understanding special education law, and the monitoring of initiatives implemented in the building may be valid recommendations through the eyes of the building principals and supervisors, these needs were not supported by the data from this study. The Leadership Academy already addresses the aforementioned ideas in the training seminars and via the mentoring and internship components. The novice administrators, the principals, and the district-level supervisors feel that the novice administrators are prepared in those areas. Four novice administrators, on the contrary, indicated there were several areas where they did not feel adequately prepared. These areas are: student and staff celebrations, the legal and political system, policies and laws, school culture and climate, contractual obligations, and collaboration with the community.

The areas of need, however, vary from building to building. One supervisor supported this by stating, “. . .high schools are arranged differently, the way we handle how administrators do things in the middle schools are even different. So it could be based on the leadership and the delegation of the principals” (Transcript 2, p.5). Neither the principals nor the district-level supervisors offered any recommendations regarding the way in which schools vary the

administrative duties assigned to administrators. One reason may be because supervisors like to afford building principals the autonomy needed to run their individual schools. Each school is entirely unique with its student population, staff, and community members. Many district-level supervisors trust building principals to orchestrate what is best for his/her school.

Thus, it is recommended that once the aspiring administrator obtains an administrative position, that person and his/her direct supervisor must work on developing the skills needed to effectively complete the assigned duties in the building. All school buildings do not require exactly the same assigned duties for the various administrators. Some buildings allow all the administrators to equally share the duties and to share similar experiences. Some schools separate the duties that administrators are assigned based on the strengths of the administrators. Other schools assign duties on a rotating basis: one year an administrator may deal primarily with scheduling and special education issues, and the next year that same administrator may deal primarily with discipline, athletics, and transportation. Therefore, it is incumbent on the novice administrator and the building principals to cultivate those skills required for building success.

Recommendation 3: Implement more activities dealing with data and testing.

While the Leadership Academy provides opportunities for the participants to have conversations around the use of data and testing, more activities analyzing data and work with organizing SOL tests using the state assessment website for the purpose of school improvement is needed to assist schools. For many principals, working with data analysis and summative assessments is still fairly new. The yearly pressure to “make AYP” is an ever looming goal for principals. The conclusion is that it is beneficial for any school building to have a novice administrator who is knowledgeable in the area of data analysis and the organizing of school wide testing. In an age where high-stakes testing is at the forefront of all public schools, an

administrator with the acumen in the navigation through testing websites, the analysis of data, and the implementation of strategies for school improvement would be pursued by any school or school division. Many assistant principals are the ones primarily in charge of organizing testing. Therefore, including modules in the Leadership Academy where aspiring administrators would set up mock testing sessions for a school and would work with classroom, school wide, and division data would greatly benefit schools and school divisions.

Recommendation 4: Institute more activities directly working with funding, budgets, and grants.

Two principals and one supervisor noted that while the Leadership Academy addresses budget issues in the seminars and invites school finance officers to conduct presentations, novice administrators need to have a stronger working knowledge of dealing with finances and implications of budget constraints. In most schools, there are only two staff members who work with finance: the principal and the bookkeeper. Those individuals are the only ones, in most cases, who are cognizant of the various funding streams and the budget that the school uses to conduct business. The conclusion is that aspiring administrators would be more prepared if the Leadership Academy were to include budget sessions that call for the aspirants to devise the use of an assigned budget. This would require the aspiring administrators, individually or as several collaborative groups, to use the information obtained in the seminar and further conduct research on various schools to determine how they utilize the funds allocated to them. Finally, a budget analyst would audit each budget and present results. Projects or activities such as the aforementioned would allow novice administrators to approach their new role prepared with the experience of having worked with a school budget.

Recommendation 5: Create a more objective and defined selection process for Leadership Academy applicants.

The entrance requirement for the novice administrators in this study consisted of a nomination of a building principal, a letter of recommendation by the building principal, and a letter of interest by the aspiring administrator. The screening committee that reviewed the applications used no objective or quantifiable means of selecting the participants. Thus, the selection process was purely subjective. The recommendation is to (1) include an interview process that consists of qualitative and quantitative data, and (2) formulate a rubric by which to judge the “readiness” of the applicant to become a school leader. Principals who are new have little opportunity to determine the quality of an applicant. More quantifiable means of determining academy participants would more likely lead to a better-researched selection of aspiring administrators.

Recommendation 6: Delineate for aspiring administrators what is needed in order to obtain an administrative position with City Public Schools.

Once the aspiring administrators complete the Leadership Academy, it is their responsibility to research and apply for administrative positions in the school division. While they are placed on a highly-qualified registry of future school leaders, they are not automatically selected for administrative positions. When the aspiring administrators return to their classrooms, they often become overwhelmed with their teaching duties and are not always aware of the leadership positions available. The recommendation is to keep the aspirants informed via email about available leadership positions. Forty-one percent (20 of 49) of the total cohort received administrative positions. However, of the twenty Leadership Academy participants who obtained leadership positions, seven of them secured positions in a school division other

than the one in which they received their training. If it is the intention of City Public Schools to maintain its pool of newly- and highly-qualified leaders, it must frequently communicate to the aspirants regarding available openings in leadership. It must clearly articulate to them what the requirements are in order to obtain the positions. It must court the aspirants that it devoted so much time in developing.

Limitations

The total population of this study was rather small (N=24). Because of this, it is difficult to generalize the findings to other leadership academies. To improve on the generalizability of this study, one must use a larger population or one could use a large sample of participants.

Also, all respondents were volunteers in the study. This may contribute to bias in the responses that were obtained. The responses of the novice administrators were very high. This could be due to several factors. One may be that they really did have a very positive experience in the Leadership Academy. Another reason for the high rate of responses could be due to the participants' belief that the results of the study may be made public; thus, the participants would not want their names associated with negative responses about a program that could affect their potential for advancement in their professional careers. Yet another possibility is that participants could have felt pressured to participate in a study that has ties to the school division in which they are employed.

Another limitation is the experience or lack thereof to judge whether or not an individual is prepared. The majority of the novice administrators felt that the Leadership Academy prepared them to be school leaders. While the principals and the supervisors agreed that the novice administrators were prepared, there were a few areas where the novice administrators and the principals and supervisors disagreed as to the level of preparedness received. The limitation

of note here is that the principals and supervisors with much more experience in school administration have more training to determine preparedness or lack thereof. The newly appointed administrators are just that, novices, all who have been in their respective positions for fewer than three years. Thus they are not able to make the type of measured judgment that the principals and the supervisors are able to make.

