University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

2009

The Effect of a School-Year-Long In-Service Leadership Development Grow-Your-Own Program on New and Veteran Assistant Principals' Perceived Leadership Effectiveness

LuAnn M. Richardson

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation
Richardson, LuAnn M., "The Effect of a School-Year-Long In-Service Leadership Development Grow-Your-Own Program on New and Veteran Assistant Principals' Perceived Leadership Effectiveness" (2009). *Student Work*. Paper 28.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

The Effect of a School-Year-Long In-Service Leadership Development Grow-Your-Own Program on New and Veteran Assistant Principals' Perceived Leadership Effectiveness

By

LuAnn M. Richardson

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

In Educational Administration

Omaha, Nebraska

2009

Supervisory Committee

Dr. John W. Hill, Chair

Dr. Kay A. Keiser

Dr. Neal F. Grandgenett

Dr. Larry L. Dlugosh

UMI Number: 3359754

Copyright 2009 by
Richardson, LuAnn M.

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.
In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform 3359754
Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF A SCHOOL-YEAR-LONG IN-SERVICE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT GROW-YOUR-OWN PROGRAM ON NEW AND VETERAN ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS' PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

LuAnn M. Richardson

University of Nebraska

Advisor: Dr. John W. Hill

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program on new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness compared to supervising principal and central office administrator ratings. The study analyzed perceived leadership effectiveness as measured by the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form in six domains: (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context after participation in a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program. Overall, pretest-posttest results indicated that new assistant principals' (n = 8) and veteran assistant principals' (n = 7) beginning pretest compared to ending posttest training self-rating leadership

effectiveness domain scores were all statistically significantly greater in the direction of improvement, indicating growth in perceived leadership effectiveness while posttest-posttest results were not statistically significantly different. Finally, supervising principal and central office administrator posttest only perceived leadership effectiveness scores for new assistant principals and veteran assistant principals were not statistically significantly different, indicating that the training positively impacted both veteran and new assistant principals alike, equally preparing them for selection to the principalship based on the measured leadership domain posttest proficient range scores at the conclusion of the in-service program.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank several individuals for their support and encouragement throughout this entire process. Without you, this life goal would not have been realized.

- To my committee chair, Dr. John W. Hill, and my doctoral committee members, Dr. Kay Keiser, Dr. Neal Grandgenett, and Dr. Larry Dlugosh. Thank you for the expertise and wisdom that you so willingly shared with me to assist me in attaining such an important personal and professional goal.
- To my special friend, Bill Haase. Thank you for your unwavering encouragement, patience, and understanding during the many, many hours that I spent working to complete my doctoral studies and dissertation.
- To my family--especially to my mother and my children, Kyle, Kara, and Kasia. Thank you for supporting me through this and all of my professional endeavors. Your encouragement has motivated me throughout my entire career.
- To my friends and colleagues of the Sioux City Community School District. Thank you for your understanding and willingness to assist me in times of need.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....v

LIST OF TABLES.....ix

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

Literature Related to the Study Purpose 1

Purpose of the Study 7

Research Questions 7

Importance of the Study 19

Assumptions of the Study 20

Delimitations of the Study 20

Limitations of the Study 20

Definition of Terms 21

Significance of the Study 31

Contribution to research 31

Contribution to practice 31

Contribution to policy 32

Organization of the Study 32

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 33

Looming Shortage of School Leaders 33

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Characteristics and Skills of Effective Principals 35
The Importance of the Principal 36
The Changing Role of the Principal 38
The Principal as Instructional Leader 43
The Principal as a Change Agent 45
Challenges Facing Those Who Would Become a Principal 47
Changing student cultural demographics 47
Special education 48
Family dynamics 49
Parent involvement 50
School safety 52
Teacher supervision and evaluation 54
Teacher shortage 59
Accountability: State and federal mandates 60
Political bureaucracy 61
Curriculum supervision 61
Professional Development for Principals 63
3. METHODOLOGY 69
Participants 69

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Number of participants 69

Gender of participants 69

Age range of participants 69

Racial and ethnic origin of participants

.....69

Inclusion criteria of participants 69

Method of participant identification ..69

Research Design 70

Study Site 70

Description of Procedures 71

Research design 71

Dependent Measures 72

Research Questions and Data Analysis 76

Research Question #1 76

Research Question #2 79

Research Question #3 81

Research Question #4 84

Research Question #5 87

Data Collection Procedures 89

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Performance site 90

Institutional Review Board for the protection of human subjects approval category.....90

4. RESULTS 92

Purpose of the Study 92

Research Question #1 94

Research Question #2 98

Research Question #3 101

Research Question #4 104

Research Question #5 107

5. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION 126

Conclusions 127

Research Question #1 127

Research Question #2 129

Research Question #3 131

Research Question #4 132

Research Question #5 133

Discussion 134

Implications for further research 142

REFERENCES 147

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE.....PAGE

1. *New Assistant Principals'--Who Completed the Required School-Year-Long In-Service Leadership Development Grow-Your-Own Program--Gender, Ethnicity, Age, and Years of Administrative Experience* 111

2. *Veteran Assistant Principals'--Who Completed the Required School-Year-Long In-Service Leadership Development Grow-Your-Own Program--Gender, Ethnicity, Age, and Years of Administrative Experience* 112

3. *New Assistant Principals' Beginning and Ending Training Self-Rating Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores* 113

4. *Veteran Assistant Principals' Beginning and Ending Training Self-Rating Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores* 115

5. *New Assistant Principals' Beginning Pretest Compared to Ending Posttest Training Self-Rating Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis* 117

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

6. *New Assistant Principals' Beginning Pretest Compared to Ending Posttest Training Self-Rating Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis* 118

7. *Veteran Assistant Principals' Ending Training Compared To New Assistant Principals' Ending Training Posttest Self-Rating Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis* 119

8. *Veteran Assistant Principals' Beginning Pretest Compared to Ending Posttest Training Self-Rating Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis* 120

9. *Supervising Principal and Central Office Administrator Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores for Veteran Assistant Principals* 122

10. *Supervising Principal Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis Comparisons for Veteran and New Assistant Principals* 124

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

11. *Central Office Administrator Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis Comparisons for Veteran and New Assistant Principals* 125

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Literature Related to the Study Purpose

Historically, the assistant principalship has served as a stepping-stone to the principalship (Chan, Webb, & Bowen, 2003; Hartzell, Williams, & Nelson, 1995; Marshall, 1992; Scoggins & Bishop, 1993; Winter, 2002). Few practicing assistant principals desire to remain in this position for the duration of their career (Marshall, 1991). However, little is mentioned in pre-service training programs about the role of the assistant principal, and almost no mention is made of the position in professional literature (Glanz, 1994a; Gorton & Kettman, 1985; Kelly, 1987; Marshall, 1991; Norton & Kriekard, 1987). The role of the assistant principal may be seen as uninteresting, detached from instructional leadership, and at the base of the administrative career ladder (Marshall, 1991). Assistant principals are often regarded as having little impact on effective schools and student achievement. Furthermore, principals often overlook the talents of assistant principals (Calabrese, 1991; Kelly, 1987), and many assistant principals believe that superintendents and other central office administrators have little compassion for or understanding of their position (Kelly, 1987).

Yet the assistant principal's workday represents the entire range of societal issues inside the school building (Marshall, 1992; Panyako & Rorie, 1987). The assistant principal confronts some of the most difficult discipline challenges and mediates some of the most serious conflicts that surface among teachers, students, and the community (Koru, 1993; Marshall, 1992). Assistant principals hold conferences with parents and students, assess problems and create plans to support students in crisis, and counsel students regarding their studies and future careers (Marshall, 1991). In the most often assigned tasks, assistant principals are very often competent administrators of student discipline policies and supervisors of student activities even with little or no experience in other important areas such as curriculum or finance (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Kelly, 1987; Koru, 1993). Surprisingly, given the workload, the assistant principal position has often been viewed as an inferior role, one with great responsibility but little authority (Black, 1980; Glanz, 1994a; Gorton, 1987; Kelly, 1987; Panyako & Rorie, 1987).

Many researchers believe that assistant principals are not adequately prepared for the principalship not only due to lack of training in curriculum, instructional

leadership, and teacher supervision but also because of the lack of opportunity to perform many of the responsibilities associated with the principalship (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Hartzell et al., 1995; Kelly, 1987; Koru, 1993). The administrative responsibilities of the assistant principal have traditionally been of a different nature than that of the school principal (Chan et al., 2003; Kelly, 1987; Marshall, 1992; Panyako & Rorie, 1987). The duties of assistant principals, often assigned by the school principal, prevent assistant principals from developing into instructional leaders (Gorton, 1987; Marshall, 1991). Assistant principals are placed in management situations that take them away from working with teachers in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Marshall, 1992). The duties of assistant principals generally center on student discipline, supervision of hallways and lunchrooms, chaperoning dances and co-curricular activities, scheduling assemblies, meeting with parents, and when the principal is away from the building performing, in name only, the duties of the principal (Holmes, 1999; Johnson, 2004; Kelly, 1987; Williams, 1995).

Assistant principals believe the top five administrative duties and responsibilities most important in their preparation for the principalship, (a) curriculum

development, (b) instructional support, (c) maintaining a safe climate, (d) meeting with parents, and (e) teacher observation/ evaluation, are not aligned with the reality of how assistant principals actually spend the greater part of their time: (a) student discipline, (b) cafeteria supervision, (c) meeting with parents, (d) maintaining a safe climate, and (e) teacher observation/evaluation. Curriculum development and instructional support, duties and responsibilities that would better prepare assistant principals for the principalship, are not on what they spend the majority of their time. It seems the only true opportunity for instructional leadership for many assistant principals is teacher evaluation (Chan et al., 2003; Koru, 1993).

Most assistant principals believe that they do not receive enough in-service training to prepare them to move easily or smoothly into the principalship (Chan et al., 2003; Hartzell et al., 1995; Kelly, 1987). Engagement in student discipline and routine managerial tasks does not adequately prepare the assistant principal for the challenges that face those who seek to become school principals (Koru, 1993; Umphrey, 2007). Assistant principals need mentoring, support systems, and training to help them grow as instructional leaders, teacher coaches,

and program developers (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Kelly, 1987; Lile, 2008; Ylimaki, Jacobson, & Drysdale, 2007).

The need for quality professional development for current school administrators and better preparation for future principals and assistant principals to prepare them for their changing roles has gained national and even international attention (Johnson, 2004; Olson, 2008; Walker & Dimmock, 2006; Wallin, 2006). Significant attention has been recently committed to improving leadership in our schools (Barnett, 2004; Burch, 2007; Johnson, 2004; Murphy, Shipman, & Yff, 2000; Olson, 2008; Tirozzi, 2001; Walker & Dimmock, 2006; Wallin, 2006). A recent charge of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Lile, 2008) is to create a task force that will be centered on the professional development needs of assistant principals, especially for those who are in the position as a stepping-stone to the principalship. A focus of the task force is to prepare and support assistant principals to fill future principal positions. This training to prepare assistant principals for the principalship will include (a) collaborative leadership, (b) curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and (c) personalized learning (Lile, 2008).

Today’s experts in the field of leadership development stress the value of engaging school leaders in solving the

real problems that face them on the job while providing on-site coaching and professional networking (Walker & Dimmock, 2006). Many of the most valuable leadership programs focus on building skills and knowledge through interactions and reflections with colleagues who face similar leadership challenges (Chan et al., 2003; Houle, 2006). Recent literature in the area of leadership development places less emphasis on theory and more importance on problem-solving, data collection and analysis, effective communication skills, and dealing with stress (Groff, 2001).

Leadership preparation and professional development programs for school administrators offered at the district level as a grow-your-own initiative have only just recently become a viable response to an ever-growing principal shortage in schools nationwide (Olson, 2007). Those who aspire to the principalship generally acquire the skills and dispositions that experts in the field determine important to possess through their pre-service university programs (Umphrey, 2007). Subsequent professional development is often obtained on the job and/or through a series of one-day workshops on unrelated topics (Olson, 2007; Umphrey, 2007). Although the number of leadership development programs has increased in past years, most are

short-term and disjointed with no unifying theme of topics and no theoretical underpinnings (Tirozzi, 2001; Wallin, 2006). The largest motivator for those entering the assistant principalship is the opportunity to climb the career ladder of school administration (Marshall, 1991). School districts and professional organizations have a responsibility to provide and support the leadership development of assistant principals who aspire to the principalship.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program on new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness compared to principal and central office administrator ratings. The study analyzed secondary assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness as measured by the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation form in six domains: (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context after completion of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development program.

Research Questions

The following research questions were used to analyze the independent variable, new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness following completion of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program:

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Leadership Effectiveness Research Question #1: Do new assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program lose, maintain, or improve their beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 1a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 1b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed in the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending

training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 1c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management?

Sub-Question 1d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 1e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 1f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development

grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context?

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Leadership Effectiveness Research Question #2: Do veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program lose, maintain, or improve their beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 2a. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 2b. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal

Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 2c. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management?

Sub-Question 2d. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 2e. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 2f. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals

who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context?

The following research questions will be used to compare new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness following completion of a required school district in-service leadership development grow-your-own program.

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Research Leadership Effectiveness Question #3: Do new and veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program have congruent or different ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 3a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training

Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 3b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 3c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management?

Sub-Question 3d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 3e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 3f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context?

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Research Leadership Effectiveness Question #4: Do new and veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program have congruent or different ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by supervising principals for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 4a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (a) shared vision compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 4b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (b) the culture of learning compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 4c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (c) management compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (c) management?

Sub-Question 4d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (d) family and community compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 4e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (e) ethics compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 4f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (f) societal context compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (f) societal context?

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Research Leadership Effectiveness Question #5: Do new and veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program have congruent or different ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 5a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (a) shared vision compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 5b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (b) the culture of learning compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores

as measured by a central office administrator for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 5c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (c) management compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (c) management?

Sub-Question 5d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (d) family and community compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 5e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (e) ethics compared to veteran assistant

principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 5f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (f) societal context compared to veteran assistant principals ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (f) societal context?

Importance of the Study

Because it is generally recognized that the assistant principalship serves as a training ground for the principalship, and because the trend in today's public school districts is to enlist school principals by growing their own, it is important for district administrators to recognize and provide responsibilities and experiences to prepare assistant principals to become future school principals (Chan et al., 2003; Kelly, 1987; Panyako & Rorie, 1987). This study's findings will be helpful to Central Office personnel and other school administrators who coordinate and plan in-service professional development

for new and veteran assistant principals to assist them in successfully moving into the principalship.

Assumptions of the Study

The study had several strong features. All assistant principals in the research district were required to complete the same school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program delivered by district central office personnel. The training program was developed as a ground-up, problem-based, coaching model with maximum central office, principal, and assistant principal stakeholder input and adjustments to the final in-service design before implementation. Furthermore, the program was designed to support assistant principals' view of their emerging leadership capacities and capabilities rather than as an outside evaluation of their performance.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to the fifteen secondary assistant principals who were employed in a Midwestern urban school district during the 2007-2008 school year and who completed the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program.

Limitations of the Study

This comparative survey study utilized two naturally formed groups of assistant principals based on the number

of years of experience as a school administrator. The first arm was a naturally formed group of assistant principals (*n* = 8) with three or less years of administrative experience. The second naturally formed arm consisted of assistant principals (*n* = 7) who had six or more years of administrative experience. This comparative pretest-posttest and posttest-posttest survey study was confined to one Midwestern urban school district during one school year. The selective nature and small number of participants of this exploratory study could limit the utility and generalizability of the study findings.

Definition of Terms

Assessment. Assessment is the process of gathering accurate evidence of student learning from clearly defined and appropriate learning targets.

Assistant principal. An assistant principal is an assistant to the head of the school whose duties are traditionally focused on school building and grounds management, student supervision, discipline, and attendance.

Culture of learning. Culture of learning is a leadership standard identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium and supported by the Council of Chief State School Officers. "A school administrator is

an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

Curriculum supervision. Curriculum supervision is the process of ensuring that the written or intended curriculum is taught, resourced, experienced, and assessed.

Ethics. Ethics is a leadership standard identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium and supported by the Council of Chief State School Officers. "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

Family and community. Family and community is a leadership standard identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium and supported by the Council of Chief State School Officers. "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

In-service leadership development program. The in-service leadership development program was an intensive, focused professional development program which provided district assistant principals with the knowledge and skills to grow as effective school leaders.

The required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program was designed by a group of central office administrators from one Midwestern urban school district with input from secondary principals and assistant principals employed by the same district during 2007-2008 school year. Professional development needs for school administrators and, in particular for assistant principals, identified in the literature were given consideration as the program was designed. In addition, assistant principals were asked to identify the areas in which they felt they needed more professional development. Some of the most common areas identified were curriculum leadership, teacher supervision and evaluation, hiring practices, school finance, and working with families and community more effectively.