Connected to this is the fact that any type of deficit in the program may not have easily been identified by the novice administrators. In their focused state to obtain an administrative position and because of their aforementioned lack of experience, they may not have been able to pick up on program weaknesses in the same way that the principal or the supervisor may.

One final limitation is that the district-level supervisors were not always able to determine the degree of preparedness of the novice administrators. For six of the twelve questions posed, the supervisors stated that they did not have enough evidence to determine whether or not several novice administrators were prepared. This may be due to several factors. The supervisors are housed at the central administration building rather than in the school buildings. Therefore, it would not always be possible to make a valid comment on the work of a subordinate if one does not always come in contact with that subordinate. Also, supervisors oversee several schools. They are often summoned to schools to participate in acknowledgements or celebrations or to solve problems. One supervisor noted, "If I have schools that are doing well, in working and taking care of business, then I end up spending more time with the schools that aren't." Depending on the schools, a supervisor may frequent certain schools and not others, thereby witnessing the work of one administrator more frequently than another.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the observations determined by the data in this study, several recommendations for further study have been compiled:

Recommendation 1: Conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the Leadership Academy in order to evaluate quantitatively the benefits of the program. This type of study will assist the program leaders to determine what course of action may be implemented regarding funding.

Recommendation 2: Conduct a longitudinal study over the three years that the novice administrators have been in their positions to examine the effects that the Leadership Academy might have had on their administrative careers.

Recommendation 3: Conduct a qualitative study on two or more school divisions with similar demographics and funding to analyze the way in which they prepare future school leaders.

Recommendation 4: Conduct a mixed-method study comparing administrators who were Leadership Academy completers to administrators who were either non-completers or administrators who never participated in the program to examine which group is considered more effective in their roles.

Recommendation 5: Conduct a qualitative study of Leadership Academy completers who returned to the classroom rather than pursue an administrative position to examine why they made that decision after completing coursework and the additional training of the Leadership Academy.

Recommendation 6: Conduct a study of novice administrators who were Leadership Academy completers using the scores on the SLLA to determine whether or not a particular score on the exam indicates how effective an administrator may be having experienced the same training.

Recommendation 7: Conduct a mixed-method study comparing novice administrators who were Leadership Academy completers versus novice administrators who were non-completers or who never participated in the Leadership Academy to examine their effect on student performance.

Recommendation 8: Conduct a study on the collegiate training that the novice administrators received prior to their studies in the Leadership Academy. Try to determine whether it was the administrative college courses that had such a positive impact on the novice administrators or whether it was truly the work of the Leadership Academy that caused the novice administrators to respond so positively to the survey.

References

- Barnett, D. (2004). School leadership preparation programs: Are they preparing tomorrow's leaders? *Education*, 125(1), 121-129.
- Bjork, L. G., & Richardson, M. D. (1997). Institutional barriers to educational leadership training: A case study. *The Educational Forum*, 62, 74-81.
- Blank, R. K. (2002). Using surveys of enacted curriculum to advance evaluation of instruction in relation to standards. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 77(4), 86-121.
- Bloom, G., & Krovetz, M. (2001, January). A step into the principalship. *Leadership Magazine*, 30(3), 12-13.
- Boeckman, M. (1999). Superintendents perceptions of the interstate school leaders licensure consortium standards for school leaders. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arkansas State University.
- Borman, G. D. (2002). Experiments for educational evaluation and improvement. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 77(4), 7-27.
- Brown, K. M. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(5), 700-745.
- Brown, P. (2006, March). Educating leaders for tomorrow: Preparing principals for today's demands. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 525-526.
- Bush, T. (2006, March). Educating leaders for tomorrow: The national college for school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 508-511.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2003). Retrieved October 14, 2006 from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/nnotices/coded/030002/030002.html>

- Chenoweth, T., Carr, C., & Ruhl, T. (2002). *Best practices in educational leadership preparation programs*. Paper presented at the Administrator Licensure Planning Forum, Portland, OR.
- Christy, K. W., & McNeil, L. (2000). *Excellence in administrator preparation programs: How will we know?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.
- City Public Schools. (2004). *Leadership Academy for Aspiring School Leaders*. City, VA: Author.
- City Public Schools. (2005). City Public Schools. [Website].
<http://www.sbo.city.k12.va.us>
- Clark, D. C., & Clark, S. N. (1997). Addressing dilemmas inherent in educational leadership preparation programs through collaborative restructuring. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2) 21-41.
- Collarbone, P. (1998). Developing a leadership programme for school leaders: An NPQH assessment centre manager reflects. *School Leadership and Management*, 18(3), 335-346.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cunningham, M. L., & Hardman, T. (1999). The principal shortage: A university-school district solution. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.
- Daresh, J. (1997, January). Improving principal preparation: A review of common

- strategies. *NASSP Bulletin*, Retrieved October 6, 2006 from
http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3696/is_199701/ai_n8742163/print
- Daresh, J., & Male, T. (2000). Crossing the border into leadership: Experiences of newly appointed British headteachers and American principals. *Educational Management & Administration*, 28(1), 89-101.
- Daresh, J. & Playko, M. (1994). Aspiring and practicing principals' perceptions of critical skills for beginning leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 32(3), 35-46.
- Dejnozka, E. L., & Kapel, D. E. (1982). *American Educators' Encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Demoulin, D. F. (1996, Spring). Introducing accountability in the leadership training for school administrators: Leadership pattern centered. *Education*, 116, 346-352.
- Devin, M. (2004, Fall). Save a place for leadership in the debate on adequacy: A new model for developing leadership in schools. *Educational Considerations*, 32(1), 70-75.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 634(87), 43-65.
- Donlevy, J. (2004, March). New York voices: Focusing on aspiring New York City principals. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 31(3), 219-221.
- Drisko, J. W. (1997, Winter). Strengthening qualitative studies and reports: Standards to promote academic integrity. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 33(1), 185-197.
- Educational Testing Service. (2004). *School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) Requirement in Virginia*. Retrieved July 11, 2006 from
<http://www.ets.org/sls/slsaboutslla.html>
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (1965). Improving America's

- Schools Act of 1994 (IASA). Retrieved July 15, 2006 from
<http://cwx.prenhall.com/bookbind/pubbooks/burns3/medialib/docs/esea1965.htm>
- English, F. W. (1994). *Theory in educational administration*. New York: Harper Collins College Publisher.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., Foleno, T., & Foley, P. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Ferrandino, V. L. (2003, April). Partnership and progress: Principals' perspective. *National Association of Elementary School Principals*, Retrieved July 6, 2006 from
<http://www.naesp.org/ContentLoad.do?contentId=738&action=print>
- Fortune, J., & Hundley, K. (2006). *An introduction to program evaluation*. Workshop prepared for Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Furger, R. (2000). New help for school administrators. *Edutopia*, Retrieved July 10, 2006 from
http://www.edutopia.org/php/print.php?id=Art_168&template=printarticle.php
- Gallego, M. A., Rueda, R., & Moll, L. C. (2005). Multilevel approaches to documenting change: Challenges in community-based educational research. *Teachers College Record*, 107(10), 2299-2325.
- Gamage, D. T., & Ueyama, T. (2004, Fall). Professional development perspectives of principals in Australia and Japan. *The Educational Forum*, 69(1), 65-78.
- Gates, S., Ringel, J., Santibanez, L., Ross, K., & Chung, C. (2003). *Who is leading our schools? An overview of school administrators and their careers*. Santa Monica, CA, RAND.

- Gerald, D. E., & Hussar, W. J. (1999, August 13). Projections of education statistics to 2009. Retrieved July 10, 2006 from the National Center for Education Statistics <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=1999038>
- Glasman, N. S., & Glasman, L. D. (1997). Connecting the preparation of school leaders to the practice of school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 3-20.
- Goldman, R. L., Aldridge, J., & Worthington, L. (2004). Project lead: A training program for minority educators in special education and educational leadership. *College Student Journal*, 38(2), 285-291.
- Grimmett, P. P., & Echols, F. H. (2000). Teacher and administrator shortages in changing times. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 25(4), 328-343.
- Guskey, T. R. (1998). The age of our accountability: Evaluation must become an integral part of staff development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 19(4), Retrieved February 3, 2007 from <http://www.nsd.org/library/publications//jsd/guskey194.cfm>
- Hackman, D. G., & Alsbury, T. L. (2005, Spring). Standards-based leadership preparation program improvement through the use of portfolio assessment. *Educational Considerations*, 32(2), 36-45.
- Hamilton, P. (2006, November). Phone Interview. City: Virginia.
- Hargreaves, A. (2005, Winter). Leadership succession. *The Educational Forum*, 69(2), 163-173.
- Hargreaves, A., Moore, S., Fink, D., Brayman, C., & White, R. (2003). *Succeeding leaders? A study of secondary principals rotation and succession*: Final report for the Ontario Principals' Council. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Principals' Council.
- Harklau, L., & Norwood, R. (2005). Negotiating researcher roles in ethnographic

- program evaluation: A postmodern lens. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 36(3), 278-288.
- Harle, A. (2000, Fall). Leadership Academy: One system's solution to leadership training. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 67(1), 56-61.
- Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005, Summer). The accidental principal: What doesn't get taught in schools. *Education Next*, 5(3), 34-40.
- Hohmann-Marriott, B. E. (2001). Marriage and family therapy research: Ethical issues and guidelines. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, (29), 1-11.
- Holloway, J. H. (2004). Mentoring new leaders. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 87-88.
- Howley, A., & Larson, W. (2002, Fall). The foundations and educational administration: natural allies or strange bedfellows? *Educational Foundations*, 16(4), 71-86.
- Howley, A., Andrianaivo, S., & Perry, J. (2005, April). The pain outweighs the gain: Why teachers don't want to become principals. *Teachers College Record*, 107(4), 757-782.
- Jensen, C. (2005-2006). The employability of site administrators who obtained administrative certification by examination. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision*, 23(4E), 1-11.
- Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), 602-611.
- Kaplan, L., Owings, W., & Nunnery, J. (2005). Principal quality: A Virginia study connecting interstate school leaders licensure consortium standards with student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(643), 28-44.
- Knowles, M. (1984). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. Houston, TX: Gulf.

- Lashway, L. (2003, December). Finding leaders for hard-to-staff schools. *ERIC Digest 173*, Retrieved October 7, 2006 from <http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest173.html>
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating School Leaders*. The Education Schools Project: Washington, DC.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Livingston, M., Davis, L., Green, R. L., & Desapin, B. C. (2001, Fall). *Strengthening the professional role through collaboration: A guide for school administrators*. Education, Retrieved October 17, 2006 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3673/is_200110/ai_n8989317/print
- Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2000). *Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals* (4th ed.). California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Malone, B. G., Nelson, J. S., & Nelson, C. V. (2001). Admitting at-risk students into a principal preparation program: Predicting success. *American Secondary Education*, 29(4), 2-17.
- Margheim, D. E. (2001). *Teacher beliefs about the outcomes of high-stakes testing and measurement-driven instruction in Virginia's public schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Merrett, F. (2006). Reflections on the Hawthorne Effect. *Educational Psychology*, 26(1), 143-146.

- Milstein, M. M., & Krueger, J. (1997). Improving educational administration preparation programs: What we have learned over the past decade. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 100-116.
- Mitgang, L. (2003). *Beyond the pipeline: Getting the principals we need, where they are needed most*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.
- National Center for Alternative Certification. (2006). National Center for Education Information. Retrieved October 14, 2006 from <http://www.teach-now.org/newsdisp.cfm?newsid=230>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997, February). Programs for aspiring principals: Who participates? U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/NCES>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983, April). *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2006). *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Education Goals Report. (1993). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Staff Development Council. (2000). *Learning to lead, leading to learn: Improving school quality through principal professional development*. Oxford, OH: Author.
- NCATE Standards Report. (2006). *Conceptual framework: Danforth educational leadership program*. College of Education: University of Washington.