Fifty-nine hours of in-service leadership development was designed and implemented over the course of the 2007-2008 school year, beginning in September and concluding in mid-June. Assistant principals as an entire group met

biweekly with the Director of Secondary Education to receive this in-service leadership development program. In addition, the Director of Secondary Education met individually with each assistant principal to provide scheduled mentoring and support throughout the program.

The school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program addressed the following topics: (a) effective school leadership with a focus on McRel's 21 Leadership Responsibilities overview (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), (b) the principal's role in curriculum development and supervision with an added focus on the district's curriculum review process, active participation with content area teachers across the district as they identified the learning targets for their courses, and the newly created Iowa Core Curriculum (2007), (c) teacher supervision and evaluation with a focus on the district's teacher appraisal process, individual teacher professional development plans, and electronic classroom walk-throughs using the Downey Walk-through Model (Downey, Steffy, English, Frase, & Poston, 2004), (d) assessment for learning versus assessment of learning (Stiggins, Arter, Chappuis, & Chappuis, 2006), (e) school finance and hiring practices with emphasis on district-specific information and processes, (f) supervision of special education

classrooms with a focus on alternate assessment of special needs students to meet No Child Left Behind 2001 requirements, and (g) cultural proficiency to assist the participants in gaining a deeper understanding of the changing culture of the school district and the larger community.

Another important part of the leadership development program also required each participant to design, implement, and present a project over the course of the school year. Examples of some of the projects were: (a) the development and implementation of a student mentoring program, (b) a privilege (rather than consequence) system of discipline at a middle school and a high school, (c) a professional development program for special education teachers, (d) an anti-bullying program for middle school students, (e) pacing guides for each course across the district in the area of high school social studies, and (f) increasing parent and community involvement through the formation of a focus group which resulted in the creation of a family library that housed numerous bilingual fiction and nonfiction books in an Hispanic neighborhood.

All fifteen participants successfully completed the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-

your-own program and earned state licensure renewal and/or graduate level credit, funded by the district.

Instructional supervision. Instructional supervision is the process of ensuring that sound practices supported by research are utilized in the delivery of the curriculum.

Leadership effectiveness. Leadership effectiveness is the ability to motivate and/or influence others to work together to attain the organization's goals.

Leadership standards. The leadership standards are specific skills and dispositions that principals must acquire to attain the issues outlined in the standards of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium supported by the Council of Chief State School Officers (1996). The standards address six broad areas: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management of learning, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context.

Management of learning. Management of learning is a leadership standard identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium and supported by the Council of Chief State School Officers. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and

effective learning environment" (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the chief federal law affecting education from kindergarten through high school. NCLB centers on four pillars: accountability for results, more choices for parents, greater local control and flexibility, and an emphasis on proven education methods based on scientific research.

Parent involvement. Parent involvement refers to engagement between parents and the school community in the education of the child, to include home- and school-based elements. Involvement can be in various forms to include communication about school between the parent and the school and between the parent and the child, parental assistance with homework, and parental volunteerism at school.

Principal/assistant principal evaluation form. The Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form is the appraisal instrument built upon ISLLC's six leadership standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996) used in the evaluation of principals and assistant principals in a Midwestern school district. The

Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form was developed by a district committee comprised of K-12 building principals, assistant principals and central office administrators and was lead by the school district's Director of Human Resources during the 2005-2006 school year. The committee reviewed the literature surrounding principal/assistant principal appraisal, with special emphasis given to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders. Administrative appraisal instruments from other districts as well as recommendations of the state school administrators' association were also studied and considered. The instrument was drafted by the committee and submitted to a larger group of building and central office administrators for feedback. After consideration of feedback by the initial committee, revisions were made to the document. The document was taken to the district's Board of Directors for approval in the spring of 2006. The Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation form officially became the district document used in the appraisal of building administrators beginning in the fall of 2006.

The district principal/assistant principal appraisal instrument was created to include a section which focused on each of the ISLLC standards: (a) shared vision, (b)

culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (d) societal context. Although it was expected that the evaluator would elaborate on the administrator's progress in each of the standards in a narrative format, a continuum ranging from unacceptable to distinguished was included in each section of the instrument. The value of each of the descriptors on the continuum was as follows: (a) unacceptable = .51 to 1.50, (b) needs improvement = 1.51 to 2.50, (c) developing = 2.51 to 3.50, (d) proficient = 3.51 to 4.50, and (e) distinguished = 4.51 to 5.50.

Training in the evaluation of administrators was mandated by the state Department of Education during the 2007-2008 school year. All six secondary building principals in the district, as well as central office administrators who evaluate principals, including the Director of Secondary Education, all successfully completed the same state-required training which focused on ISLLC's Standards for School Leaders during the 2007-2008 school year.

School safety. A safe and secure school environment is one in which the school climate allows everyone, staff as well as students, to interact in a positive manner to result in optimum learning. School safety not only is

defined as a physically safe environment but also as an emotionally safe environment.

Shared vision. Shared vision is a leadership standard identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium and supported by the Council of Chief State School Officers. “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

Societal context. Societal context is a leadership standard identified by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium and supported by the Council of Chief State School Officers. A school administrator is an education leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

Teacher supervision and evaluation. Teacher supervision and evaluation is generally defined by policy as the role of the administrator in terms of annual evaluations, which includes collaboration in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. However, effective

teacher supervision and evaluation has been shown to produce positive changes in student learning and achievement.

Significance of the Study

This study has the potential to contribute to research, practice, and policy. It is of significant interest because of the shortage of highly qualified school administrators, especially secondary school principals. Through the understanding of the results of this study, school boards, superintendents, central office personnel, and practicing school principals will be able to decide what role in-service leadership development programs should play as school districts attempt to grow their own principals from the ranks of the assistant principalship.

Contribution to research. There is little research today regarding the preparation of assistant principals for the principalship. The results of this study may inform theoretical literature about the effectiveness of in-service leadership development grow-your-own programs.

Contribution to practice. Based on the outcomes of this study, school districts may decide whether to offer assistant principals an organized, well-planned grow-your-own in-service leadership development program to prepare them to fill the position of head principal. This study's

findings will be helpful to Central Office personnel and other school administrators who coordinate and plan in-service professional development for new and veteran assistant principals to assist them in successfully moving into the principalship.

Contribution to policy. Local level policy will be impacted by this study. If results show a positive impact on perceived leadership development, consideration may be given to continue the program and/or expand the program to include others who aspire to be principals.

Organization of the Study

The literature review relevant to this study is presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 describes the research design, methodology, and procedures used to gather and analyze the data of the study. This includes a detailed synthesis of the participants, a comprehensive list of the dependent variables, dependent measures, and the data analysis used to statistically determine if the null hypothesis shall be rejected for each research question. Chapter 4 reports the research findings, including data analysis, table, descriptive statistics, and inferential statistics. Chapter 5 provides conclusions and a discussion of the research findings.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

Looming Shortage of School Leaders

The looming shortage of school administrators has become a crisis in our country (Daresh, 2002; Fenwick & Pierce, 2001; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Goodwin, Cunningham & Childress, 2003; Hammond, Muffs, & Sciascia, 2001; Harris, 2001; Johnson, 2004; McCreight, 2001, Michael & Young, 2006; Newton & Zeitoun, 2002; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Public Agenda, 2001; Torgerson, 2003; Whitaker, 2001). Evidence indicates that a significant number of principals will retire or are on the verge of retirement within the next few years (Fenwick & Pierce, 2001; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Hammond et al., 2001; Harris, 2001; Johnson, 2004; McCreight, 2001, Michael & Young, 2006; Newton & Zeitoun, 2002; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Torgerson, 2003; Whitaker, 2001; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998). To add to this dilemma, a number of principals are moving into non-administrative positions (Breeden, Heigh, Leal & Smith, 2001; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998). Many teacher educators holding administrative certification are hesitant to apply for these positions because they have observed the conditions that principals experience such as inadequate salaries relative to responsibilities, long working hours,

increased accountability, and a work environment filled with seemingly impossible tasks (Andrianaivo, Howley, & Perry, 2005; Burdette & Schertzer, 2005; Cooley & Shen, 2003; Cushing, Kerrins & Johnstone, 2003; Daresh, 2002; Fenwick & Pierce, 2001; Newton & Zeitoun, 2002; Olson, 2008; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004; Vroom & Jago, 2007). Another contribution to the principal shortage is the decrease in the average tenure of educators in these positions in recent years (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000).

The principal shortage is being felt in all regions, states, cities, and towns without exception (Hudson & Williamson, 1999; Kerrins, 2001; Whitaker, 2001). The absence of qualified individuals to fill these vacancies does not appear to be affected by the location or size of a school (Groff, 2001; Moore, 1999). Although surveyed school districts have indicated that they are having difficulty filling principalships at all levels (Whitaker, 2001), the shortage of qualified applicants at the secondary level is particularly alarming (Cooper, Fusarell, & Carella, 2000; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Portin, Shen, & Williams, 1998; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998).

As school districts attempt to fill administrative positions vacated by retiring principals, it is not uncommon to have a very shallow pool of applicants.

Furthermore, the quality of applicants for the principalship is steadily declining (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Donaldson, Bowe, Mackenzie, & Marnik, 2004; McCreight, 2001; Whitaker, 2001; Winter, 2002). Often districts must run multiple advertisements, encourage the application of individuals who have little or no experience (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001), or enlist the assistance of statewide, regional, or national search firms (McCreight, 2001). It is not uncommon for schools across the nation to open the school year without a full-time administrator (Groff, 2001; Vroom & Jago, 2007) or resort to enlisting the leadership of a person who is not fully certified or who has very limited experience (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001).

Characteristics and Skills of Effective Principals

Successful principals exhibit many of the characteristics of effective leaders in other professions: authenticity, high expectations, integrity, vision, trustworthiness, reliability, responsibility, honesty, patience, flexibility, resilience, and strong communication skills, to name a few (Ramsey, 2006). They realize that every day is an opportunity “to make struggling teachers and students better; good teachers and students great; and great teachers and students masters in their fields” (Sewell, 2003, p. 54). The skill set expected of today’s

school principal is more expansive than required of principals in years past. To be a successful school leader today, one must be a strong instructional leader (Southworth, 2002) while possessing the ability to support student and adult learning through the creation of learning communities that hold all accountable (Mazzeo, 2003). To possess the energy to do all of this and more, school leaders must have a passion for education and for the success of not only their students but also for their communities (Day, 2004).

The Importance of the Principal

Since the passage of the No Child Left Behind (2002) legislation and consequent increased awareness of gaps in the achievement of America's children, educators and policymakers have studied the characteristics of effective schools in an effort to determine what factors most significantly impact student achievement. Evidence suggests that, of all school-related factors that affect student learning, strong principal leadership affects student achievement only second to classroom instruction (Bradshaw, Buckner, & Hopkins, 1997; Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Johnson & Uline, 2005; Leithwood, Seashore, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; Shen, Rodriguez-Campos, & Rincones-Gomez, 2000).

Effective schools research and the site-based decision making movement have indicated that the principal is crucial in school improvement efforts (Daresh, 2002; DiPaola, & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Gamage & Ueyama, 2004; Glanz, 1994b; Groff, 2001; Hudson & Williamson, 1999; Johnson, 2004; Lindahl, 2007; Sweeney, 1982; Tirozzi, 2001; Vroom & Jago, 2007). The role of the school principal and student achievement and success are closely connected (Breeden et al., 2001; Harris, 2001; Johnson & Uline, 2005; Sweeney, 1982). School improvement, now the focus for educational leadership, recognizes the importance of competent, caring building administrators who are hard-working and are able to problem-solve, inspire others, and influence the attitudes and behaviors of teachers to create a more meaningful learning environment that contributes to the improved learning of students (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Groff, 2001; Kersten & Israel, 2005; Olson, 2008). Research also reveals that the effect of strong leadership, although not the only factor, is greater in schools that face societal challenges (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Leithwood et al., 2004). The building administrator's leadership may account for approximately 20% of the educational institution's effect on student achievement (Bottoms, O'Neill, Fry, & Jacobson,

2004). Researchers recognize the impact that principals have on learning, but state that the degree to which leadership affects achievement is not easily measured because of the complexity of the variables (Pritchett-Johnson, Livingston, Schwartz, & Slate, 2000). However, adequate yearly progress, graduation rate, high school exit exams, school safety, and family involvement do not occur without a well-qualified, highly motivated school principal (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Groff, 2001; Kersten & Israel, 2005; Lovely, 2004; Olson, 2008; Tirozzi, 2001). The principalship is a demanding job, critical for all operations of the school including achievement for all students. Those who aspire to school leadership, as well as those who prepare educational leaders, are aware of the challenges of the position (Linn, Sherman, & Gill, 2007).

The Changing Role of the Principal

In the discussion regarding the shortage of educators who are willing to step into the principalship, much of the literature suggests that a reason for the decline in the interest in these positions is the complexity and difficulty of the job (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Daresh, 2002; Harris, 2001; Hudson & Williamson, 1999; Olson, 2008; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004;

Robbins & Gerritz, 1986; Zellner, Jinkins, Gideon, Doughty, & McNamara, 2002). The changing role of the principal in recent years appears to have negatively impacted people in these positions, both personally and professionally (Groff, 2001; Portin et al., 1998). The expanded role of the principal now includes a focus on instructional leadership ensuring that each and every student from all cultures, backgrounds, and economic circumstances learn at the highest levels (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; O'Donnell & White, 2005; Portin et al., 1998; Ylimaki et al., 2007). Superintendents consistently identify increased student achievement, as a top priority of the school principal's role (Hess & Kelly, 2005). This leadership includes supervision of the delivery of the curriculum, improving instruction, identifying and clearly communicating a mission and vision for the school, supervising staff, assessing student learning, leading staff development, and building a working relationship between the school and its community (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Hoffman, 2004; Portin et al., 1998). In addition, principals continue to retain the other responsibilities that have traditionally been a part of the job, such as building maintenance, responding to staff desires, conducting teacher evaluations, maintaining student discipline, managing the

budget, and maintaining a safe learning and working environment (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Hoffman, 2004; Portin et. al, 1998).

The principal's work is characterized by a monumental list of important and often contradictory responsibilities from instructional leadership to school safety to building management. The principal is often called upon to respond to unpredictable situations at a rapid pace while still holding onto the long-range vision of the school. There is little time for reflection and virtually no opportunity to collaborate or problem-solve with others during the workday (Wong, 2004). The work of the principal is often depicted as a continuous stream of short tasks with constant interruptions, extremely complex but tremendously exciting (Hoffman, 2004; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Robbins & Gerritz, 1986). This expansion of responsibilities forces the principal to decide which duties will consume their time and which will be postponed or left undone (Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004).

Although much emphasis has been placed upon shared leadership and site-based management, the principalship has not become a sought after position (Daresh, 2002; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004; Umphrey, 2007). The responsibility for improved academic performance as dictated by the No Child

Left Behind Act (2002) ultimately rests on the school principal (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Tirozzi, 2001) and has probably had the greatest impact on the principal's changing job description (Ervay, 2006). Success as a school leader is becoming more commonly associated with meeting accountability standards (Michael & Young, 2006). Certainly, the pressures of high stakes standardized testing coupled with countless leadership and management tasks are contributing to increased instability in school administration (Hargreaves, 2005).

Moreover, the changing role of the principal is contributing to a decline in morale and enthusiasm for the position (Lile, 2008; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Portin et al., 1998) since many of the duties are not identified as contributions to job satisfaction (Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004). Many who enter the principalship do so to positively impact the lives of children (Potter, 2001; Torgerson, 2003). On the contrary, building leaders are finding that, once they enter these positions, they must expend more time and effort to respond to external political and monetary demands (Torgerson, 2003). Completion of reports, complying with federal, state, and local mandates, dealing with difficult parents, dwindling budgets, and responding to increased criticism of public education consume today's

principal's energy (Clements, 1980; Potter, 2001; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004; Robbins & Gerritz, 1986). Many principals find it increasingly challenging to adequately meet the responsibilities of the job as an instructional leader because of the immediacy of managerial and other external demands (Adams, 1999; Zimmerman & Jackson-May, 2003). A cause of frustration for those in the position is the lack of recognition and gratitude they feel for their role in the school (Portin et al., 1998).