- Orcozco, L. (1999). *Collaboration: Facing the journey of discovery together*. [Lecture].
California State University: Author.
- Orr, M. T. (2006, March). Educating leaders for tomorrow: Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation's schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(7), 492-499.
- Peel, H. A., Wallace, C., Buckner, K. G., Wrenn, s. L., & Evans, R. (1998). Improving leadership preparation programs through school, university, and professional organization partnership. *NASSP Bulletin*, 82(602), 26-34.
- Peterson, K. D. (1986, Summer). Principals' work, socialization, and training: Developing more effective leaders. *Theory into Practice*, 25(3), 151-155.
- Piaget, J. (1950). *The psychology of intelligence*. New York: Routledge.
- Playko, M. (1995). Mentoring for educational leaders: A practitioner's perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(5), 84-92.
- Siegrist, G. (1999, Winter). Educational leadership must move beyond management training to visionary and moral transformational leaders. *Education*, 120(2), 297-303.
- Smith, B. S., & Dawson, C. M. (1999). Applying the constructivist framework to principal preparation programs. Retrieved October 6, 2006 from <http://www.hehd.clemson.edu/SRCEA/YrBkv1n1/SMITH.htm>
- SREB. (2001). *Leading school improvement: What research says*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- SREB. (2001). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- SREB. (2005). *Case study: a district-driven principal preparation program design*.

- Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). *Foundational models for 21st century program evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer.
- Teitel, L. (1997). Understanding and harnessing the power of the cohort model in preparing educational leaders. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 66-85.
- Trammell, J. (2005). Learning about the learning center: Program evaluation for learning assistance programs. *The Learning Assistance Review*, 10(2), 31-40.
- Trenta, L., & Covrig, D. (2000). Northeast Ohio Principals' Academy Pilot Entry Year Program Evaluation Report. The University of Akron: Author.
- Tucker, P. D., Henig, C. B., & Salmonowicz, M. J. (2005). Learning outcomes of an educational leadership cohort program. *Educational Considerations*, 32(2), 27-35.
- Tucker, P., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2002). *School Leadership in an Era of Accountability*. Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute. Richmond, Virginia.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). Improving teacher quality state grants. (Title II, Part A). Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/index.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2004). Innovative pathways to school leadership. Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.edpubs.org/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). Preparing, training, and recruiting high quality teachers and principals (Title II, Part A, Sec. 2101). Retrieved July 15, 2006, from <http://www.nochildleftbehind.com/nclb-law/PART-A.-TEACHER-AND-PRINCIPAL-TRAINING>
- Virginia Department of Education. (2003, October). Report of the task force to evaluate

and redesign preparation programs and professional development for school leaders.

Retrieved July 10, 2006 from <http://www.pen.k12.va.us>

Vornberg, J. A. (1992). *Leadership competencies and perceived training effects:*

Meadows principal improvement program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Wheaton, C., & Kay, S. (1999, November). *Wired for collaboration.* *Educational*

Leadership, 29(2), Retrieved October 17, 2006 from

http://www.acsa.org/publications/pub_detail.cfm?leadershipPubID=1332

Wilmore, E. L., McNeil, J. J., Jr., & Townzen, L. (1999). *The Evaluation of a Field*

Based Principal Preparation Program in Texas. The University of Texas at Arlington:

Author.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Office of Research Compliance Form

APPENDIX A

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of Research Compliance

Institutional Review Board
1880 Pratt Drive (0497)
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
540/231-4991 Fax: 540/231-0959
E-mail: moored@vt.edu
www.irb.vt.edu

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE UNIVERSITY AND STATE UNIVERSITY
SUBJECT:

cc: File
DATE: April 23, 2007
MEMORANDUM
TO: Glen Earthman
Rory Stapleton
FROM: David M. Moore

IRB Expedited Approval: "A Study of the City Public Schools Leadership Academy for Aspiring School Leaders", IRB # 07-237

This memo is regarding the above-mentioned protocol. The proposed research is eligible for expedited review according to the specifications authorized by 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110. As Chair of the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board, I have granted approval to the study for a period of 12 months, effective April 23, 2007.

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities include the following:

1. Report promptly proposed changes in previously approved human subject research activities to the IRB, including changes to your study forms, procedures and investigators, regardless of how minor. The proposed changes must not be initiated without IRB review and approval, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.
2. Report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks or harms to human research subjects or others.
3. Report promptly to the IRB of the study's closing (i.e., data collecting and data analysis complete at Virginia Tech). If the study is to continue past the expiration date (listed above), investigators must submit a request for continuing review prior to the continuing review due date (listed above). It is the researcher's responsibility to obtain re-approval from the IRB before the study's expiration date.
4. If re-approval is not obtained (unless the study has been reported to the IRB as closed) prior to the expiration date, all activities involving human subjects and data analysis must cease immediately, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects.

Important:

If you are conducting **federally funded non-exempt research**, this approval letter must state that the IRB has compared the OSP grant application and IRB application and found the documents to be consistent. Otherwise, this approval letter is invalid for OSP to release funds. Visit our website at <http://www.irb.vt.edu/pages/newstudy.htm#OSP> for further information.

Approval date:

Continuing Review Due Date:

Expiration Date:

4/23/2007

4/22/2008

4/8/2008

FWA00000572(expires 1/20/2010)

IRB # is IRB00000667

APPENDIX B

City Public Schools

Institutional Review Board Approval

APPENDIX B
Institutional Review Board Approval
Research Authorization Committee
7XX-XXX-XXXX CITY BOULEVARD • CITY, VIRGINIA 2XXXX

August 1, 2006

Ms. Rory Stapleton
P.O. Box 2038
Newport News, Virginia 23609

Dear Ms. Stapleton:

The Research and Authorization Committee has met and reviewed your application to conduct the study entitled *A Study of the [City] Public School's Leadership Academy*. I am pleased to inform you that the committee has approved your request with the following stipulations:

- All data required for your project will be obtained through the Leadership Academy Steering Committee.
- Upon completion of your study, you may be asked to present your findings to a group of [City] Public Schools educators.
- Please send a final copy of your project to the Research Authorization Committee.

I wish you much success on your dissertation. Your topic is of great interest to City Public Schools. Please contact me at XXX-XXXX or xxx.xxxx@xx.k12.va.us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Research Authorization Committee Chair
cc: Deputy Superintendent

APPENDIX C

Letter to Leadership Academy Program Completers

Appendix C

Letter to Leadership Academy Program Completers

Dear Administrator,

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at The Virginia Polytechnic and Institute and State University. I am conducting my research on the program completers of the 2004-2006 cohorts of the Leadership Academy. The purpose of the study is to determine if the Leadership Academy has met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions. Part of accomplishing this goal is to determine if the program completers feel prepared in their new roles.

Because you are a program completer who have obtained an administrative position in the division, I invite you to participate in this study. Your principal or supervisor will also receive an invitation to participate in the study.

Please be assured that all responses will be held in the strictest of confidence. Neither your name nor the name of the school division will be revealed.

If you would like a copy of the findings, please send me your e-mail address and at the completion of the study, you will receive the results. With all research, there are minimal risks involved.

Though there is no monetary compensation connected with this study, your time and participation are greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at rstaplet@vt.edu

By clicking on this link, I agree to participate in the study: (Link to Survey Monkey)

Sincerely,

Rory. P. Stapleton, Ed. S.
Doctoral Student
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

APPENDIX D
Program Completers' Survey

APPENDIX D

LEADERSHIP ACADEMY PROGRAM COMPLETERS' SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Directions 1: Please complete the following demographic information:

Gender – Female _____ Male _____
 Age – 20-30 years _____ 31-40 years _____ 41-50 years _____ 51+ years _____
 School – Elementary _____ Middle _____ High _____
 Years in Education – 1-3 years _____ 4-10 years _____ 11-20 years _____ 21+ years _____

Directions 2: You have been identified as an administrator who completed the Leadership Academy. The course content of the Leadership Academy is based primarily on the ISLLC standards. Please respond to the statements regarding the way in which the Leadership Academy prepared you to perform the following actions in your current administrative role. Please use the following Likert Scale.

Strongly Disagree=SD	Disagree=D	Agree=A	Strongly Agree=SA
ISLLC Standards	Survey Statement		
1. A vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community			
	1. The Leadership Academy prepared me to communicate the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.		
	2. The Leadership Academy provided me examples from which I could model the mission and vision of life-long learning.		
	3. The Leadership Academy presented strategies which I could use to involve the school community in school improvement efforts.		
	4. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to utilize assessment data related to student learning to develop the school's vision and goals.		
	5. The Leadership Academy helped me understand the importance of utilizing relevant demographic student and parent data to develop the school's mission and goals.		
	6. The Leadership Academy helped me identify existing resources that help support the school's mission and goals.		
	7. The Leadership Academy demonstrated for me how to seek needed resources to support the school's mission and goals.		

Please respond to the statements regarding the way in which the Leadership Academy prepared you to perform the following actions in your current administrative role. Please use the following Likert Scale.

Strongly Disagree=SD	Disagree=D	Agree=A	Strongly Agree=SA
2. A school culture and instructional program that promotes student learning and staff professional growth.		1. The Leadership Academy provided me the opportunity to learn skills (active listening, summarizing, investigating, timely responding, etc.) to help me treat all individuals in a fair, dignified, and respectful manner.	
		2. The Leadership Academy helped me to identify and address barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture and climate.	
		3. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of considering diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in making decisions.	
		4. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to consider diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in developing learning opportunities for students and staff.	
		5. The Leadership Academy prepared me to utilize varied forms of technology in teaching and learning.	
		6. The Leadership Academy presented me with methods of recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff.	
		7. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that multiple opportunities for learning are made available to all students.	
3. Management of the organization and resources for safety and efficiency.		1. The Leadership Academy taught me the skills needed to address and resolve conflicts in a timely manner and utilize conflict resolution skills where appropriate.	
		2. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to remain abreast of emerging trends in education and, where appropriate, apply strategies obtained to my school community.	
		3. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage financial, human, and material resources.	
		4. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that the school's facility is safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing.	
		5. The Leadership Academy made me aware of the need to maintain confidentiality and privacy of school information.	
4. Collaborating with family and community members and acquiring resources.		1. The Leadership Academy reinforced the need for me to involve family members in the educational experiences of students.	
		2. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to establish and nurture partnerships with community members.	

Please respond to the statements regarding the way in which the Leadership Academy prepared you to perform the following actions <u>in your current administrative role</u> . Please use the following Likert Scale.			
Strongly Disagree=SD	Disagree=D	Agree=A	Strongly Agree=SA
			3. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of being visible in the community and actively participating in school and community events.
			4. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage public resources and funds.
			5. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to provide opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.
5. Being fair and acting ethically and with integrity.			
			1. The Leadership Academy taught me to serve as a positive role model for students, staff, and community members.
			2. The Leadership Academy prepared me to use my influence and office for the benefit of the stakeholders and not for personal gain.
			3. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to protect the rights of the students and staff members.
			4. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of fulfilling all legal and contractual obligations.
			5. The Leadership Academy helped me to understand the importance of opening the school to public scrutiny for the purpose of improvement.
6. Appropriately responding to the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of school leadership.			
			1. The Leadership Academy provided me with ways to communicate with community leaders outside the school division.
			2. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to participate in ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups.
			3. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to create a school environment that operates on behalf of students and their families.
			4. The Leadership Academy prepared me to work within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities.
			5. The Leadership Academy taught me to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for students.

**All statements are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.

Directions: Please respond to the following three questions.

Did the mentorship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?

Yes ____ No ____

Did the internship component of the Leadership Academy prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?

Yes ____ No ____

Did the participating in the HOPE Summit prepare you to perform your duties in your current administrative role?

Yes ____ No ____

**With all research, there are minimal risks involved. Once again, individual responses will be kept in the strictest of confidence. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at 757-886-7700 or via e-mail at rstaplet@vt.edu

Thank you for your time and participation in this study.

APPENDIX E
Program Completers' Survey
Validation Instrument

APPENDIX E

Research Question: Has the City Public Schools’ Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions?

Purpose: The purpose of the content validation tool is to assist the researcher in validating the domain, strength of association, and clarity of each survey statement.

Directions: Circle the number of the appropriate response. (Validation Tool adapted with permission from Dale Margheim.)