Principals also cite a frustration regarding a lack of time to complete their leadership and management responsibilities effectively (Harris, 2001; Hoffman, 2004; Kneese, Pankake, Schroth, & Blackburn, 2003; Lile, 2008; Portin et al., 1998; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998), identifying an incongruence between what they believe are the most important tasks of the job and what are the more realistic daily demands (Portin et al., 1998; Vroom & Jago, 2007). Many principals who realize that their responsibilities cannot be accomplished by working the regular eight-hour workday have increased their workweek in an attempt to fulfill all the obligations that the position requires (Breeden et al., 2001; Portin et al., 1998). Principals must decide how to best use their time to

accomplish the most important instructional leadership responsibilities (O'Donnell & White, 2005).

Due to the expanded demands of the position and the ever-so-slight increase in compensation offered to assume these responsibilities, many well-qualified professionals who have completed certification requirements are reluctant to enter the field of building administration (Harris, 2001; Moore, 1999; Pounder & Crow, 2005; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004; Tirozzi, 2001). According to a 2001 Public Agenda report, 29% of the superintendents surveyed reported their belief that the quality of principals has declined (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001). The duties of the principalship need to be revised in order to recruit people into what currently appears as a very unattractive position with little job satisfaction (Cushing et al., 2003; Di-Paola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; McCreight, 2001; Moore, 1999; Thomson, Blackmore, Sachs, & Tregenza, 2003; Whitaker, 2001). Policy must support instructional leadership by ensuring that administrators possess the resources to accomplish their managerial tasks so that they can focus on those activities that most impact teaching and learning (Coldren & Spillane, 2007; Whitaker, 2001).

The Principal as Instructional Leader

Higher expectations for student achievement have altered the principal's role beyond management to include instructional leadership (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Duvall & Wise, 2004; Fenwick & Pierce, 2001; Kersten & Israel, 2005; Vroom & Jago, 2007). For over twenty-five years, much effective schools research has identified the importance of leadership that focuses on curriculum and instructional programming to improve student achievement (Coldren & Splillane, 2007; Ervay, 2006; Marshall, 1992; McGhee & Lew, 2007; Sweeney, 1982). Instructional leadership has been identified as the chief responsibility of the school principal at all levels. School leaders have accepted this responsibility, realizing the importance of possessing expertise in teaching and learning while establishing and leading the development and implementation of high curricular standards (Duvall & Wise, 2004; Kersten & Israel, 2005; Vroom & Jago, 2007). Principals are now required to lead their schools in ways that require a deep understanding of curriculum and assessment, sound instructional practices, effective classroom management, and child development (Fenwick & Pierce, 2001). They must prepare and facilitate data analysis, lead professional development, and work with site-based councils in order to lead a continuous improvement process that demonstrates

progress in raising student achievement (Barnett, 2004; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Lile, 2008). At the same time, they must ensure the success of students who have not usually done well under less demanding expectations which poses additional challenges for today's school leader (Murphy et al., 2000).

However, due to the conflicting demands from various public stakeholders and an overabundance of managerial responsibilities, principals frequently report that they lack the time to be effective instructional leaders (Catano & Stronge, 2006; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Gentilucci & Muto, 2007). Feeling increasingly overloaded by the multiple demands of the position, they consistently cite their conflicting roles as contributions to job stress and dissatisfaction (Coldren & Spillane, 2007; Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Groff, 2001; Lile, 2008).

The Principal as a Change Agent

Portraying instructional leadership as the principal's most essential role impacts student learning, but school leaders must be able to go beyond literacy and mathematics achievement. The role of instructional leader too narrowly defines today's principal to institute the types of reforms that will generate the schools for the next century (Fullan, 2002). Effective leaders recognize

the importance of leading and managing an organization in a time that requires creative responses to increasing cultural and economic diversity, accountability, and learning driven by technology. Clearly, due to this changing environment that is also becoming progressively more political, the educational leader of the twenty-first century will be called upon to be an agent of change (Jackson & Davis, 2000; Williams, 1995). School leaders must initiate and implement change by enlisting the good will and strengths of their teachers, staff, parents, students, community leaders, and other business and political key stakeholders. A principal must lead with a solid understanding of the change process, anticipating challenges, working to meet the needs of all, and distributing decision-making (Calabrese, 2002; Fullan, 2002; Petzko, 2005). School improvement relies on principals who can create and guide others through the conditions of educational reform in today's rapidly changing world (Fullan, 2002; Lindahl, 2007). It often requires a deep knowledge of the human side of organizational change, the ability to form effective coalitions (Fullan, 2002; Lindahl, 2007), and the ability to manage change (Bridges, 1991). Unfortunately, change leadership is an often-overwhelming task for school leaders

who may not possess the knowledge required to be an effective agent of change. Many are not prepared to embrace and value the changing diversity of our communities and our schools and lead others in the organization to adequately serve all children (Jean-Marie, 2008; Lindahl, 2007; Walker & Dimmock, 2005)

Challenges Facing Those Who Would Become a Principal

There is much new to learn and do in preparation for becoming a principal including: (a) understanding rapidly changing cultural demographics, (b) understanding the needs of special education students, (c) understanding family dynamics, (d) understanding the importance of parent involvement, (e) understanding school safety, (f) understanding teacher supervision and evaluation, (g) understanding the teacher shortage, (h) understanding accountability of state and federal mandates, (i) understanding political bureaucracy, and (j) understanding curriculum supervision.

Changing student cultural demographics. The cultural demographics of the United States are rapidly changing. The increase in the population of Hispanics and Asians in this country who do not speak English will continue to impact programming in our nation's schools. Due to the number of students entering our schools speaking a language other

than English, school administrators must develop and implement the instructional methods and programs to meet these students' learning needs while attending to their social, emotional, and moral needs (Tirozzi, 2001).

According to Walker and Dimmock (2005), meeting the needs of diverse learners is, perhaps, the most challenging issue faced by today's educators. School leaders must possess an acute awareness of the needs of all children, including those of have been historically underserved in our nation's schools (Jean-Marie, 2008). They must know how to bridge the school with the community, making teaching and learning responsive to cultural and ethnic diversity (Walker & Dimmock, 2005).

Special education. Today's school leaders are charged with the responsibility for implementing curriculum that raises the achievement of all students, including those with learning and behavioral disabilities. An added challenge of the principalship is the time-consuming effort required to be in compliance with special education reporting and to provide adequate program management, staff resources, and legal support for parents of special needs students (Cushing et al., 2003; Johnson, 2004; Torgerson, 2003; Vroom & Jago, 2007). The principal's leadership is important to a school-wide implementation of inclusionary

practices requiring an understanding of special education literature and a working knowledge with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. In order to support learning for students with special needs, principals must be familiar with instructional strategies that are effective with diverse learners by providing opportunities for training and assistance for teachers (Johnson, 2004).

Family dynamics. Today's school principals report feeling the weight of the demands of dysfunctional families, low socio-economic status, and students with severe mental health and emotional problems (Gross, 2003; Hoffman, 2004; O'Donnell & White, 2005). Fewer students are attending public schools from a traditional family as it was once defined to include two parents, a mother and a father, married and living together (Gross, 2003; Houle, 2006; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). Same-sex partners, single parents, men in homemaker roles, and grandparents acting as primary caretakers illustrate that many children attending our schools have experienced very diverse and differing ways of being parented and nurtured. Principals must be prepared to support all students regardless of family structure and issues outside of school that may place stress on a child (Barrera & Warner, 2006; Houle, 2006; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). Many students have emotional

difficulties that must be met before adequate learning can take place, and principals must be instrumental in securing resources to meet student needs in times of limited funding. (Gross, 2003; Murphy, Vriesenga, & Storey, 2007).

Educational leaders are giving more attention to social justice issues and student and family advocacy (Murphy et al., 2007). Many administrators are accepting the responsibility to act as social workers (Hoffman, 2004) in efforts to assist families in their struggles resulting from divorce, poverty, or other unfortunate situations (Portin et al., 1998). It is now the principal's personal responsibility to meet the needs of society's problems in the schools, which consumes time from an already overloaded workday (Groff, 2001; Peterson & Kelley, 2001). Dysfunctional families and transience manifest themselves as negative influences on the achievement of students. Poverty, malnutrition, domestic violence, crime, alcohol and drug abuse, teen pregnancy, and inadequate health care are all issues that must be addressed by the principal in order to insure that children from these circumstances are not further victimized in school for those things beyond their control (Hoffman, 2004; Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Parent involvement. Researchers confirm the importance of parent involvement in the process and outcomes of a

child's education (DePlanty, Coulter-Kern, & Duchane, 2007; Deslandes & Bertrand, 2005; Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, & Holbein, 2005; Machen, Wilson, & Notar, 2005). Parent involvement has been correlated to a number of positive outcomes such as increased academic achievement, higher grades, favorable attitudes toward school, lower dropout rates, fewer special education placements, fewer disciplinary referrals, and higher levels of social skills (Deslandes & Bertrand, 2005; Gonzalez-DeHass et al., 2005). Discussion between parents and their children about school has also been found to improve learning and reduce inappropriate behavior (DePlanty et al., 2007). Parents are an important part of school improvement and student achievement (DePlanty et al., 2007; Gonzalez-DeHass et al., 2005; Machen et al., 2005). However, as children advance through school, parent involvement tends to decrease with some parents believing that involvement in their student's education at the secondary level is not as important (DePlanty et al., 2007). Families who are adversely affected by unemployment, homelessness, education level of the parent, or lack of support from other adults are not as likely to be involved in their child's education (DePlanty et al., 2007). Diversity may also negatively impact the

relationship between the school and the home (Barrera & Warner, 2006; Deslandes & Bertrand, 2005).

Principals must be partners with parents in their desire to increase parent involvement in student learning. Principals must identify realistic ways to involve parents by respecting parents' work schedules, understanding families' busy lives, recognizing miscommunication in second languages, and understanding diverse family structures and circumstances (Barrera & Warner, 2006). Single parents and those with limited education have been shown to be less involved in certain types of school activities which may require additional effort from the principal to overcome these barriers (Deslandes & Bertrand, 2005). In addition, some of the literature cites the importance of preparation for principals in the area of community and parent issues (Petzko, 2005).

School safety. School safety in the United States continues to be one of the most pressing issues in education since violent actions in schools continue to occur (Bucher & Manning, 2005). According to a 2007 report by the National Center for Education Statistics, students ages 12 through 18 were victims of about 1.5 million nonfatal crimes at school, including theft and violent crimes. Approximately 39,600 schools (48%) took at least

one serious disciplinary action against a student for offenses such as physical attacks or fights; insubordination; distribution, possession, or use of alcohol; distribution, possession, or use of illegal drugs; use or possession of a weapon other than a firearm or explosive device; and use or possession of a firearm or explosive device during the 2005-06 school year. The percentage of schools that took disciplinary action for use of possession of a weapon other than a firearm was greater during the 2005-06 school year (19%) than it was in the previous school year (17%).

Providing a safe and secure school environment, a top priority job of the successful principal, one in which the school climate allows everyone to interact in a positive manner, is essential for optimum learning (Axelman, 2006; Bucher & Manning, 2005). Schools where there are more frequent acts of bullying, violent, or unsafe activity may maintain a less-than-optimum learning environment for their students, impacting student achievement. Any crime or violent action at a school affects more than the individuals directly involved; it may also negatively impact the entire educational process, affecting far many more people in the school and its community (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007).

In the past, school safety policies addressed fights, bullying, sexual harassment, and classroom management (Heinen, Webb-Dempsey, Moore, & Friebel, 2006). That changed with the 1999 mass murder-suicide incident at Columbine High School. School safety, discipline, and order suddenly became major concerns for public schools (Noguera, 2007). School districts across the country began to implement well-thought-out processes in an effort to curtail school violence (Torres & Chen, 2006). Solutions generally call for a set of regulations such as dress codes, metal detectors, security guards, and searches of students and their property to ward off the threat of an unsafe environment (Axelman, 2006). The school principal is key in providing safe school leadership. Much of the research surrounding school safety cites the importance of strong leadership (Heinen et al., 2006). A challenge for educational leaders is to provide a safe school climate that is respectful of others and does not tolerate bullying, but does provide students with constructive ways to air their grievances (Bucher & Manning, 2005).

Teacher supervision and evaluation. Much of the research indicates that, of all school-related factors, the instructional practices of the classroom teacher have the highest impact on student learning (Danielson & McGreal,

2000; Feeney, 2007; Marzano, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005; Petzko, 2005). The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards has stated that to improve school and student learning, we must focus on strengthening teaching (Lester, 2003). The National Association of Elementary School Principals defines the role of the future principal as more of a coach or colleague than a boss (Klauke, 1990). Principals must have the skills to effectively conference with teachers, provide resources for teachers' professional growth, and encourage teacher reflection. Skills of today's school leaders must not only include professional knowledge but also pedagogy, interpersonal communication skills, and an understanding of student and adult learning (Southworth, 2002).

With the public priority on accountability for the achievement of all students regardless of ethnicity, socio-economic status, disability, or family dynamics, the importance of teacher supervision and evaluation is identified as some of the most important work of school leaders in the improvement process (Coldren & Spillane, 2007; Cooper, Ehrensal & Bromme, 2005; Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Feeney, 2007; Petzko, 2005). Educational stakeholders such as school boards, parents, and legislators identify the principal as key in teacher evaluation (Peterson,

2004). Policy generally defines the role of the administrator in the instruction arena in terms of annual evaluations. The ability of a school leader to assess teacher quality by evaluating instructional strategies and model and inspire improvement is imperative for the success of the students in a school (Petzko, 2005). School principals must connect what they do to what teachers do (Coldren & Spillane, 2007). Principals as teacher supervisors must work with teachers in the same way that teachers are expected to work with their students (Glickman, 2002.) Many educational researchers agree that principals determine the success of effective teacher supervision and evaluation, as well as improvement in instruction and increased student learning (Petzko, 2005; Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003).

However, the research surrounding the topic of teacher supervision and evaluation is not all encouraging (Peterson, 2004). Teachers look to their principals for guidance in pedagogy, content knowledge, classroom management, and lesson design (Zimmerman & Delkert-Pelton, 2003). Although research strongly indicates that most building principals possess the capacity to effectively evaluate teacher quality (Peterson, 2004), teachers often view the principal as a hindrance to successful evaluation

and improvement when principals are perceived to have little teaching experience or lack content knowledge (Zimmerman & Delkert-Pelton, 2003). A challenge for building leaders is to keep abreast of current best practice, instructional strategies, and curriculum. Teacher evaluation at the secondary level is especially challenging because, while the evaluator's content knowledge is crucial, it is unreasonable to expect that a secondary principal will possess content knowledge in all subject areas (Peterson, 2004).

Current views of teacher supervision suggest that school leaders work collaboratively and maintain open communication with teachers to more positively impact student learning (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Cooper et al., 2005; Feeney, 2007; Zimmerman & Delkert-Pelton, 2003). Leaders who are perceived by teachers to have the most impact on student learning are those who engage in professional conversations with staff and provide them with opportunities for professional development (Barnett, 2004) and collaborative dialogue (Binkley, 1995). Teachers and principals discuss practice, they research, plan, design, and evaluate curriculum collaboratively, and they teach each other what they know about teaching and learning (Binkley, 1995). Current models such as professional

learning communities can provide the structure for principals to develop more collective processes, not only in the area of teacher supervision but also in other areas such as curriculum development (Burch, 2007; DuFour, 2003) and assessment.

Current school district policies generally require principals to conduct a number of classroom observations each year which often culminates as a summative evaluation on a regular, though not yearly, basis (Coldren & Spillane, 2007). School leaders believe that they do not possess the time and personnel necessary to conduct sufficiently thorough teacher evaluations (Kersten & Israel, 2005; Peterson, 2004). Although principals have identified instructional supervision, including teacher evaluation, as a top priority of the position, the reality is that it falls behind such tasks as discipline, facilities management, and student services coordination and activity supervision (Peterson, 2004).

School leaders must be adept in assisting teachers by reviewing lesson plans, submitting recommendations for improvement, and demonstrating instructional strategies. They must recognize active, purposeful teaching, and more importantly, know what to do when it is absent (Fenwick & Pierce, 2001). Dealing with the ineffective teacher has

been identified as a threat to the job satisfaction of the building principal (Cooper et al., 2005; Peterson, 2004). Designing and implementing an improvement plan is often one of the most challenging, time-consuming, stressful tasks of the position (Zimmerman & Delkert-Pelton, 2003).