DOMAINS

ISLLC Standard Domains: 1= Vision and Mission, 2= School Culture, Instructional Program, 3= Management, 4= Collaborating with Family and Community, Acquiring Resources, 5= Acting Fairly, Ethically, and with Integrity, 6= Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context

ASSOCIATION RATING

1=Very Weak, 2= Weak, 3= Strong, 4= Very Strong (Association with the chosen Domain)

CLARITY RATING

1= Not Clear, Delete; 2= Partially Clear, Revise; 3= Very Clear, Leave As Is (Clarity of Question)

Statement	Domain	Association Rating	Clarity Rating
1. The Leadership Academy demonstrated for me how to develop a plan in which objectives and strategies to achieve the school’s vision and goals are clearly articulated.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
2. The Leadership Academy provided me with ways to strengthen my school by engaging in political, social, and economical communication with key stakeholders.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
3. The Leadership Academy helped me to understand the fairness and ethics in opening the school to public scrutiny for the purpose of improvement.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
4. The Leadership Academy taught me the importance of advocating a school culture and instructional program centered on professional development that promotes student learning.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
5. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to help me responsibly and efficiently manage financial, human, and material resources.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
6. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to establish and nurture partnerships with community members.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
7. The Leadership Academy stressed the need to communicate progress toward the vision and mission by involving all stakeholders in school improvement efforts.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
8. The Leadership Academy taught me the ethics and integrity involved in serving as a positive role model for students, staff, and community members.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
9. The Leadership Academy showed me how to manage my time in order to maximize the attainment of organizational goals.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3

APPENDIX E

Research Question: Has the City Public Schools’ Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions?

Purpose: The purpose of the content validation tool is to assist the researcher in validating the domain, strength of association, and clarity of each survey statement.

Directions: Circle the number of the appropriate response. (Validation Tool adapted with permission from Dale Margheim.)

DOMAINS

ISLLC Standard Domains: 1= Vision and Mission, 2= School Culture, Instructional Program, 3= Management, 4= Collaborating with Family and Community, Acquiring Resources, 5= Acting Fairly, Ethically, and with Integrity, 6= Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context

ASSOCIATION RATING

1=Very Weak, 2= Weak, 3= Strong, 4= Very Strong (Association with the chosen Domain)

CLARITY RATING

1= Not Clear, Delete; 2= Partially Clear, Revise; 3= Very Clear, Leave As Is (Clarity of Question)

10. The Leadership Academy presented me with methods of recognizing and celebrating the responsibilities, contributions, and accomplishments of students and staff.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
11. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to collaborate with family and the community to help me responsibly and efficiently manage public resources and funds.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
12. The Leadership Academy taught me to use the legal and political system to improve opportunities for students.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
13. The Leadership Academy showed me how to use the school district’s vision to shape the educational programs, plans, and activities of my school.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
14. The Leadership Academy highlighted for me the importance of developing a vision of life-long learning with and among stakeholders.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
15. The Leadership Academy guided me in managing the operation of a school’s facility ensuring that it is safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
16. The Leadership Academy reinforced the need for me to involve family members in the educational experiences of students.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
17. The Leadership Academy stressed for me the ethics of using my influence and office for the benefit of the stakeholders and not for personal gain.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
18. The Leadership Academy prepared me to work within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3

APPENDIX E

Research Question: Has the City Public Schools’ Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions?

Purpose: The purpose of the content validation tool is to assist the researcher in validating the domain, strength of association, and clarity of each survey statement.

Directions: Circle the number of the appropriate response. (Validation Tool adapted with permission from Dale Margheim.)

DOMAINS

ISLLC Standard Domains: 1= Vision and Mission, 2= School Culture, Instructional Program, 3= Management, 4= Collaborating with Family and Community, Acquiring Resources, 5= Acting Fairly, Ethically, and with Integrity, 6= Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context

ASSOCIATION RATING

1=Very Weak, 2= Weak, 3= Strong, 4= Very Strong (Association with the chosen Domain)

CLARITY RATING

1= Not Clear, Delete; 2= Partially Clear, Revise; 3= Very Clear, Leave As Is (Clarity of Question)

19. The Leadership Academy guided me in ensuring that multiple opportunities for learning are made available to all students.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
20. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to nurture the school’s culture and instructional program by considering all students and staff members in developing learning opportunities.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
21. The Leadership Academy helped me develop the skills needed to participate in ongoing dialogue of a political, social, economical, and legal nature with representatives of diverse community groups.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
22. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of being visible in the community and actively participating in school and community events.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
23. The Leadership Academy prepared me to enhance the culture and instructional program of the school by utilizing varied forms of technology in teaching and learning.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
24. The Leadership Academy showed me the importance of assessing the school culture and climate on a regular basis in order to promote the success of all students.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
25. The Leadership Academy taught me to manage the safety of the school by resolving conflicts in a timely manner and by utilizing conflict resolution skills where appropriate.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
26. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to act with fairness and integrity in protecting the rights of students and staff members.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
27. The Leadership Academy prepared me to communicate the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3

APPENDIX E

Research Question: Has the City Public Schools’ Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions?

Purpose: The purpose of the content validation tool is to assist the researcher in validating the domain, strength of association, and clarity of each survey statement.

Directions: Circle the number of the appropriate response. (Validation Tool adapted with permission from Dale Margheim.)

DOMAINS

ISLLC Standard Domains: 1= Vision and Mission, 2= School Culture, Instructional Program, 3= Management, 4= Collaborating with Family and Community, Acquiring Resources, 5= Acting Fairly, Ethically, and with Integrity, 6= Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context

ASSOCIATION RATING

1=Very Weak, 2= Weak, 3= Strong, 4= Very Strong (Association with the chosen Domain)

CLARITY RATING

1= Not Clear, Delete; 2= Partially Clear, Revise; 3= Very Clear, Leave As Is (Clarity of Question)

28. The Leadership Academy showed me how to develop a school’s vision and goals by utilizing assessment data related to student learning.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
29. The Leadership Academy provided me with strategies to create a school environment that operates culturally, legally, politically, and economically on behalf of students and their families.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
30. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to utilize my knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development to inform management decisions.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
31. The Leadership Academy helped me to identify and address barriers that would prohibit a positive school culture and climate.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
32. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to exercise ethics and integrity in fulfilling all contractual obligations.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
33. The Leadership Academy helped me understand the importance of developing the school’s mission and goals by utilizing relevant demographic student and parent data.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3
34. The Leadership Academy encouraged me to provide opportunities for the staff to collaborate with the community.	1 2 3 4 5 6	1 2 3 4	1 2 3

**All statements are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.

APPENDIX F

Letter to Supervisors of Leadership Academy Program Completers

Appendix F

Letter to Supervisors of Leadership Academy Program Completers

Dear Principal/Supervisor,

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at The Virginia Polytechnic and Institute and State University. I am conducting my research on the program completers of the 2004-2006 cohorts of the Leadership Academy. The purpose of the study is to determine if the Leadership Academy has met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions. Part of accomplishing this goal is to determine if the program completers were prepared for their new roles.

Because you are a principal/supervisor of a Leadership Academy Program Completer, I invite you to participate in this study. The novice administrator will also receive an invitation to participate in the study.

Please be assured that all responses will be held in the strictest of confidence. Neither your name nor the name of the school division will be revealed.

If you would like a copy of the findings, please send me your e-mail address and at the completion of the study, you will receive the results. With all research, there are minimal risks involved.

Though there is no monetary compensation connected with this study, your time and participation are greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at rstaplet@vt.edu

Your phone call to orchestrate a time and place for the interview will indicate your consent in participating in this study: (757) 886-7700 Ext. 1102 or 1106.

Sincerely,

Rory. P. Stapleton, Ed. S.
Doctoral Student
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

APPENDIX G

Validation of
Supervisors' Interview Questions and Protocol

Appendix G

March 28, 2007

Validation and Pilot Study: The purpose of this pilot study is to assist the researcher with the domain association and clarity of the questions posed. The researcher is to ask all questions and record all responses without any indication of bias: smiles, nods, etc. Please assist the researcher by providing feedback that will be used for the actual administration of the interviews and for the improvement of this instrument. Please use page three to assist the researcher.

Supervisors' Interview and Protocol
Study: City Public Schools' Leadership Academy

Date of the interview:

Time:

Place:

Interviewer:

Position of Respondent:

The interview in which you are about to participate is part of the dissertation process through Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in pursuit of a doctor of philosophy degree. You have been selected because one of your administrators is a completer of the Leadership Academy. This study is being conducted to determine if the Leadership Academy has met its goal in producing prepared administrators for school leadership positions. Please answer each question candidly and without reservations. Group responses may be revealed for program improvement. However, individual responses will be held in the strictest of confidence.

Demographic Section:

1. How long have you been in education?
2. How long have you been a public school administrator?

Questions/Statements:

1. Do you feel your assistant principal is prepared in the following areas:
 1. Communicating and modeling the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action with any stakeholder?

Appendix G (cont.)

2. Considering diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in making decisions. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
3. Practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and resolving problems in a timely manner. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
4. Securing community resources to help the school solve problems and achieve goals. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this?
5. Responding fairly, respectfully, and in a timely manner to students, parents, staff, and community members. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action with any stakeholder?
6. Communicating with a diverse body of decision makers outside the school community. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this?
7. Making decisions around the school's vision and goals by using student demographic and assessment data. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this?
8. Using technology in teaching and learning and remaining abreast of current trends in education. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
9. Protecting the rights of students and staff members and practicing confidentiality with school information. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
10. Establishing partnerships with community members and being active and visible in community events. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
11. Working within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities to improve opportunities for students. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?

Appendix G (cont.)

12. Practicing effective communication skills and sharing responsibility leading to ownership and accountability. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?

2. If you had to include additional experiences in the Leadership Academy so that the participants could emerge more prepared for school leadership positions, what would you include?

III. Are there any experiences that you would eliminate? If so, why?

****With all research, there are minimal risks involved. Once again, individual responses will be kept in the strictest of confidence. Before using your responses, I will send you a copy of the responses for you to verify the accuracy. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at 757-886-7700 or via e-mail at rstaplet@vt.edu
Thank you for your time and participation in this study.**

****All questions are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author.**

Primary Research Question: Has the City Public Schools Leadership Academy met its goal of producing administrators prepared for public school leadership positions?

Subset Questions Pertinent to Pilot: Do the building principals feel the Leadership Academy has prepared novice administrators to be school leaders? Do the district level supervisors feel the Leadership Academy has prepared the novice administrators to be school leaders?

Directions: After the researcher reads each question:

1. **Indicate to the researcher the domain where you believe the question best fits.**
2. **Indicate to the researcher whether or not you feel the question is clear.**
3. **Indicate to the researcher if you detect any indication of bias.**

DOMAINS: 1. Vision and Mission 2. School Culture, Instructional Program 3. Management
4. Collaborating with Family and Community, Acquiring Resources 5. Acting Fairly, Ethically, and with Integrity
6. Political, Social, Economical, Legal, and Cultural Context

Appendix G (cont.)

Validation and Pilot Study: The purpose of this pilot study is to assist the researcher with the domain association and clarity of the questions posed. The researcher is to ask all questions and record all responses without any indication of bias: smiles, nods, etc. Please assist the researcher by providing feedback that will be used for the actual administration of the interviews and for the improvement of this instrument. Please use page three to assist the researcher.

Directions for use of this page: The researcher will indicate the Domain that the pilot study participant feels is associated with the question. In addition, the researcher will place a “Y” for Yes or an “N” for No to indicate whether or not the pilot study participant feels the research question is clear. Next, the researcher will place a “Y” for Yes or an “N” for No to indicate whether or not the pilot study participant feels the researcher showed any indication of bias in reading the question. Last, the researcher discusses with the pilot study participant the intended domain for each question and discusses possible improvements to each question for domain association, clarity, and indication of bias.

Interview Question	Domain (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)	Clarity (Y or N)	Indication of Bias (Y or N)
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			

APPENDIX H

Supervisors' Interview Questions and Protocol

Appendix H

Supervisors' Interview and Protocol
Study: City Public Schools' Leadership Academy

Date of the interview:

Time:

Place:

Interviewer:

Position of Respondent:

Informed Consent Signature/Initials _____

The interview in which you are about to participate is part of the dissertation process through Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in pursuit of a doctor of philosophy degree. You have been selected because one of your administrators is a completer of the Leadership Academy. This study is being conducted to determine if the Leadership Academy has met its goal in producing prepared administrators for school leadership positions. Please answer each question candidly and without reservations. Group responses may be revealed for program improvement. However, individual responses will be held in the strictest of confidence.