Teacher shortage. Realizing the importance of the classroom teacher in attaining high levels of student achievement, teacher shortages due to retirements, especially in certain content areas at the secondary level, is yet another challenge faced by today's school principal (Gross, 2003). For the first time in the history of this country, the number of people entering the teaching profession is far less than the number of those leaving (Lieberman & Miller, 2005). As many as two million new teachers, mostly at the middle and high school levels, will be needed within the next few years (Tirozzi, 2001). Although the shortage of qualified teachers in general is a dilemma, hiring teachers in particular areas such as math, science, foreign language, special education, and bilingual education pose an even greater challenge for principals (Kneese et al., 2003). The No Child Left Behind Act (2002) requires all teachers to be highly qualified, meeting high standards for certification and licensure, which requires school administrators to recruit, hire, and support those

who will provide excellence in teaching (Lieberman & Miller, 2005). Although principals traditionally have always sought to hire and retain the most competent teachers in the field, the shortage of highly qualified teachers poses challenges to school administrators.

Accountability: State and federal mandates. Accountability for student achievement is at the top of state and national school reform agendas. Meeting accountability standards provides an ever-increasing challenge for those in school leadership positions (Guskey, 2007; Ylimaki et al., 2007). School leaders now shoulder the responsibility for the academic performance of all students by meeting annual yearly progress goals measured by standardized tests as defined by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Houle, 2006; O'Donnell & White, 2005; Ramsey, 2006). Today's school principals are expected to take the lead in setting goals for student achievement, creating and implementing the plan to attain those goals, using data to regularly monitor progress, and altering plans to make certain that students make gains (Guskey, 2007; Ramsey, 2006). Much of the literature surrounding the role of the school principal cites the stress that school leaders and teachers feel as they struggle to meet higher

standards of accountability for the learning of all students while addressing the social, emotional, physical, and moral needs of the children with whom they work (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Political bureaucracy. Amplified accountability, along with increased competition for limited resources, has forced today's school principal to become more involved with policies and politicians. Many principals recognize and have responded to the need to become active advocates for public education due to federal legislation, court mandates, and funding issues. Yet, school administrators feel the stress that their involvement in local, state, and federal bureaucracy and politics brings, creating frustration because this work interferes with the daily demands of the principalship (Daresh, 2002; Vroom & Jago, 2007).

Curriculum supervision. The principal plays a critical role in curriculum supervision. Leadership in the area of curriculum has been identified as the core of instructional leadership (Williams, 1995). Effective leadership in developing and monitoring the implementation of the curriculum has been identified as essential to increasing student learning (Berlin, Jensen, & Kavanagh, 1988; Fullan, 2005; Marzano et al., 2005; Ruebling, Stow, Kayona, &

Clarke, 2004). Curriculum supervision and staff supervision have been identified as the two most important responsibilities of the school principal (Kienapfel, 1984). Clear standards and the assessments that measure them are the heart of school improvement and higher achievement (Clark & Clark, 2000; DuFour, 2003; Hoy & Hoy, 2002; Schmoker & Marzano, 1999). According to Clark and Clark (2000) and Ruebling et al. (2004), when principals do not take the lead, curriculum documents do not exist. In many school districts where curriculum documents are in existence, they are often poorly written or ignored by school personnel. The challenge for the school leader involves addressing performance standards through curricular reform with consideration on the developmental needs of all students, including English language learners and those with learning disabilities (Clark & Clark, 2000; Cushing et al., 2003).

In addition, the principal is charged with insuring that the written curriculum is taught, resourced, experienced, and tested. Principals must stay abreast of new developments and innovations in all content areas, realizing that no principal can be an expert in all areas (Hill, 1990; Kienapfel, 1984). Principals' involvement with the curriculum communicates the significance of the

curriculum to classroom instructors. The delivery of the curriculum and its accompanying assessments are vital to increased student achievement (Marzano, 2003; Ruebling et al., 2004).

Though a review of the literature solidly supports the principals' importance in curriculum leadership, shortage of principal preparation in this area is a grave concern. Many school principals consider curriculum supervision an impossible task due to their lack of training and expertise in instruction (Fiore, 2004). Curriculum leadership is complex and time-consuming. However, considering the importance of leadership in curriculum supervision, administrators simply cannot allow the day-to-day management tasks to impede their leadership in the creation and delivery of the curriculum. (Berlin et al., 1988; Kienapfel, 1984). They must be visible in classrooms and engage in dialogue focused on student learning to insure that the curriculum is being appropriately implemented (Clark & Clark, 2000).

Professional Development for Principals

Preparation of principals has not kept pace with changes that today's school leaders must address (Hess & Kelly, 2005). Although school improvement efforts have focused on raising student achievement through increased

standards, accountability, and teacher professional development, the National Staff Development Council (2000) has addressed the importance of strengthening the skills of school leadership as the most effective way to impact all school challenges. In-service training is a valuable means for providing those who wish to become tomorrow's principals with the skills, knowledge, and dispositions required to successfully meet this challenge. On-going professional development opportunities for principals are vital in establishing resiliency for the position and must be made a priority (Daresh, 2002; Hoffman, 2004). Yet Lovely (2004) cites that 73% of school districts in the United States do not have programs to prepare or support principals.

The need for quality professional development for current school administrators and better preparation for future principals and assistant principals to prepare them for their changing roles has recently gained national and even international attention (Barnett, 2004; Johnson, 2004; Olson, 2008; Walker & Dimmock, 2006; Wallin, 2006). Significant attention has been committed to improving leadership in our schools (Murphy et al., 2000). Quality professional development for administrators is critical to successful reform efforts, the future of education, and

increased student achievement (Bradshaw et al., 1997; Kent, 2004). Improving the skills of building leaders has much potential in increasing students' academic achievement, especially for minority and low-income students (National Staff Development Council, 2000). A current charge of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Lile, 2008) is to create a task force that will be centered on the professional development needs of assistant principals, especially for those who are in the position as a stepping-stone to the principalship. A focus of the task force is to prepare and support assistant principals to fill future principal positions. This training to prepare assistant principals for the principalship will include: (a) collaborative leadership, (b) curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and (c) personalized learning (Lile, 2008).

Today's experts in the field of leadership development stress the value of engaging school leaders in solving the real problems that face them on the job while providing on-site coaching and professional networking (Walker & Dimmock, 2006). Many of the most valuable leadership programs focus on building skills and knowledge through interactions and reflections with colleagues who face similar leadership challenges (Chan et al., 2003; Houle, 2006; Petzko, 2004). Recent literature in the area of

leadership development places less emphasis on theory and more importance on problem-solving, data collection and analysis, effective communication skills, and dealing with stress (Groff, 2001). The professional development for today's school leader must be delivered in an authentic learning context that is job-embedded and ongoing with active involvement that ties new learning to prior knowledge, something that has not historically occurred (Davis et al., 2005; Petzko, 2004). Preparing school leaders cannot be a single event; it must be an on-going course of action (Browne-Ferrigno & Allen, 2006; Zimmerman & Jackson-May, 2003).

Providing time for leadership development is a challenge in many districts where the principal's day is typically very fast-paced, intense, and fragmented. While there is agreement that administrators need professional development, widespread effective professional development is too slowly becoming a district priority (Odden, Archibald, Fermanich, & Gallagher, 2002). In most districts, the opportunity for professional learning for principals is inadequate (Sparks, 2002). Principals and assistant principals find it challenging and even frustrating to be required to be away from their buildings to participate in professional development (Bradshaw et

al., 1997). An additional challenge is the lack of knowledge that many school administrators currently possess about their own need for professional development (Foley, 2001). Professional development for school administrators is just not a priority in most districts and with most administrators (Mazzeo, 2003).

Leadership preparation and professional development programs for school administrators offered at the district level as a grow-your-own initiative have only just recently become important in response to an ever-growing principal shortage in schools nationwide (Beeson, 2001; Harris, 2001; Lovely, 2004; McCreight, 2001; Olson, 2007; Potter, 2001). Those who aspire to the principalship generally acquire the skills and dispositions that experts in the field determine important to possess through their pre-service university programs (Umphrey, 2007). Subsequent professional development is often obtained on the job and/or through a series of one-day workshops on unrelated topics (Olson, 2007; Umphrey, 2007). Although the number of leadership development programs has increased in past years, most are short-termed and disjointed with no unifying theme of topics and no theoretical underpinnings (Wallin, 2006). Because the largest motivator for entering the assistant principalship is the opportunity to climb the career ladder

of school administration (Marshall, 1991), school districts and professional organizations have the responsibility to provide and support the leadership development of school leaders, socializing them into the district culture and providing meaningful, job-embedded continuous support (Howley & Pendarvis, 2002; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Pounder & Crow, 2005; Tirozzi, 2001). New and future school administrators need access to hands-on professional development and contact with mentors (Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Moore, 1999; Whitaker, 2001). In short, we must provide opportunities for the professional learning to our principals to support their success, knowing that if they succeed, our schools will not fail our children.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

Participants

Number of participants. The number of subjects for this study was fifteen assistant middle school and high school assistant principals who served in one urban school district during the 2007-2008 school year.

Gender of participants. The gender of the participants was nine males (60%) and six females (40%).

Age range of participants. The age range of the subjects was from 31 years of age to 59 years of age.

Racial and ethnic origin of participants. The racial and ethnic origin of the subjects was 88% White, 6% Black, and 6% Pacific Islander. Of the total number of subjects (n = 15), there were no restrictions based upon race or ethnicity.

Inclusion criteria of participants. All study participants served as middle school and high school assistant principals in a Midwestern school district during the 2007-2008 school year.

Method of participant identification. All subjects were employed by the same Midwestern urban school district and, although working in six different secondary schools and supervised by six different principals, were provided

the same in-service leadership development program and follow-up by a single central office administrator, the Director of Secondary Education.

Research Design

Participants were divided into two groups based on their years of experience as school administrators. Group one consisted of eight participants with three or less years of administrative experience who served as middle school or high school assistant principals during the 2007-2008 school year. The average number of years of experience for group one participants was 1.5 years. The average age of group one subjects was 41 years, 8 months.

Group two consisted of seven subjects with six or more years of administrative experience who served as middle school or high school assistant principals during the 2007-2008 school year. The average number of years of experience for group two participants was 8.71 years. The average age of group two subjects was 47 years, 8 months.

Study Site

The research for this study was conducted in the Sioux City School District through normal educational and professional development practices. The study did not interfere with the normal educational practices of the district and did not involve coercion of any kind. All data

was analyzed in the Office of Secondary Education, 1221 Pierce Street, Sioux City, Iowa 51105. Data was stored in a locked cabinet in the Director of Secondary Education's office. No individual identifiers were attached to the data.

Description of Procedures

Research design. The exploratory pretest-posttest two-group comparative survey study utilized two naturally formed groups of assistant principals based on the number of years of experience as a school administrator. This comparative survey study design is displayed in the following notation:

Group 1 X_1 O_1 X_2 O_2

Group 2 X_1 O_1 X_3 O_2

Group 1 = assistant principals with three or less years of administrative experience (n = 8)

Group 2 = assistant principals with six or more years of administrative experience (n = 7)

X_1 = required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for assistant principals

X_2 = new assistant principals with three or less years of administrative experience

X_3 = veteran assistant principals with six or more years of administrative experience

O_1 = pretest. Leadership effectiveness as measured by the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form assistant principal self-evaluation.

O_2 = posttest. Leadership effectiveness as measured by the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form: (a) Assistant Principal self-evaluation, (b) Supervising Principal Evaluation, (c) Central Office Administrator Evaluation.

The independent variables were new assistant principals, assistant principals with three or less years of administrative experience, and veteran assistant principals, assistant principals with six or more years of administrative experience. Both groups participated in the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program as one group and were, at no time, differentiated in any way.

Dependent Measures

The following research questions focused on the dependent variable, assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness, in six domains: shared vision, the culture of learning, management, family and community, ethics, and societal context after completion of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program. Leadership effectiveness was determined

by comparing beginning and ending assistant principals' Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation form self-rating scores. Leadership effectiveness data was also collected following the assistant principals' completion of the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program using scores reported by the supervising principal and central office administrator on the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form.

The independent variables were new assistant principals, assistant principals with three or less years of administrative experience, and veteran assistant principals, assistant principals with six or more years of administrative experience. Both groups completed the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program as one group and were, at no time, differentiated in any way.

The school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program was designed by a group of central office administrators from a Midwestern urban school district with input from secondary principals and assistant principals employed by the same district during 2007-2008 school year. Professional development needs for school administrators and, in particular for assistant principals, identified in the literature were given consideration as

the program was designed. In addition, assistant principals were asked to identify the areas in which they felt they needed more professional development. Some of the most common areas identified were curriculum leadership, teacher supervision and evaluation, hiring practices, school finance, and working with families and community more effectively.

Fifty-nine hours of in-service leadership development was designed and implemented over the course of the 2007-2008 school year, beginning in September and concluding in mid-June. Assistant principals as an entire group met biweekly with the Director of Secondary Education to receive this in-service leadership development grow-your-own program. In addition, the Director of Secondary Education met individually with each assistant principal to provide scheduled mentoring and support throughout the program.

The school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program addressed the following topics: (a) effective school leadership with a focus on McRel's 21 Leadership Responsibilities overview (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), (b) the principal's role in curriculum development and supervision with an added focus on the district's curriculum review process, active participation

with content area teachers across the district as they identified the learning target for their courses, and the newly created Iowa Core Curriculum, (c) teacher supervision and evaluation with a focus on the district's teacher appraisal process, individual teacher professional development plans, and electronic classroom walk-throughs using the Downey Walk-through Model (Downey et al., 2004), (d) assessment for learning versus assessment of learning (Stiggins et al., 2006), (e) school finance and hiring practices with emphasis on district-specific information and processes, (f) supervision of special education classrooms with a focus on alternate assessment of special needs students to meet NCLB 2001 requirements, and (g) cultural proficiency to assist the participants in gaining a deeper understanding of the changing culture of the school and the larger community.

Another important part of the leadership development program also required each participant to design, implement, and present a project over the course of the school year. Examples of some of the projects were: (a) the development and implementation of a student mentoring program, (b) a privilege (rather than consequence) system of discipline at a middle school and a high school, (c) a professional development program for special education

teachers, (d) an anti-bullying program for middle school students, (e) pacing guides for each course across the district in the area of high school social studies, and (f) increasing parent and community involvement through the formation of a focus group which resulted in the creation of a family library that houses numerous bilingual fiction and nonfiction books in an Hispanic neighborhood.

All fifteen participants successfully completed the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program and earned state licensure renewal and/or graduate level credit, funded by the district.

Research Questions and Data Analysis

The following research questions were used to analyze new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness following completion of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Leadership Effectiveness Research Question #1: Do new assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program lose, maintain, or improve their beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision, (b)

the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 1a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 1b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 1c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management?

Sub-Question 1d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development

grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 1e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 1f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context?

Research Sub-questions #1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, and 1f were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between new assistant principals beginning training compared to ending training Self-Rating Evaluation Form scores. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Pretest-Posttest Leadership Effectiveness Research Question #2: Do veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program lose, maintain, or improve their beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 2a. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 2b. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 2c. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management?

Sub-Question 2d. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 2e. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 2f. Is there a statistically significant difference between veteran assistant principals who completed the required in-service leadership development grow-your-own program beginning training

compared to ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context?

Research Sub-questions #2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, and 2f were analyzed using dependent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between veteran assistant principals' beginning training compared to ending training Self-Rating Evaluation Form scores. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

The following research questions were used to compare new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness following completion of the required school district in-service leadership development grow-your-own program.

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Research Leadership Effectiveness Question #3: Do new and veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program have congruent or different ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management,

(d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 3a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (a) shared vision compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain score for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 3b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 3c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (c) management?

Sub-Question 3d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 3e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 3f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Self-Rating Evaluation Form domain scores for (f) societal context?

Research Sub-questions #3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3e, and 3f were analyzed using independent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between new assistant

principals' ending training compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Self-Rating Evaluation Form scores. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level was employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Research Leadership Effectiveness Question #4: Do new and veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program have congruent or different ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by supervising principals for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context?

Sub-Question 4a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (a) shared vision compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 4b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (b) the culture of learning compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (b) the culture of learning?

Sub-Question 4c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (c) management compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (c) management?

Sub-Question 4d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (d) family and community compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 4e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (e) ethics compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 4f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (f) societal context compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by the supervising principal for (f) societal context?

Research Sub-questions #4a, 4b, 4c, 4d, 4e, and 4f were analyzed using independent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between new assistant principals' ending training compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principals Evaluation Form scores as measured by supervising principals. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level was employed to

help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Overarching Posttest-Posttest Research Leadership Effectiveness Question #5: Do new and veteran assistant principals who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program have congruent or different ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context.

Sub-Question 5a. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (a) shared vision compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (a) shared vision?

Sub-Question 5b. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (b) culture of learning compared to

veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (b) culture of learning?

Sub-Question 5c. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (c) management compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (c) management?

Sub-Question 5d. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (d) family and community compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (d) family and community?

Sub-Question 5e. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation

Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (e) ethics compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (e) ethics?

Sub-Question 5f. Is there a statistically significant difference between new assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (f) societal context compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form domain scores as measured by a central office administrator for (f) societal context?

Research Sub-questions #5a, 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e, and 5f were analyzed using independent *t* tests to examine the significance of the difference between new assistant principals' ending training compared to veteran assistant principals' ending training Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form scores as measured by a central office administrator. Because multiple statistical tests were conducted, a one-tailed .01 alpha level were employed to help control for Type 1 errors. Means and standard deviations are displayed on tables.

Data Collection Procedures

All perceived leadership effectiveness data was collected through school district program evaluation processes. Permission from the appropriate school personnel was obtained. Non-coded numbers were used to display individual de-identified data as well as aggregated subgroup data. Aggregated group data, descriptive statistics, and parametric statistical analysis were utilized and reported with means and standard deviations on tables.

Performance site. The research for this study was conducted in the Sioux City School District through normal educational and professional development practices. The study did not interfere with the normal educational practices of the district and will not involve coercion of any kind. All data was analyzed in the Office of Secondary Education and Professional Development, 1221 Pierce Street, Sioux City, Iowa 51105. Data was stored in a locked cabinet in the Director of Secondary Education's office. No individual identifiers were attached to the data.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects Approval Category. The exemption category for this study was Category 145CFR46.101(b). The research was conducted in the public school setting under normal educational practices. The study procedures did not

interfere in any way with the normal educational and professional development practices of the participating school employees and did not involve coercion or discomfort of any kind. A letter of support from the school district is located in Appendix A.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program on new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness compared to supervising principal and central office administrator ratings. The study analyzed perceived leadership effectiveness as measured by the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation form in six domains: (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context after participation in a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-you-own program.

Leadership effectiveness data were collected following the assistant principals' completion of the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program using scores reported by the supervising principal and a central office administrator on the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form.

The independent variables for this study were new assistant principals, those assistant principals with three

or less years of administrative experience, and veteran assistant principals, those assistant principals with six or more years of administrative experience. Both assistant principal groups had completed the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program.

The school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program was designed by a group of central office administrators from a Midwestern urban school district with input from secondary principals and assistant principals employed by the same district during 2007-2008 school year. Professional development needs for school administrators and, in particular for assistant principals, identified in the literature were given consideration as the program was designed. In addition, assistant principals were asked to identify the areas in which they felt they needed more professional development. Some of the most common areas identified were curriculum leadership, teacher supervision and evaluation, hiring practices, school finance, and working with families and community more effectively.

Fifty-nine hours of in-service leadership development was designed and implemented over the course of the 2007-2008 school year, beginning in September and concluding in mid-June. Assistant principals, as an entire group, met

biweekly with the director of secondary education to complete in-service learning activities and demonstrate learned competencies. In addition, the Director of Secondary Education met individually with each assistant principal to provide scheduled mentoring and support throughout the program.

Table 1 displays new assistant principals'--who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program--gender, ethnicity, age, and years of administrative experience. Table 2 displays veteran assistant principals'--who completed the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program--gender, ethnicity, age, and years of administrative experience. New assistant principals' beginning and ending training self-rating individual leadership effectiveness domain scores are found in Table 3. Veteran assistant principals' beginning and ending training self-rating individual leadership effectiveness domain scores may be found in table 4.

Research Question #1

The first pretest-posttest hypothesis was tested using the dependent *t* test. The first hypothesis comparing new assistant principals' beginning pretest compared to ending posttest

training self-rating leadership effectiveness domain score inferential analysis were displayed in Table 5. As seen in Table 5, the null hypothesis was rejected for all 6 of the measured pretest-posttest leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The pretest shared vision domain score (M = 3.19, SD = 0.68) compared to the posttest shared vision domain score (M = 4.00, SD = 0.57) was statistically significantly different, $t(7)$ = 5.81, p = .0003 (one-tailed), d = 1.30. The pretest culture of learning domain score (M = 3.38, SD = 0.77) compared to the posttest culture of learning domain score (M = 4.06, SD = 0.53) was statistically significantly different, $t(7)$ = 4.08, p = .002 (one-tailed), d = 1.05. The pretest management domain score (M = 3.38, SD = 0.92) compared to the posttest management domain score (M = 4.06, SD = 0.62) was statistically significantly different, $t(7)$ = 4.44, p = .002 (one-tailed), d = 1.88. The pretest family and community domain score (M = 3.25, SD = 0.63) compared to the posttest family and community domain score (M = 3.91, SD = 0.40) was statistically significantly different, $t(7)$ = 4.41, p = .002 (one-tailed), d = 1.29. The pretest ethics domain score (M = 3.56, SD = 0.51) compared to the posttest ethics domain score (M = 4.00, SD = 0.46) was statistically significantly different, $t(7)$ = 7.00, p = .0001 (one-tailed), d

= .91. The pretest societal context domain score (M = 3.44, SD = 0.48) compared to the posttest societal context domain score (M = 4.03, SD = 0.39) was statistically significantly different, $t(7) = 4.77$, $p = .001$ (one-tailed), $d = 1.37$.

Overall, pretest-posttest results indicated that new assistant principals' beginning pretest compared to ending posttest training self-rating leadership effectiveness domain scores were all statistically significantly greater following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context.

Comparing new assistant principals' domain scores with the self-evaluation rating standard puts their results in perspective. A posttest shared vision self-rating domain mean score of 4.00 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.19 and a rating standard of developing. A posttest culture of learning self-rating domain mean score of 4.06 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of

3.38 and a rating standard of developing. A posttest management self-rating domain mean score of 4.06 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.38 and a rating standard of developing. A posttest family and community self-rating domain mean score of 3.91 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.25 and a rating standard of developing. A posttest ethics self-rating domain mean score of 4.00 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.56 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest societal context self-rating domain mean score of 4.03 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.44 and a rating standard of developing. Finally, new assistant principals' pretest mean self-rating perceptions were overall within the developing category while posttest mean self-rating perceptions were overall within the proficient category. All 6 mean domain scores were numerically in the direction of improvement indicating growth in perceived leadership effectiveness.

Research Question #2

The second pretest-posttest hypothesis was tested using the dependent *t* test. The second hypothesis comparing veteran assistant principals' beginning pretest compared to ending posttest training self-rating leadership effectiveness domain score inferential analysis were displayed in Table 6. As seen in Table 6, the null hypothesis was rejected for all 6 of the measured pretest-posttest leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The pretest shared vision domain score (M = 3.93, SD = 0.66) compared to the posttest shared vision domain score (M = 4.25, SD = 0.61) was statistically significantly different, $t(6) = 3.58$, $p = .01$ (one-tailed), $d = .50$. The pretest culture of learning domain score (M = 3.71, SD = 0.47) compared to the posttest culture of learning domain score (M = 4.11, SD = 0.38) was statistically significantly different, $t(6) = 7.78$, $p = .0001$ (one-tailed), $d = .95$. The pretest management domain score (M = 3.82, SD = 0.53) compared to the posttest management domain score (M = 4.21, SD = 0.42) was statistically significantly different, $t(6) = 7.78$, $p = .0001$ (one-tailed), $d = .81$. The pretest family and community domain score (M = 3.64, SD = 0.59) compared to the posttest family and community domain score (M = 4.14, SD = 0.52) was statistically significantly

different, $t(6) = 5.29$, $p = .0001$ (one-tailed), $d = .90$. The pretest ethics domain score ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.56$) compared to the posttest ethics domain score ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.53$) was statistically significantly different, $t(6) = 4.38$, $p = .002$ (one-tailed), $d = .52$. The pretest societal context domain score ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.59$) compared to the posttest societal context domain score ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.43$) was statistically significantly different, $t(6) = 4.77$, $p = .002$ (one-tailed), $d = .86$.

Overall, pretest-posttest results indicated that veteran assistant principals' beginning pretest compared to ending posttest training self-rating leadership effectiveness domain scores were all statistically significantly greater following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. Comparing veteran assistant principals' domain scores with the self-evaluation rating standard puts their results in perspective. A posttest shared vision self-rating domain mean score of 4.25 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of

improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.93 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest culture of learning self-rating domain mean score of 4.11 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.71 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest management self-rating domain mean score of 4.21 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.82 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest family and community self-rating domain mean score of 4.14 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.64 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest ethics self-rating domain mean score of 4.18 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.89 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest societal context self-rating domain mean score of 4.11 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.68 and a rating standard of proficient. Finally, veteran assistant principals' pretest

mean self-rating perceptions were overall within the proficient category while posttest mean self-rating perceptions were overall within the proficient category. All 6 mean domain scores were numerically in the direction of improvement indicating growth in perceived leadership effectiveness.

Research Question #3

The third posttest-posttest hypothesis was tested using the independent *t* test. A comparison of veteran assistant principals' ending training compared to new assistant principals' ending training posttest self-rating leadership effectiveness domain score inferential analysis were displayed in Table 7. As seen in Table 7, the null hypothesis was not rejected for any of the 6 measured posttest-posttest leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The posttest shared vision domain score for veteran assistant principals (M = 4.25, SD = 0.61) compared to the posttest shared vision domain score for new assistant principals (M = 4.00, SD = 0.57) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.82$, $p = .21$ (one-tailed), $d = .42$. The posttest culture of learning domain score for veteran assistant principals (M = 4.11, SD = 0.38) compared to the posttest culture of learning domain score for

new assistant principals (M = 4.06, SD = 0.53) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.19$, $p = .43$ (one-tailed), $d = .11$. The posttest management domain score for veteran assistant principals (M = 4.21, SD = 0.42) compared to the posttest management domain score for new assistant principals (M = 4.06, SD = 0.62) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.54$, $p = .30$ (one-tailed), $d = .28$. The posttest family and community domain score for veteran assistant principals (M = 4.14, SD = 0.52) compared to the posttest family and community domain score for new assistant principals (M = 3.91, SD = 0.40) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -1.00$, $p = .17$ (one-tailed), $d = .50$. The posttest ethics domain score for veteran assistant principals (M = 4.18, SD = 0.53) compared to the posttest ethics domain score for new assistant principals (M = 4.00, SD = 0.46) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.69$, $p = .25$ (one-tailed), $d = .36$. The posttest societal context domain score for veteran assistant principals (M = 4.11, SD = 0.43) compared to the posttest societal context domain score for new assistant principals (M = 4.03, SD = 0.39) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.36$, $p = .36$ (one-tailed), $d = .19$.

Overall, posttest-posttest results indicated that veteran assistant principals' ending training compared to

new assistant principals' ending training posttest self-rating leadership effectiveness domain scores were not statistically significantly different following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The findings indicate that both groups of participants benefited from the required in-service training program and their self-perceptions improved accordingly. Because both veteran and new assistant principals reported statistically significant pretest-posttest self-perception gains while posttest-posttest equipoise was observed for all 6 posttest-posttest domain comparisons, it may be said that the training was not biased for either group and that a positive response to training may be anticipated from both veteran and new assistant principals alike. Because veteran and new assistant principals' posttest self-ratings were all within the proficient range at the conclusion of the in-service program, they all would be considered equally prepared for selection to the principalship based on the measured leadership domains.

Table 8 displays supervising principal and central office administrator posttest ending training individual leadership effectiveness domain scores for new assistant principals. Supervising principal and central office administrator posttest ending training individual leadership effectiveness domain scores for veteran assistant principals were displayed in Table 9.

Research Question #4

The fourth posttest-posttest hypothesis was tested using the independent *t* test. Supervising principal posttest ending training individual leadership effectiveness domain score inferential analysis comparisons for veteran and new assistant principals results were displayed in Table 10. As seen in Table 10, the null hypothesis was not rejected for any of the 6 measured posttest-posttest leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The posttest shared vision domain score for supervising principals evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 3.93, SD = 0.91) compared to the posttest shared vision domain score for supervising principals evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.91, SD = 0.88) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = 0.05$, $p = .48$ (one-tailed), $d = .02$. The posttest culture of learning domain score for

supervising principals' evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 3.75, SD = 0.78) compared to the posttest culture of learning domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.84, SD = 0.52) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.27$, p = .39 (one-tailed), d = .13. The posttest management domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 4.04, SD = 0.60) compared to the posttest management domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.81, SD = 1.01) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = 0.51$, p = .31 (one-tailed), d = .28. The posttest family and community domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 4.04, SD = 0.68) compared to the posttest family and community domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 4.06, SD = 1.02) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.06$, p = .48 (one-tailed), d = .02. The posttest ethics domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 4.07, SD = 0.55) compared to the posttest ethics domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 4.09, SD = 0.92) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.06$, p = .48 (one-tailed), d = .02. The posttest societal context domain

score for supervising principals' evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 3.79, SD = 0.80) compared to the posttest societal context domain score for supervising principals' evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.81, SD = 0.78) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.07$, $p = .47$ (one-tailed), $d = .02$.

Overall, posttest-posttest results indicated that supervising principals' evaluation of veteran assistant principals ending training compared to supervising principals' evaluation of new assistant principals ending training posttest leadership effectiveness domain scores were not statistically significantly different for veteran and new assistant principals following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The findings indicate that posttest supervising principal ratings all fell within the proficient range between 3.5 and 4.5 on the rating scale, indicating that supervising principals perceived that both groups of participants benefited from the required in-service training program. Because equipoise was observed for all 6 posttest-posttest

domain comparisons it may be said that supervising principals perceived that the training positively impacted both veteran and new assistant principals alike. Because supervising principals' posttest ratings of veteran and new assistant principals were all within the proficient range at the conclusion of the in-service program, it may be concluded that the supervising principals found both veteran and new assistant principals to be equally prepared for selection to the principalship based on the measured leadership domains.

Research Question #5

The fifth posttest-posttest hypothesis was tested using the independent *t* test. Central office administrator posttest ending training individual leadership effectiveness domain score inferential analysis comparisons for veteran and new assistant principals results were displayed in Table 11. As seen in Table 11, the null hypothesis was not rejected for any of the 6 measured posttest-posttest leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The posttest shared vision domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 3.96, SD = 0.37) compared to the posttest shared vision domain score for the central office administrator

evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.69, SD = 0.87) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = 0.78$, $p = .23$ (one-tailed), $d = .43$. The posttest culture of learning domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 3.82, SD = 0.19) compared to the posttest culture of learning domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.72, SD = 0.87) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = -0.30$, $p = .38$ (one-tailed), $d = .18$. The posttest management domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 4.00, SD = 0.41) compared to the posttest management domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.78, SD = 0.93) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = 0.57$, $p = .29$ (one-tailed), $d = .32$. The posttest family and community domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 3.93, SD = 0.35) compared to the posttest family and community domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 3.69, SD = 0.91) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = 0.66$, $p = .26$ (one-tailed), $d = .38$. The posttest ethics domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 4.32, SD = 0.31) compared to the posttest ethics domain score

for the central office administrator evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 4.06, SD = 0.62) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = 0.99$, $p = .17$ (one-tailed), $d = .56$. The posttest societal context domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals (M = 4.11, SD = 0.54) compared to the posttest societal context domain score for the central office administrator evaluation of new assistant principals (M = 4.00, SD = 0.58) was not statistically significantly different, $t(13) = 0.37$, $p = .36$ (one-tailed), $d = .19$.

Overall, posttest-posttest results indicated that the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals ending training compared to the central office administrator evaluation of new assistant principals ending training posttest leadership effectiveness domain scores were not statistically significantly different for veteran and new assistant principals following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The findings indicate that posttest central office administrator ratings all fell

within the proficient range between 3.5 and 4.5 on the rating scale, indicating that the central office administrator perceived that both groups of participants benefited from the required in-service training program. Because equipoise was observed for all 6 posttest-posttest domain comparisons, it may be said that the central office administrator perceived that the training positively impacted both veteran and new assistant principals alike. Because central office administrator posttest ratings of veteran and new assistant principals were all within the proficient range at the conclusion of the in-service program, it may be concluded that the central office administrator found both veteran and new assistant principals to be equally prepared for selection to the principalship based on the measured leadership domains.

Table 1

New Assistant Principals'--Who Completed the Required School-Year-Long In-Service Leadership Development Grow-Your-Own Program--Gender, Ethnicity, Age, and Years of Administrative Experience

	Gender	Age (a, b)	Years of Administrative Experience (c)
1.	Male	33	2
2.	Male	49	1
3.	Male	28	1
4.	Female	52	2
5.	Female	50	1
6.	Male	31	1
7.	Female	47	3
8.	Female	44	1

(a) Note: Mean age for new assistant principals = 41 years, 8 months.

(b) Note: Two participants (25%) were minority and 6 (75%) were Caucasian.

(c) Note: Mean years of administrative experience for new assistant principals = 1.50.