Demographic Section:

3. How long have you been in education?
4. How long have you been a public school administrator?

Questions/Statements:

3. Do you feel your assistant principal is prepared in the following areas:
 1. Communicating and modeling the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action with any stakeholder?
 2. Considering diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in making decisions. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
 3. Practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and resolving problems in a timely manner. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
 4. Securing community resources to help the school solve problems and achieve goals. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this?
 5. Responding fairly, respectfully, and in a timely manner to students, parents, staff, and community members. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action with any stakeholder?
 6. Communicating with a diverse body of decision makers outside the school community. Provide me with an example that has caused you to

- respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this?
7. Using student demographic and assessment data to drive decisions. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this?
 8. Using technology in teaching and learning and remaining abreast of current trends in education. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
 9. Protecting the rights of students and staff members and practicing confidentiality with school information. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
 10. Establishing partnerships with community members and being active and visible in community events. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
 11. Working within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities to improve opportunities for students. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
 12. Practicing effective communication skills and sharing responsibility leading to ownership and accountability. Provide me with an example that has caused you to respond the way you have. Prompt: Are there any instances where you have witnessed him/her performing this action?
4. If you had to include additional experiences in the Leadership Academy so that the participants could emerge more prepared for school leadership positions, what would you include?

III. Are there any experiences that you would eliminate? If so, why?

**With all research, there are minimal risks involved. Once again, individual responses will be kept in the strictest of confidence. Though there is no monetary compensation connected with this study, your time and participation are greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at rstaplet@vt.edu

Before using your responses, I will send you a copy of the responses for you to verify the accuracy. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me at 757-886-7700 or via e-mail at rstaplet@vt.edu

Thank you for your time and participation in this study.

**All questions are adapted from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. Washington, DC: Author

APPENDIX I

Data of Principals' Interviews

Appendix I

Data of Principals' Interviews

Percentage of Principals who felt their Novice Administrators were Prepared.

Do you feel your assistant principal is prepared in the following areas:	% Prepared	% Not Prepared	% Not Observed
1. Communicating and modeling the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	88	12	
2. Considering diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in making decisions.	88	12	
3. Practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and resolving problems in a timely manner.	63	37	
4. Securing community resources to help the school solve problems and achieve goals.	63	37	
5. Responding fairly, respectfully, and in a timely manner to students, parents, staff, and community members.	100 Respectful		
	88 Fair and Respectful	12	
	75 Timely	25	
6. Communicating with a diverse body of decision makers outside the school community.	63	12	25
7. Using student demographic and assessment data to drive decisions.	88	12	
8. Using technology in teaching and learning and remaining abreast of current trends in education.	88 Using technology	12	
	100 Current trends		

Appendix I (continued) Do you feel your assistant principal is prepared in the following areas:	% Prepared	% Not Prepared	% Not Observed
9. Protecting the rights of students and staff members and practicing confidentiality with school information.	100		
10. Establishing partnerships with community members and being active and visible in community events.	63	37	
11. Working within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities to improve opportunities for students.	100		
12. Practicing effective communication skills and sharing responsibility leading to ownership and accountability.	88	12	

APPENDIX J

Data of Supervisors' Interviews

Appendix J

Data of Supervisors' Interviews

Raw Data of the Number of Novice Administrators that Supervisors Felt Were Prepared.

Do you feel your assistant principal is prepared in the following areas:	# Prepared	# Not Prepared	#Needs Improvement	#Not Enough Evidence
1. Communicating and modeling the vision and mission of the school division to students, parents, staff, and community members.	9	0	2	0
2. Considering diversity (cultural, gender, and ability) in making decisions.	10	1	0	0
3. Practicing effective conflict resolution skills, confronting and resolving problems in a timely manner.	6	1	4	0
4. Securing community resources to help the school solve problems and achieve goals.	6	0	0	5
5. Responding fairly, respectfully, and in a timely manner to students, parents, staff, and community members.	10 (Fair and Respectful)	1	0	0
	9 (Timely)	2	0	0
6. Communicating with a diverse body of decision makers outside the school community.	9	0	0	2
7. Using student demographic and assessment data to drive decisions.	8	0	0	3

Appendix J (continued)				
Do you feel your assistant principal is prepared in the following areas:	#Prepared	# Not Prepared	# Needs Improvement	#Not Enough Evidence
8. Using technology in teaching and learning and remaining abreast of current trends in education.	9	0	0	2
9. Protecting the rights of students and staff members and practicing confidentiality with school information.	9	0	0	2
10. Establishing partnerships with community members and being active and visible in community events.	9	0	0	2
11. Working within the policies and laws of the local, state, and federal authorities to improve opportunities for students.	11	0	0	0
12. Practicing effective communication skills and sharing responsibility leading to ownership and accountability.	9	2	0	0

VITAE

Rory Magdalene P. Stapleton

<u>Education</u>	2003-2007 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Educ. Leadership and Policy Studies
	2000-2001 George Washington University Washington, D.C.	Ed.S. in Administration
	1994-1997 Christopher Newport University Newport News, Virginia	Master of Arts in Teaching
	1983-1987 Christopher Newport College Newport News, Virginia	Bachelor of Arts in English Education
<u>Professional Experience</u>	2007- Hampton City Schools	Principal
	2005- 2007 Newport News Public Schools	Assist. Principal of Instruction
	2004-2005 Newport News Public Schools	Assist. Principal of Operations
	2004- Newport News Public Schools	Administrator of Continuing Education
	2004 Summer Christopher Newport University	Adjunct Professor
	2002 -2004 Newport News Public Schools	Assist. Principal I
	2002 Summer Newport News Public Schools	Principal
	1987 - 2002 Newport News Public Schools	English Teacher
	1999-2000 Denbigh High School	Women's Junior Varsity Basketball Coach
	1987-1988 Christopher Newport College	Assistant Women's Basketball Coach
<u>Presentations</u>	Summer 2006 Conference Presentation on Good to Great by Jim Collins	
	1997-1998 Conference Presenter	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presented pedagogical information to better enhance teachers at the Virginia Association of Teachers of English State Conference: “Creating Master Teachers of Language Arts,” at the “First Year Teachers’ Conference,” and at the “Creating an Aesthetic Classroom” session at Christopher Newport University 	

Community Affiliation Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. Newport News, VA

Delta Kappa Gamma Newport News, VA

Publications Poetry Published in the Fall 2005 edition of **The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin**

Published in the Fall 2005 edition of the **CHKD Newsletter**

Poetry Published in the Spring 1991 edition of the **Virginia English Bulletin**

Letter Published in the September 1998 edition of the **United Jewish Community Newsletter**

Served on the Editorial Board of the 1999 issue of **Reading in Virginia**, the Journal of the Virginia State Reading Association