Table 2

Veteran Assistant Principals'--Who Completed the Required School-Year-Long In-Service Leadership Development Grow-Your-Own Program--Gender, Ethnicity, Age, and Years of Administrative Experience

Gender	Age (a, b)	Years of Administrative Experience (c)
1. Male	39	9
2. Male	41	10
3. Female	59	9
4. Female	59	8
5. Male	36	6
6. Male	55	10
7. Male	45	9

(a) Note: Mean age for veteran assistant principals = 47 years, 8 months.

(b) Note: Seven participants (100%) were Caucasian.

(c) Note: Mean years of administrative experience for veteran assistant principals = 8.71.

Table 3

New Assistant Principals' Beginning and Ending Training Self-Rating Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores (a)

Domain Name	Beginning Scores	Ending Scores
Shared Vision		
1.	2.75	3.75
2.	2.50	3.25
3.	2.75	4.00
4.	3.50	4.50
5.	2.75	4.00
6.	3.00	3.25
7.	4.50	4.75
8.	3.75	4.50
Culture of Learning		
1.	3.25	3.75
2.	2.50	3.25
3.	3.50	4.50
4.	3.00	4.00
5.	2.75	4.25
6.	3.00	3.50
7.	4.25	4.50
8.	4.75	4.75
Management		
1.	2.00	3.00
2.	3.00	3.75
3.	3.75	4.50
4.	3.75	4.25
5.	2.50	4.00
6.	3.00	3.50
7.	4.25	4.75
8.	4.75	4.75

Table 3

New Assistant Principals' Beginning and Ending Training Self-Rating Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores (a; Cont.)

Domain Name	Beginning Scores	Ending Scores
Family & Community		
1.	3.25	4.00
2.	3.00	3.50
3.	2.25	3.75
4.	4.00	4.25
5.	3.25	4.25
6.	3.00	3.50
7.	4.25	4.50
8.	3.00	3.50
Ethics		
1.	2.50	3.00
2.	3.50	4.25
3.	4.00	4.50
4.	3.75	4.00
5.	3.25	3.75
6.	3.50	4.00
7.	4.00	4.25
8.	4.00	4.25
Societal Context		
1.	3.50	4.00
2.	3.00	3.75
3.	3.25	4.00
4.	3.50	4.25
5.	3.00	4.25
6.	3.00	3.25
7.	4.25	4.50
8.	4.00	4.25

(a) Note: Data corresponds with Table 1.

Table 4

Veteran Assistant Principals' Beginning and Ending Training Self-Rating Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores (a)

Domain Name	Beginning Scores	Ending Scores
Shared Vision		
1.	3.75	4.00
2.	3.00	3.50
3.	4.50	4.75
4.	5.00	5.25
5.	3.75	4.50
6.	4.00	4.00
7.	3.50	3.75
Culture of Learning		
1.	3.00	3.50
2.	3.50	4.00
3.	4.00	4.25
4.	4.00	4.50
5.	4.25	4.50
6.	4.00	4.25
7.	3.25	3.75
Management		
1.	3.00	3.50
2.	3.50	4.00
3.	4.25	4.50
4.	4.50	4.75
5.	4.25	4.50
6.	3.75	4.25
7.	3.50	4.00

Table 4

Veteran Assistant Principals' Beginning and Ending Training Self-Rating Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores (a; Cont.)

Domain Name	Beginning Scores	Ending Scores
Family & Community		
1.	3.00	3.50
2.	3.25	3.75
3.	4.25	4.50
4.	4.50	5.00
5.	3.25	4.25
6.	4.00	4.25
7.	3.25	3.75
Ethics		
1.	3.50	3.75
2.	3.00	3.50
3.	4.25	4.50
4.	4.25	4.50
5.	3.50	3.75
6.	4.25	4.25
7.	4.50	5.00
Societal Context		
1.	3.00	3.75
2.	3.25	3.75
3.	4.00	4.25
4.	4.75	5.00
5.	3.75	4.00
6.	3.75	4.00
7.	3.25	4.00

(a) Note: Data corresponds with Table 2.

Table 5

New Assistant Principals' Beginning Pretest Compared to Ending Posttest Training Self-Rating Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis

	New Assistant Principals						
	Pretest Scores		Posttest Scores				
Source Of Data	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Effect Size	*t*	*p*
A (a)	3.19	(0.68)	4.00	(0.57)	1.30	5.81	.0003***
B	3.38	(0.77)	4.06	(0.53)	1.05	4.08	.002*
C	3.38	(0.92)	4.06	(0.62)	1.88	4.44	.002*
D	3.25	(0.63)	3.91	(0.40)	1.29	4.41	.002*
E	3.56	(0.51)	4.00	(0.46)	.91	7.00	.0001****
F	3.44	(0.48)	4.03	(0.39)	1.37	4.77	.001**

(a) Note: A = Shared Vision; B = Culture of Learning; C = Management; D = Family and Community; E = Ethics; F = Societal Context.

*p = .002. **p = .001. ***p = .0003. ****p = .0001.

Table 6

Veteran Assistant Principals' Beginning Pretest Compared to Ending Posttest Training Self-Rating Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis

	Veteran Assistant Principals						
	Pretest Scores		Posttest Scores				
Source Of Data	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Effect Size	*t*	*p*
A (a)	3.93	(0.66)	4.25	(0.61)	.50	3.58	.01*
B	3.71	(0.47)	4.11	(0.38)	.95	7.78	.0001****
C	3.82	(0.53)	4.21	(0.42)	.81	7.78	.0001****
D	3.64	(0.59)	4.14	(0.52)	.90	5.29	.001***
E	3.89	(0.56)	4.18	(0.53)	.52	4.38	.002**
F	3.68	(0.59)	4.11	(0.43)	.86	4.77	.002**

(a) Note: A = Shared Vision; B = Culture of Learning; C = Management; D = Family and Community; E = Ethics; F = Societal Context.

*p = .01. **p = .002. ***p = .001. ****p = .0001.

Table 7

Veteran Assistant Principals' Ending Training Compared To New Assistant Principals' Ending Training Posttest Self-Rating Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis

Source Of Data	Veteran Assistant Principal Posttest Scores Mean	SD	New Assistant Principal Posttest Scores Mean	SD	Effect Size	*t* (b)	*p*
A (a)	4.25	(0.61)	4.00	(0.57)	.42	-0.82	.21*
B	4.11	(0.38)	4.06	(0.53)	.11	-0.19	.43*
C	4.21	(0.42)	4.06	(0.62)	.28	-0.54	.30*
D	4.14	(0.52)	3.91	(0.40)	.50	-1.00	.17*
E	4.18	(0.53)	4.00	(0.46)	.36	-0.69	.25*
F	4.11	(0.43)	4.03	(0.39)	.19	-0.36	.36*

(a) Note: A = Shared Vision; B = Culture of Learning; C = Management; D = Family and Community; E = Ethics; F = Societal Context.

(b) Note: Negative *t* test result is in the direction of greater veteran assistant principal mean posttest scores.

**ns.*

Table 8

Supervising Principal and Central Office Administrator Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores for New Assistant Principals

Domain Name and Individual Number from Table 1	Supervising Principal Posttest Scores	Central Office Administrator Posttest Scores
Shared Vision		
1.	4.50	3.50
2.	3.75	3.50
3.	2.75	3.50
4.	5.00	3.50
5.	4.00	4.25
6.	2.50	2.00
7.	4.50	4.25
8.	4.25	5.00
Culture of Learning		
1.	4.00	3.50
2.	4.25	3.50
3.	3.25	3.50
4.	4.50	3.75
5.	3.75	4.25
6.	3.00	2.00
7.	4.25	4.25
8.	3.75	5.00
Management		
1.	4.50	4.00
2.	4.50	4.00
3.	3.50	4.00
4.	4.50	4.00
5.	3.75	4.25
6.	1.50	1.50
7.	4.25	4.25
8.	4.00	4.25

Table 8

Supervising Principal and Central Office Administrator Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores for New Assistant Principals (Cont.)

Domain Name and Individual Number from Table 1	Supervising Principal Posttest Scores	Central Office Administrator Posttest Scores
Family & Community		
1.	5.00	4.00
2.	3.75	4.00
3.	3.50	3.50
4.	5.00	4.00
5.	4.00	4.00
6.	2.00	1.50
7.	4.25	4.25
8.	5.00	4.25
Ethics		
1.	2.50	3.50
2.	4.75	4.50
3.	4.75	4.00
4.	5.00	4.00
5.	4.00	4.00
6.	3.00	3.00
7.	4.00	4.50
8.	4.75	5.00
Societal Context		
1.	4.50	3.50
2.	3.25	4.25
3.	4.00	4.00
4.	5.00	4.00
5.	3.00	4.25
6.	2.75	3.00
7.	4.25	4.00
8.	3.75	5.00

Table 9

Supervising Principal and Central Office Administrator Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores for Veteran Assistant Principals

Domain Name and Individual Number from Table 2	Supervising Principal Posttest Scores	Central Office Administrator Posttest Scores
Shared Vision		
1.	3.25	4.25
2.	4.50	3.75
3.	5.00	4.25
4.	5.00	4.25
5.	3.75	4.25
6.	3.25	3.50
7.	2.75	3.50
Culture of Learning		
1.	3.50	3.75
2.	4.25	3.75
3.	5.00	4.00
4.	4.00	4.00
5.	3.50	4.00
6.	3.50	3.50
7.	2.50	3.75
Management		
1.	3.50	3.50
2.	4.25	4.00
3.	4.50	4.00
4.	5.00	4.50
5.	3.25	3.50
6.	3.75	4.00
7.	4.00	4.50

Table 9

Supervising Principal and Central Office Administrator Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Scores for Veteran Assistant Principals (Cont.)

Domain Name and Individual Number from Table 2	Supervising Principal Posttest Scores	Central Office Administrator Posttest Scores
Family & Community		
1.	3.50	3.50
2.	4.00	3.50
3.	5.00	4.00
4.	5.00	4.00
5.	3.75	4.00
6.	3.50	4.00
7.	3.50	4.50
Ethics		
1.	3.50	4.25
2.	4.25	4.00
3.	4.50	4.25
4.	5.00	4.25
5.	3.50	4.25
6.	3.75	4.25
7.	4.00	5.00
Societal Context		
1.	3.00	3.50
2.	4.25	3.50
3.	4.50	4.50
4.	5.00	4.00
5.	3.50	4.25
6.	3.00	4.00
7.	3.25	5.0

Table 10

Supervising Principal Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis Comparisons for Veteran and New Assistant Principals

Source Of Data	Veteran Assistant Principal Posttest Scores Mean	SD	New Assistant Principal Posttest Scores Mean	SD	Effect Size	*t* (b)	*p*
A (a)	3.93	(0.91)	3.91	(0.88)	.02	0.05	.48*
B	3.75	(0.78)	3.84	(0.52)	.13	-0.28	.39*
C	4.04	(0.60)	3.81	(1.01)	.28	0.51	.31*
D	4.04	(0.68)	4.06	(1.02)	.02	-0.06	.48*
E	4.07	(0.55)	4.09	(0.92)	.02	-0.06	.48*
F	3.79	(0.80)	3.81	(0.78)	.02	-0.07	.47*

(a) Note: A = Shared Vision; B = Culture of Learning; C = Management; D = Family and Community; E = Ethics; F = Societal Context.

(b) Note: Negative *t* test result is in the direction of greater new assistant principal mean posttest scores.

**ns.*

Table 11

Central Office Administrator Posttest Ending Training Individual Leadership Effectiveness Domain Score Inferential Analysis Comparisons for Veteran and New Assistant Principals

Source Of Data	Veteran Assistant Principal Posttest Scores Mean	SD	New Assistant Principal Posttest Scores Mean	SD	Effect Size	*t*	*p*
A (a)	3.96	(0.37)	3.69	(0.87)	.43	0.78	.23*
B	3.82	(0.19)	3.72	(0.87)	.18	0.30	.38*
C	4.00	(0.41)	3.78	(0.93)	.32	0.57	.29*
D	3.93	(0.35)	3.69	(0.91)	.38	0.66	.26*
E	4.32	(0.31)	4.06	(0.62)	.56	0.99	.17*
F	4.11	(0.54)	4.00	(0.58)	.19	0.37	.36*

(a) Note: A = Shared Vision; B = Culture of Learning; C = Management; D = Family and Community; E = Ethics; F = Societal Context.

**ns*

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program on new and veteran assistant principals' perceived leadership effectiveness compared to supervising principal and central office administrator ratings. The study analyzed perceived leadership effectiveness as measured by the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation form in six domains: (a) shared vision, (b) the culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context after completion of a required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program.

Leadership effectiveness data were collected following the assistant principals' completion of the school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program using self-reported scores as well as scores reported by the supervising principal and a central office administrator on the school district's Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Form.

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from the study for each of the five research questions.

Research Question #1

Overall, pretest-posttest results indicated that new assistant principals' beginning pretest compared to ending posttest training self-rating leadership effectiveness domain scores were all statistically significantly greater following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. Comparing new assistant principals' domain scores with the self-evaluation rating standard puts their results in perspective. A posttest shared vision self-rating domain mean score of 4.00 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.19 and a rating standard of developing. A posttest culture of learning self-rating domain mean score of 4.06 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.38 and a rating standard of

developing. A posttest management self-rating domain mean score of 4.06 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.38 and a rating standard of developing. A posttest family and community self-rating domain mean score of 3.91 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.25 and a rating standard of developing. A posttest ethics self-rating domain mean score of 4.00 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.56 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest societal context self-rating domain mean score of 4.03 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.44 and a rating standard of developing. Finally, new assistant principals' pretest mean self-rating perceptions were, overall, within the developing category while posttest mean self-rating perceptions were overall within the proficient category. All 6 mean domain scores were numerically in the direction of improvement indicating growth in perceived leadership effectiveness.

Research Question #2

Overall, pretest-posttest results indicated that veteran assistant principals' beginning pretest compared to ending posttest training self-rating leadership effectiveness domain scores were all statistically significantly greater following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. Comparing veteran assistant principals' domain scores with the self-evaluation rating standard puts their results in perspective. A posttest shared vision self-rating domain mean score of 4.25 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.93 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest culture of learning self-rating domain mean score of 4.11 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.71 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest management self-rating domain mean score of 4.21 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and

represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.82 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest family and community self-rating domain mean score of 4.14 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.64 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest ethics self-rating domain mean score of 4.18 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.89 and a rating standard of proficient. A posttest societal context self-rating domain mean score of 4.11 is congruent with a rating standard of proficient and represents a change in the direction of improvement from a pretest mean score of 3.68 and a rating standard of proficient. Finally, veteran assistant principals' pretest mean self-rating perceptions were, overall, within the proficient category while posttest mean self-rating perceptions were, overall, within the proficient category. All 6 mean domain scores were numerically in the direction of improvement, indicating growth in perceived leadership effectiveness.

Research Question #3

Overall, posttest-posttest results indicated that veteran assistant principals' ending training compared to new assistant principals' ending training posttest self-rating leadership effectiveness domain scores were not statistically significantly different following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The findings indicate that both groups of participants benefited from the required in-service training program and their self-perceptions improved accordingly. Because both veteran and new assistant principals reported statistically significant pretest-posttest self-perception gains while posttest-posttest equipoise was observed for all 6 posttest-posttest domain comparisons, it may be said that the training was not biased for either group and that a positive response to training may be anticipated from both veteran and new assistant principals alike. Because veteran and new assistant principals posttest self-ratings were all within the proficient range at the conclusion of the in-service program, they all would be considered equally

prepared for selection to the principalship based on the measured leadership domains.

Research Question #4

Overall, posttest-posttest results indicated that supervising principals' evaluation of veteran assistant principals ending training compared to supervising principals' evaluation of new assistant principals ending training posttest leadership effectiveness domain scores were not statistically significantly different for veteran and new assistant principals following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The findings indicate that posttest supervising principal ratings all fell within the proficient range between 3.51 and 4.50 on the rating scale, indicating that supervising principals perceived that both groups of participants benefited from the required in-service training program. Because equipoise was observed for all 6 posttest-posttest domain comparisons, it may be said that supervising principals perceived that the training positively impacted both veteran and new assistant principals alike. Because

supervising principals' posttest ratings of veteran and new assistant principals were all within the proficient range at the conclusion of the in-service program, it may be concluded that the supervising principals found both veteran and new assistant principals to be equally prepared for selection to the principalship based on the measured leadership domains.

Research Question #5

Overall, posttest-posttest results indicated that the central office administrator evaluation of veteran assistant principals' ending training compared to the central office administrator evaluation of new assistant principals' ending training posttest leadership effectiveness domain scores were not statistically significantly different for veteran and new assistant principals following completion of the required school-year-long in-service leadership development grow-your-own program for all 6 of the measured leadership effectiveness domain comparisons: (a) shared vision, (b) culture of learning, (c) management, (d) family and community, (e) ethics, and (f) societal context. The findings indicate that posttest central office administrator ratings all fell within the proficient range between 3.51 and 4.50 on the rating scale, indicating that the central office

administrator perceived that both groups of participants benefited from the required in-service training program. Because equipoise was observed for all 6 posttest-posttest domain comparisons, it may be said that the central office administrator perceived that the training positively impacted both veteran and new assistant principals alike. Because central office administrator posttest ratings of veteran and new assistant principals were all within the proficient range at the conclusion of the in-service program, it may be concluded that the central office administrator found both veteran and new assistant principals to be equally prepared for selection to the principalship based on the measured leadership domains.

Discussion

Significant educational reform in our nation will continue to require strong principal leadership to ensure that all students learn at the highest levels, despite the impossibly long list of principals' responsibilities ranging from instructional to societal issues (Crum & Sherman, 2008). The public has placed accountability for high academic achievement for all students on the shoulders of the school leader (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Guskey, 2007; Houle, 2006; O'Donnell & White, 2005; Ramsey, 2006; Ylimaki et al.,

2007). However, significantly more students are coming to school noticeably less prepared to learn due, in part, to the stresses placed on children and the burdens placed on their families (Barrera & Warner, 2006; Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Gross, 2003; Hoffman, 2004; Houle, 2006; O'Donnell & White, 2005). Consequently, the principalship is perceived, by many prospective school leaders, as an unattractive and impossibly difficult task (Catano & Stronge, 2006; Daresh, 2002; Harris, 2001; Hudson & Williamson, 1999; Olson, 2008; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Petzko, 2008; Rayfield & Diamantes, 2004; Robbins & Gerritz, 1986; Winter & Morgenthal, 2001; Zellner et al., 2002). These changing roles and responsibilities along with long hours, inadequate compensation, increased accountability, and insufficient resources and support suggest that probable candidates for the principalship who have earned administrative certification are less than enthusiastic about working in this position (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Winter & Morganthal, 2001). The roles and responsibilities of school leaders have changed so dramatically that it appears that the public has created a job description that is unrealistic in the eyes of many who would have accepted in this challenge in the past (DiPaola

& Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Pounder, Galvin, & Shepherd, 2003; Winter & Morgenthal, 2001).

This well-documented shortage of qualified applicants in all regions, states, cities, and towns across our country is disturbing (Daresh, 2002; Fenwick & Pierce, 2001; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Goodwin et al., 2003; Hammond et al., 2001; Harris, 2001; Johnson, 2004; McCreight, 2001, Michael & Young, 2006; Newton & Zeitoun, 2002; Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Public Agenda, 2001; Torgerson, 2003; Whitaker, 2001). More than 40% of the nation's school principals are expected to leave their positions during the next decade due to impending retirements (Levine, 2005). Even more alarming is the attrition rate of those who enter the principalship. According to Grogan and Andrews (2002), the attrition rate of principals during an eight-year period of time appears to be about 45% to 55%, with a large quantity of attrition happening during the first three years in the position.

The shallow pool of qualified applicants poses an additional reason for the principal shortage (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Donaldson et al., 2004; McCreight, 2001; Whitaker, 2001; Winter, 2002). Fewer competent people are seeking school leadership positions at a time when the call for principals and assistant principals is increasing

(Oliver, 2003). If there is a shortage of aspiring principals, if half abscond the position within the first eight years, and if many of those who do aspire to the position are alleged to be unqualified, the needs of those who are hired to do the job must be addressed (Petzko, 2008).

This widespread shortage of school principals, well documented throughout the literature, has created the urgency for the creation of quality in-service programs for school administrators. Many principals, and those who aspire to the principalship, lack the necessary skills to lead in the schools of the 21st century. However, providing time for leadership development is a challenge in many districts where the principal's day is typically very fast-paced, intense, and fragmented. While there is agreement that administrators need professional development, widespread effective professional development is too slowly becoming a district priority (Odden et al., 2002). In most districts, the opportunity for professional learning for principals is inadequate (Sparks, 2002).

Convincing school leaders to commit adequate time for their own professional development is a concern (Bradshaw et al., 1997). Principals and assistant principals find it challenging and even frustrating to be required to be away

from their buildings to participate in professional development. An additional challenge is the lack of knowledge that many school administrators currently possess about their own need for professional development (Foley, 2001). Professional development for school administrators is just not a priority in most districts and with most administrators (Mazzeo, 2003).

Because studies have shown that leadership skills can be learned (Daly, 2003), more attention has recently become focused on the professional development needs of principals (Houle, 2006). Educators and policy makers now recognize that quality professional development is a major component in educational improvement plans (Guskey, 2003). Currently, many national and state associations provide professional development for school administrators, and numerous federal regional laboratories and for-profit organizations have created and sold training programs for school leaders. Some local school districts are developing more in-service programs to meet the professional development needs of their leadership (Peterson, 2001).

As districts, states, regional laboratories, and for-profit organizations respond to the need for professional development of school leaders, the challenge will be to create professional development opportunities that are less

fragmented and more meaningful (Mazzeo, 2003). High quality professional development for administrators must be different from the passive *sit and get* format of the past because the model of staff development used in the past has not significantly affected school improvement efforts and is no longer an acceptable form today (Zimmerman & Jackson-May, 2003). Effective professional development for school leaders must be structured to prepare principals and other school leaders to meet the demands of their jobs in today's society. Quality professional development requires time that must be purposeful and well structured (Guskey, 2003). The National Staff Development Council's report (2000), drawing on research conducted by Educational Research Service, states that principals need professional development that is long-term, job-embedded and delivered in an authentic learning context, providing opportunities for active involvement and containing a focus on the attainment of high levels of student learning. Meaningful professional development ties new learning to prior knowledge, supports reflective practice, and offers opportunities to collaborate with colleagues about common challenges. Professional development for administrators should be closely tied to career goals and be specialized (Peterson, 2001). High quality professional development

programs must also consider feedback gathered from teaching and learning to guide program development and its evaluation (Mazzeo, 2003). In addition, the NSDC (2000) promotes effective coaching for administrators as a way to work with colleagues to receive feedback and new knowledge, as well as modeling.

Quality professional development for administrators is critical to successful reform efforts, the future of education, and increased student achievement (Bradshaw et al.; Kent, 2004). Improving the skills of those who aspire to the principalship has much potential in increasing students' academic achievement, especially for minority and low-income students (National Staff Development Council, 2000). Schools and districts that are able to effectively respond to the learning needs of all students have an accomplished, knowledgeable principal who is able to communicate the vision and the mission that teaching and learning are expected of each and every student (National Staff Development Council, 2000).

The design of many professional development programs is changing to better meet the needs of the school leaders. Closer collaboration between institutions of higher learning and school districts is changing the structure of professional development programs. In-service programs are

beginning to be structured more like preparation programs with the inclusion of more authentic learning and coaching/mentoring (Davis et al., 2005). The cohort structure has proven to be an effective method for practicing and aspiring administrators who benefit from adult learning theory (Davis et al., 2005). Effective professional development must be a long-term commitment that is focused on student learning needs and achievement. To be meaningful, it must be collaborative, job-embedded, differentiated, and supportive of the district's goals (Zimmerman & Jackson-May, 2003). It has been noted in the literature that professional development may best be provided by supervisors who know the goals of the district and regularly collaborate with schools and principals (Derrington & Sharratt, 2008).

As professional development opportunities for school leaders increase, the focus must be on the evidence that supports its effects on student learning (Guskey, 2003). Studies indicate that principals who experience quality professional development will be more successful school leaders. In addition, they will be more apt to design and implement professional development for their teachers that is meaningful and relevant (Bradshaw et al., 1997). Assisting principals in being more effective will require a

deeper understanding of the challenges of the job as well as the things that inhibit their leadership (Portin, Schneider, DeArmond & Gundlach, 2003). Those who design and deliver professional development for school leaders must consider the research as they support principals in developing the knowledge and skills that positively affect how schools function and how students learn.

Implications for further research. One of the most serious issues in education today is principal recruitment. From a research perspective, little attention has been paid to the recruitment of school administrative positions (Winter & Morgenthal, 2001). In many locations across the nation, school districts are doing whatever it takes to recruit, train, and offer ongoing support for principals, not only to meet immediate needs but to generate a fresh group of qualified administrators.

Short-term solutions to the principal shortage include (a) hiring recently retired principals, (b) hiring assistant principals who aspire to be principals, (c) keeping good principals on the job, rather than assigning them to central office positions, (d) providing monetary incentives for principals that will increase the gap between veteran teachers' salaries and those of beginning principals, (e) recruiting candidates from nearby

universities who are finishing advanced degrees, and (f) considering candidates outside of education (Harris, 2001).

Over the long-term, some urban districts are beginning to institute *grow-your-own* programs, designed to prepare would-be principals within their organizations (Harris, 2001; Lovely, 2004; McCreight, 2001; Potter, 2001; Torgerson, 2003). Many urban school districts have collaborated with local universities to develop programs that combine authentic experiences with the university's offerings (Harris, 2001; Peterson & Kelley, 2001). Understanding the difficulty that principals and assistant principals have in leaving their buildings to attend professional development, the Miami-Dade District recently instituted a plan that offers online professional development courses (Harris, 2001). Some states and school districts are now turning to leadership academies and paid internships under the guidance of a seasoned principal, followed by two years' of professional development, once new principals are assigned to their own schools (Thomson et al., 2003). A recent study of principal development programs found that successful programs aggressively recruited candidates, including strong teachers identified as having excellent leadership potential (Olson, 2007). Although these proactive, coordinated approaches are

experiencing some success in some urban areas, the challenge of the recruitment of quality applicants who are prepared for the responsibilities of the position in other areas of the country continues to be a stark reality. Many of these districts are resorting to using more experienced principals within their district and in neighboring districts as mentors to new and emergent leaders (Cooner, Tochterman, & Garrison-Wade, 2005).

School officials who criticize administrator candidate quality often have difficulty articulating exactly what is lacking in the existing candidate pool (Bowles, King, & Crow, 2000). This raises the question of whether the district has clearly articulated its needs and preferences in the position and candidate qualifications. Although many short-term and long-term solutions to the principal shortage are mentioned in the literature, further research is warranted to determine which recruitment efforts are most successful in attaining and retaining quality candidates for the principalship.

Leadership development programs for assistant principals and others who aspire to the principalship can support the institution by encouraging a collaborative approach to solving the district’s problems while, at the same time, creating a solid collection of qualified

administrators for building leadership positions. Through leadership development programs, participants, who feel included and trusted, dialogue freely and focus on problem solving to benefit the district (Lewis, 1996). Prospective leaders are socialized into the norms and values of the culture of the district, while securing training in administrative responsibilities (Peterson & Kelley, 2001). The assertion that promotion of collegiality and collaboration among future district leaders is thought to help build a sense of community among a group of people who value the opportunity to work together, exchange ideas, and collectively problem-solve must be systematically evaluated and researched before wholesale acceptance of this reform model (Guskey, 2003). Future research should focus on the impact of the recruitment efforts and subsequent period of retention of administrators who have been participants of building this culture of trust and collegiality that supports collective problem solving through grow-your-own programs.

Our schools need principals who are able to address the myriad of day-to-day management tasks while maintaining the shared vision of high levels of student achievement as the focus of the work. Making difficult decisions, communicating with all stakeholders, and possessing the

knowledge and skills to lead others to improve teaching and learning are some of the attributes that are vital for today's leaders of our schools. It is important that assistant principals, curriculum coordinators, and teachers--tomorrow's school leaders who aspire to the principalship--are afforded *grow-your-own* opportunities that place knowledge and skill acquisition squarely within a culture and context that insists upon success for all (Cowie & Crawford, 2007).

References

Adams, J. P. (1999). Good principals, good schools. *Trust for Educational Leadership, 29*(1), 8-11.

Andrianaivo, S., Howley, A., & Perry, J. (2005). The pain outweighs the gain: Why teachers don't want to become principals. *Teachers College Record, 107*(4), 757-782.

Axelman, M. J. (2006). African American youth speak out about the making of safe high schools. *Preventing School Failure, 50*(4), 37-44.

Barnett, D. (2004). School leadership preparation programs: Are they preparing tomorrow's leaders? *Education, 125*(1), 121-129.

Barrera, J. M., & Warner, L. (2006). Involving families in school events. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 42*(2), 72-75.

Beeson, E. (2001). Rural schools: Facing unique challenges. *Principal, 81*(1), 22-24.

Berlin, B. M., Jensen, K., & Kavanagh, J.A. (1988). The principal as curriculum leader: Expectations vs. performance. *NASSP Bulletin, 72*(509), 43-49. Retrieved January 8, 2008, from http://bul.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/72/509/43

Binkley, N. (1995). Reforming teacher evaluation policy: A qualitative study of the principal's role. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9*(3), 223-242.

Black, A. B. (1980). Clarifying the role of the assistant principal. *NASSP Bulletin, 64*(436), 33-39. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from http://bul.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/64/436/33

Bloom, G., & Krovetz, M. (2001). A step into the principalship. *Leadership, 30*(3), 12-13.

Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., Fry, B., & Jacobson, A. (2004). *Progress being made in getting a quality leader in every school.* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Bowles, B., King, D., & Crow, G. (2000). *Viable principal candidates: Superintendents' perspective.* Paper presented at the 2000 American Educational Research Association Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Bradshaw, L. K., Buckner, K., & Hopkins, P. (1997, December). *Singing from the same sheet: Collaborative efforts for leadership development.* Nashville, Tennessee: 29th Annual Conference of the National Staff Development Council.

Breeden, K., Heigh, L., Leal, M., & Smith, L. (2001). *Principal power: Recruiting, retaining, and rewarding quality principals.* Retrieved January 6, 2008, from http://shrivercenter.org/documents/gsip_policy_papers2001/principal.doc

Bridges, W. (1991). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change.* Reading, MA: Perseus Books.

Browne-Ferrigno, T. & Allen, L. W. (2006). Preparing principals for high-need rural schools: A central office perspective about collaborative efforts to transform school leadership. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 21*(1), 6-16.

Bucher, K. T., & Manning, M. L. (2005). Creating safe schools. *The Clearing House, 79*(1), 55-60.

Burch, P. (2007). The professionalization of instructional leadership in the United States: competing values and current tensions. *Journal of Education Policy, 22*(2), 195-214.

Burdette, M., & Schertzer, K. (2005). Cultivating leaders from within. *Educational Leadership, 62*(8), 40-42.

Calabrese, R. L. (1991). Effective assistant principals: What do they do? *NASSP Bulletin, 75*(533), 51-57.

Calabrese, R. L. (2002). The school leader's imperative: Leading change. *International Journal of Educational Management, 16*(7), 326-332.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(3), 221-237.

Chan, T. C., & Webb, L., & Bowen, C. (2003). *Are assistant principals prepared for principalship? How do assistant principals perceive?* Kennesaw, GA: Annual Meeting of the Sino-American Education Corsortium. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED481543).

Clark, D. C., & Clark, S. N. (2000). Developmentally responsive curriculum and standards-based reform: Implications for middle level principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 84*(615), 1-13.

Clements, Z. J. (1980, May). Enriching the role of the assistant principal. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from http://bul.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/64/436/14

Coldren, A. F., & Spillane, J. P. (2007). Making connections to teaching practice: The role of boundary practices in instructional leadership. *Educational Policy 21*(2), 369-396.

Cooley, V. E., & Shen, J. (2003). School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(634), 10-25.

Cooner, D., Tochterman, S., & Garrison-Wade, D. (2005). Preparing principals for leadership in special education: Applying isslc standards. *Connections: NASSP Journal of Secondary and Higher Education, 6,* 19-24.

Cooper, B. S., Ehrensal, P. A. L., & Bromme, M. (2005). School-level politics and professional development: Traps in evaluating the quality of practicing teachers. *Educational Policy, 19*(1), 112-125. Retrieved February 28, 2009, from http://epx.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/19/1/112

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., & Carella, V. A. (2000). *Career crisis in the school superintendency? The results of a national survey.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 443167).

Council of Chief State School Officers (1996). *Interstate school leaders licensure consortium: Standards of school leaders.* Boston: Author.

Cowie, M. & Crawford, M. (2007). Principal preparation—still an act of faith? *School Leadership and Management, 27*(2), 129-146.

Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement: High school principals' reflections on their successful leadership practices. *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(5), 562-580.

Cushing, K. S., Kerrins, J. A., & Johnstone, T. (2003). Disappearing principals. *Leadership, 32*(5), 28-29.

Daly, N. R. (2003). Characteristics that count. *Association Management, 55*(1), 49-52.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Daresh, J. C. (2002, April). *Where are the future principals? Explaining a lack of interest.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED468676).

Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005, August). *Developing successful principals: Review of research.* Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Day, C. (2004). The passion of successful leadership. *School Leadership & Management, 24*(4), 425-437.

DePlanty, J., Coulter-Kern, R., & Duchane, K. A. (2007). Perceptions of parent involvement in academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*(6), 361-368.

Derrington, M., & Sharratt, G. (2008). Evaluation of school principals using interstate school leaders licensure consortium (ISLLC) standards. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice, 5*(3), 20-29.

Deslandes, R., & Bertrand, R. (2005). Motivation of parent involvement in secondary-level schooling. *The Journal of Educational Research, 98*(3), 164-175.

DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(634), 43-65.

Donaldson, G. A., Jr., Bowe, L. M., Mackenzie, S. V., & Marnik, G. F. (2004). Learning from leadership work: Maine pioneers a school leadership network. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(7), 539-544.

Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K., Jr. (2004). *The three-minute classroom walk-through: Changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

DuFour, R. (2003). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 12-15.

Duvall, S., & Wise, D. (2004). Time to support instruction. *Leadership, 34*(1), 23-25.

Ervay, S. (2006). Academic leadership in america's public schools. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(2), 77-86.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Foleno, T (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership.* New York, NY: Public Agenda.

Feeney, E. J. (2007). Quality feedback: The essential ingredient for teacher success. *The Clearing House, 80*(4), 191-197.

Fenwick, L. T., & Pierce, M. C. (2001). The principal shortage: crisis or opportunity? *Principal, 80*(4), 24-32.

Fiore, D. J. (2004). *An introduction to educational administration: Standards, theories, and practice.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Foley, R. M. (2001). Professional development needs of secondary school principals of collaborative-based service delivery models. *The High School Journal, 85*(1), 10-23.

Fullan, M. (2002). The change leader. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 16-20.

Fullan, M. (2005). Turnaround leadership. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), 174-181.

Gamage, D. T., & Ueyama, T. (2004). Professional development perspectives of principals in Australia and Japan. *The Educational Forum, 69*(1), 65-78.

Gentilucci, J. L., & Muto, C. C. (2007). Principals' influence on academic achievement: The student perspective. *NASSP Bulletin, 91*(3), 219-236.

Gilman, D. A., & Lanman-Givens, B. (2001). Where have all the principals gone? *Educational Leadership, 58*(8), 72-74.

Glanz, J. (1994a). Dilemmas of assistant principals in their supervisory role: Reflections of an assistant principal. *Journal of School Leadership, 4*(5), 577-590.

Glanz, J. (1994b). Where did the assistant principalship begin? Where is it headed? *NASSP Bulletin, 78*(564), 35-40.

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000) The study of the American school superintendency, 2000. A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED440475).

Glickman, C. D. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gonzalez-DeHass, A. R., Willems, P. P., & Holbein, M. F. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review, 17*(2), 99-123.

Goodwin, R. H., Cunningham, M. L., & Childress, R. (2003). The changing role of the secondary principal. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(634), 26-42.

Gorton, R. (1987). Improving the assistant principalship: The principal's contribution. *NASSP Bulletin, 71*(501), 1-4. Retrieved February 21, 2009, from http://bul.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/71/501/1

Gorton, R. A., & Kettman, B. (1985). The assistant principal: An underused asset. *Principal 65*(2), 36-40.

Groff, F. (2001). Who will lead? The principal shortage. *State Legislatures, 27*(9), 16-19.

Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 233-256.

Gross, D. (2003). How to lead and where to go. *Connections: NASSP Journal of Secondary and Higher Education, 4*, 23-27.

Guskey, T. R. (2003). Analyzing lists of the characteristics of effective professional development to promote visionary leadership. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(637), 4-20.

Guskey, T. R. (2007). Leadership in the age of accountability. *Educational Horizons, 86*(1), 29-34.

Hammond, J., Muffs, M., & Sciascia, S. (2001). The leadership crisis: is it for real? *Principal, 81*(2), 28-32.

Hargreaves, A. (2005). Leadership succession. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), 163-173.

Harris, T. (2001). How urban schools are solving the principal shortage. *Principal, 81*(1), 10-13.

Hartzell, G. N., Williams, R. C., & Nelson, K. T. (1995). *New voices from the field: The work lives of first-year assistant principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Heinen, E., Webb-Dempsey, J., Moore, L. C., & Friebel, C. H. (2006). Implementing district safety standards at the site level. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(3), 207-220.

Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005). The accidental principal. *Education Next, 5*(3), 35-40.

Hill, J. C. (1990). The principal as curriculum supervisor. *Principal, 69*(3), 6-9.

Hoffman, J. (2004). Building resilient leaders. *Leadership, 34*(1), 35-38.

Holmes, J. A., Jr. (1999). Increasing the leadership role of the assistant principal. *Schools in the Middle, 8*(5), 13-16.

Houle, J. C. (2006). Professional development for urban principals in underperforming schools. *Education and Urban Society*, *38*(2), 142-159.

Howley, A., & Pendarvis, E. (2002, December). Recruiting and retaining rural school administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED470950).

Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. (2002). *Instructional leadership: A learning-centered guide.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Hudson, M., & Williamson, R. (1999, April). Preparing Tomorrow's principals: Meeting emerging challenges. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Research Association, Montreal, PQ, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED440458).

Iowa Core Curriculum (2007). Retrieved January 6, 2008, from http://www.iowamodelcore.org/docs/icc_essentialconcepts skills.pdf

Jackson, A., & Davis, G. (2000). *Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents for the 21st century.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Jean-Marie, G. (2008). Leadership for social justice: An agenda for 21st century schools. *The Educational Forum, 72*(4), 340-354.

Johnson, C. (2004). Reflections on the vice principalship. *Leadership, 34*(1), 32-34.

Johnson, J. F., Jr., & Uline, C.L. (2005). Preparing educational leaders to close achievement gaps. *Theory into Practice, 44*(1), 45-52.

Kelly, G. (1987). The assistant principal as a training ground for the principalship. *NASSP Bulletin, 71*(501), 13-20.

Kent, A. M. (2004). Improving teacher quality through professional development. *Education, 124,* 427-435.

Kerrins, J. (2001). Take this job and fill it. *Leadership, 30*(5), 20-24.

Kersten, T. A. & Israel, M. S. (2005). Teacher evaluation: Principals' insights and suggestions for improvement. *Planning and Changing, 36*(1 & 2), 47-67.

Kienapfel, B. (1984). Supervision of curriculum at the middle level. *NASSP Bulletin, 68*(52), 52-57. Retrieved January 1, 2008, from http://bul.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/68/473/52

Klauke, A. (1990). *Preparing school administrators.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED326939).

Koru, J. M. (1993). The assistant principal: Crisis manager, custodian, or visionary? *NASSP Bulletin, 71*(556), 67-71.

Kneese, C., Pankake, A., Schroth, G., & Blackburn, L. (2003). Challenges in educational administration: A comparison of rural and urban. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review, 4*(1), 11-17.

Leithwood, K., Seashore, L. K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004, September). *How leadership influences student learning.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement & Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lester, J. H. (2003). Planning effective secondary professional development programs. *American Secondary Education, 32,* 49-61.

Levine, A. (2005). Educating school leaders. *Report of the Education Schools Project.* Retrieved June 1, 2009, from http://www.edschools.org/pdf/final313.pdf

Lewis, P. H., & McDade, S. A. (1996). Creating and implementing a culture of leadership. *CUPA Journal, 46*(4), 19-24.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2005, Winter). Teachers as leaders. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), 151-162.

Lile, S. (2008, January). Defining the role of the assistant principal. *NewsLeader, 55*(5), 1, 11.

Lindahl, R. A. (2007). Why is leading school improvement such a difficult process? *School Leadership and Management, 27*(4), 319-332.

Linn, G. B., & Sherman, R., & Gill, P. B. (2007). Making meaning of educational leadership: The principalship in metaphor. *NASSP Bulletin, 91*(2), 161-171.

Lovely, S. (2004). Leadership forecasting. *Leadership, 34*(1), 17-19.

Machen, S. M., Wilson, J. D., & Notar, C. E. (2005). Parental involvement in the classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32*(1), 13-16.

Marshall, C. (1991). *The assistant principal: Leadership Choices and Challenges.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Marshall, C. (1992). The assistant principalship—an overview of the frustrations, rewards. *NASSP Bulletin, 76*(547), 88-94.

Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Mazzeo, C. (2003, September). *Improving teaching and learning by improving school leadership.* National Governors Association Center for Best Practices.

McCreight, C. (2001, May). *Solutions to securing qualified principals.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED452613).

McGhee, M. W., & Lew, C. (2007). Leadership and writing: How principals' knowledge, beliefs, and interventions affect writing instruction in elementary and secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(3), 358-380.

Michael, C., & Young, N. (2006). Preparing the next generation of school administrators: Advice from veteran leaders. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED491530).

Moore, D. H. (1999). Where have all the principals gone? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED429368).

Murphy, J., Shipman, N., & Yff, J. (2000). Implementation of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3*(1), 17-39.

Murphy, J., Vriesenga, M., & Storey, V. (2007). Educational Administration Quarterly, 1979-2003: An analysis of types of work, methods of investigation, and influences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(5), 612-628.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2007.* Retrieved January 6, 2008, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2007/

National Staff Development Council. (2000, December). *Learning to lead, leading to learn: improving school quality through principal professional development.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED467224).

Newton, R., & Zeitoun, P. (2002). Do teacher reactions to features of principalship vary by gender? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED465222).

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (2002). Retrieved February 28, 2009, from http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec02/107-110.pdf

Noguera, P. (2007). How listening to students can help schools to improve. *Theory into Practice, 46*(3), 205-211.

Norton, M. S., & Kriekard, J. A. (1987, October). Real and ideal competencies for the assistant principal. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from http://bul.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/71/501/23

Odden, A., Archibald, S., Fermanich, M., & Gallagher, H. A. (2002). A cost framework for professional development. *Journal of Education Finance, 28,* 51-74.

O'Donnell, R. J., & White, G. P. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 89*(645), 56-67.

Oliver, R. (2003, Fall). Assistant principal job satisfaction and desire to become principals. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review, 4*(2), 38-46.

Olson, L. (2007, May 2). Study sheds light of qualities of best training for principals. *Education Week, 26*(35), 1, 16.

Olson, L. (2008, April 16). Lack of school leadership seen as global problem. *Education Week, 27*(33), 8.

Panyako, D., & Rorie, L. (1987, March). The changing role of the assistant principal. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from http://bul.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/71/501/6

Peterson, K. (2001, September). *The professional development of principals: Innovations and opportunities.* Racine, WI: First Meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation.

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 60-79.

Peterson, K., & Kelley, C. (2001). Transforming school leadership. *Leadership, 30*(3), 8-11.

Petzko, V. N. (2004). Tayloring professional development for a better fit. *Principal Leadership (Middle School Ed.), 5*(3), 16-21.

Petzko, V. N. (2005). Recommendations from principals of highly successful schools regarding principal preparation. *Connections: NASSP Journal of Secondary and Higher Education, 6*, 25-32.

Petzko, V. (2008). The perceptions of new principals regarding the knowledge and skills important to their initial success. *NASSP Bulletin, 92*(3), 224-250.

Potter, L. (2001). Solving the principal shortage. *Principal, 80*(4), 34-37.

Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach, L. (2003, September). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the school principalship.* Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education.

Portin, B., Shen, J., & Williams, R. (1998). The changing principalship and its impact: Voices from principals. *NASSP Bulletin, 82*(602), 1-8.

Pounder, D., & Crow, G. (2005). Sustaining the pipeline of school administrators. *Educational Leadership, 62*(8), 56-60.

Pounder, D. G., Galvin, P., & Shepherd, P. (2003). An analysis of the United States educational administrator shortage. *Australian Journal of Education, 47*(2), 133-145.

Pritchett-Johnson, J., Livingston, M., Schwartz, R. A., & Slate, J.R. (2000). What makes a good elementary school? A critical examination. *The Journal of Educational Research, 93,* 339-348.

Public Agenda. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership.* A report prepared by Public Agenda. Retrieved February 15, 2009, from http://www.publicagenda.org/files/pdf/ahead_of_the_game.pdf

Ramsey, R. D. (2006). *Lead, follow, or get out of the way.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rayfield, R. & Diamantes, T. (2004). An analysis of administrator attitudes toward tasks in school administration. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 31*(3), 253-256.

Robbins, P., & Gerritz, B. (1986). Four training programs for principals. *The Journal of Staff Development, 7*(2), 91-99.

Ruebling, C. E., Stow, S. B., Kayona, F. A., & Clarke, N. A. (2004). Instructional leadership: An essential ingredient for improving student learning. *The Educational Forum, 68*(3), 243-253.

Schmoker, M., & Marzano, R. (1999). Realizing the promise of standards-based education. *Educational Leadership, 56*(6), 17-21.

Scoggins, A. J., & Bishop, H. L. (1993, November). A review of the literature regarding the roles and responsibilities of assistant principals. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED371436).

Sewell, S. C. (2003, Winter). Leadership: Do you manage or lead? *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 69*(2), 54-55.

Shen, J., Rodriguez-Campos, L., & Rincones-Gomez, R. (2000, August). Characteristics of urban principalship: A national trend study. *Education and Urban Society, 32*, 481-491.

Southworth, G. (2002, February). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership & Management, 22,* 73-91.

Sparks, D. (2002). *Designing powerful professional development for teachers and principals*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Stiggins, R. J., Arter, J. A., Chappuis, J., & Chappuis, S. (2006). *Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right—using it well.* Portland, OR: Educational Testing Service.

Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. *Educational Leadership, 39*(5), 346-352.

Thomson, P., Blackmore, J., Sachs, J., & Tregenza, K. (2003). High stakes principalship—sleepless nights, heart attacks and sudden death accountabilities: Reading media representations of the United States principal shortage. *Australian Journal of Education, 47*(2), 118-132.

Tirozzi, G.N. (2001). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary school principal. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(6), 434-439.

Torgerson, C. (2003). Leadership crisis in special education: What can we learn from our current leaders? *NCPEA Education Leadership Review, 4*(1), 18-24.

Torres, M. S., Jr., & Chen, Y. (2006). Assessing Columbine's impact on students' Fourth Amendment case outcomes: Implications for administrative discretion and decision making. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(3), 185-206.

Umphrey, J. (2007). Leading with heart: A conversation with Patricia Buschjost, 2007 Assistant Principal of the Year. *Principal Leadership, 7*(9), 52-54.

Vroom, V., & Jago, A. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist, 62*(1), 17-24.

Walker A., & Dimmock, C. (2005). Leading the multiethnic school: Research evidence on successful practice. *The Educational Forum, 69*(2), 291-304.

Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2006). Preparing leaders, preparing learners: The Hong Kong experience. *School Leadership and Management, 26*(2), 125-147.

Wallin, D.L. (2006). Short-term leadership development: Meeting a need for emerging community college leaders. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*(7), 513-528.

Whitaker, K. (2001). Where are the principal candidates? Perceptions of superintendents. *NASSP Bulletin, 85*(625), 82-92.

Williams, F. B. (1995). Restructuring the assistant principal's role. *NASSP Bulletin, 79*(568), 75-80.

Winter, P. A. (2002, November). *Applicant attraction to assistant principal jobs: An experimental assessment.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.

Winter, P. A., & Morgenthal, J. R. (2001, November). *The impact of school achievement on principal recruitment in a reform environment.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration, Cincinnati, OH.

Wong, H. K. (2004). Producing educational leaders through induction programs. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 40*(3), 106-111.

Yerkes, D. M., & Guaglianone, C. (1998). Where have all the high school administrators gone? *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 28*(2), 10-14.

Ylimaki, R. M., Jacobson, S. L., & Drysdale, L. (2007). Making a difference in challenging, high-poverty schools: Successful principals in the USA, England, and Australia. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 18*(4), 361-381.

Zellner, L., Jinkins, D., Gideon, B., Doughty, S., & McNamara, P. (2002, April). *Saving the principal: The evolution of initiatives that made a difference in the recruitment and retention of school leadership.* Paper presented at the 2002 AERA Annual Meeting. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED467670).

Zimmerman, J. A. & Jackson-May, J. (2003). Providing effective professional development: What's holding us back? *American Secondary Education, 31*(2), 37-48.

Zimmerman, S. & Deckert-Pelton, M. (2003). Evaluating the evaluators: Teachers' perceptions of the principal's role in professional evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(636), 28-37.