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ABSTRACT

This study explored the perceived instructional leadership responsibilities, services, and tasks district curriculum leaders and principals play in providing direct instructional services to untenured teachers. The goal of this study was to provide a description of the instructional leadership responsibilities, services, and tasks that two types of administrators provided to untenured teachers. It sought to uncover overlapping functions, conflicting service or neglected services in five districts, six schools and among 13 teachers.

This case study used document analysis and interviews to explore, describe, and interpret the instructional leadership two types of administrators (district curriculum leaders and building principals) provide to untenured teachers. A historical and professional analysis of the purposes and challenges of curricular and instructional leadership guide this study. This study used literatures relevant to instructional leadership to develop interview questions.

The findings from this study indicated that those instructional leaders were responsible for ensuring that the district’s curricular program was conceptualized, designed, and implemented according to standards that were set by the state. To accomplish these obligations those instructional leaders had both common and individual tasks that they fulfilled.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Defined

District curriculum leaders and principals are important instructional leaders in schools. They are central in improving teaching and learning and in providing instructional leadership services to teachers. In the past, district level curriculum leaders handled most instructional and curricular concerns within their local school district. These leaders served as curriculum consultants and coaches especially for new and struggling teachers. Teachers and other school officials could call upon district curriculum leaders for instructional advice and guidance (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1976; James & Weber, 1953). Often, these instructional leaders gave suggestions and assistance without a formal evaluation (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974). This guidance often nurtured a supportive environment that helped the teacher build competence and confidence in his or her curricular and instructional practices. Some have argued that keeping the instructional leadership task of evaluation distinct from guidance may have helped the supported teacher be willing to identify and correct shortcomings (Armstrong, 1989; Hunkins, 1980; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993).

In recent years, some of instructional leadership tasks have changed as district level curriculum leaders have had to attend to district-wide curriculum standard alignment. Increased focus on school performance linked to student test performance
has involved principals more in day-to-day instructional leadership. While principals in the past have shared some instructional leadership with district curriculum leaders, they primarily focused on the daily fiscal, disciplinary, and facility operation of the school (Educational Research Service, 1982; Goldman, 1966). Supervision of instruction and formal evaluations of staff’s effectiveness constituted two of the shared instructional leadership responsibilities between district curriculum leaders and principals (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974). With increased formal focus on student performance as a measure of school success, principals have been challenged to increase and improve instructional leadership services to their teachers. They have taken more responsibility for ensuring curricular and instructional improvements for teachers and students that raise student performance and overall school success or rankings.

In short, it appeared that much of the curricular and instructional assistance formerly provided by district curriculum leaders directly to teachers, specifically untenured teachers, was waning or changing. It also appeared that principals may have started to take on more of these curricular and instructional leadership responsibilities (Armstrong, 1998b; Fullan, 1991; Portin, 2000). However, some research suggested that principals might not be participating directly in curriculum and instructional activities to support classroom instruction (Armstrong, 1989b; Lipham & Hoeh, 1974; Marsh, 1997; Oliva & Pawlas, 2004).

As such, there is a lack of understanding about current practice. More description is needed to explain the unique, overlapping, coordinated or conflicting instructional leadership responsibilities district curriculum leaders and principals give to untenured teachers. As curriculum leadership has continued to change in
contemporary public schools, more systematic information needs to give rich detail to this process as it relates to untenured teachers. Increased and intense emphasis to improve student achievement levels and instructional quality suggested that current administrator instructional leadership tasks are in flux. It is believed that district curriculum leaders are undoubtedly continuing to play an important role in the process of improving district, school, and teacher instructional abilities. However, as both district curriculum leaders and principals share in the task of supporting individual teachers in their development as instructors, task clarity may be a challenge. Such a changing phenomena needed more attention. This study explores and details these issues in order to guide future research.

    Purpose of the Study

This case study sought to determine the specific instructional leadership principals and district curriculum leaders reported they provided to untenured classroom teachers. It sought to determine the unique and overlapping instructional leadership responsibilities of those two administrative groups. Along with their district-wide task of developing the intended instructional content for all teachers, it was unclear if district curriculum leaders were supporting principals in providing instructional support or if they both functioned separately. It was also unclear what coordination existed between these two administrators. This study sought to clarify these issues.

    Task clarity can help prevent role ambiguity from allowing important instructional leadership tasks to go unfulfilled. Detailed descriptions of instructional leadership responsibilities of both district curriculum leaders and principals could be
useful in understanding how administrators coordinated these important instructional leadership services. Some assumed that the dynamic context of high-stakes testing could have been changing the instructional leadership services of district curriculum leaders and principals to untenured teachers. As high-stakes testing leads to increased focus associated with school ranking, it was unclear what influence this may be having on instructional leadership services (Leithwood, 2001). It may be that both administrators were more focused on teacher instructional support but it may also be that other tasks or values were encroaching on these instructional leadership services. The research detailing the overlapping nature of these instructional leadership services were sparse. It may also be that pressures have increased the likelihood of role ambiguity or neglect. In short, this study provides a detailed portrait of instructional leadership services given to untenured teachers in five districts. This study serves as a basis for future research in the development of instruments to keep better track of the instructional leadership services required by untenured teachers.

This case study used documents (job descriptions), and interviews to create a portrait of curriculum and instructional leadership services. As such, perceptions of principals, district curriculum leaders and untenured teachers were used to triangulate the content, extent, and quality of direct instructional support to untenured teachers.

Significance of the Study

This qualitative study provides detailed analysis and interpretations of current instructional support practices in five school districts. Such detailed analysis and interpretation generated specific lists of instructional leadership tasks performed by these administrators (district curriculum leaders and principals), the nature of their
coordination behaviors, the extent of instructional leadership services, the challenges, and the shared successes of these instructional leadership services. In addition, results from this study may provide valuable implications that can guide in the development of descriptions that insure effective instructional leadership services to untenured teachers.

Research Questions

The goals for this study were formed by a preliminary investigation of curriculum leadership conducted by the researcher, which was informed by an extensive literature review. That preliminary investigation demonstrated an historical shift in instructional leadership tasks of district curriculum leaders and principals and some contemporary changes in administrative instructional leadership tasks between these two administrators. As such, several research questions were developed to guide this study:

1. How do district curriculum leaders and principals describe their instructional leadership responsibilities for supporting untenured teachers?

2. According to district curriculum leaders and principals, how are their instructional leadership responsibilities overlapping or unique?

3. How are the instructional leadership responsibilities reported by district curriculum leaders and principals corroborated by untenured teacher reports?

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework focuses on instructional leadership. In the literature review, instructional leadership was linked to relevant concepts to form the conceptual
framework for this study. Literatures on educational leadership and leadership theory are reviewed and analyzed. Included also are literatures on the historical, philosophical, and technical components of instructional leadership.

Literature on educational leadership and leadership theory contributes to an understanding of broad leadership concepts and levels of leadership. A historical review provides an understanding of the cultural context and the prominent values through which instructional leadership evolved in American education. Further, literatures linked to general philosophies and learning theories furnishes a foundation to understand curriculum and instructional leadership decision-making. Finally, a review of contemporary practice and components of instructional leadership offers a broad understanding of instructional leadership responsibilities, tasks, and services. These theories are then used to help interpret contemporary instructional leadership experiences and challenges. Table 1 provides the conceptual themes and citations of this study.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was to identify the perceived instructional responsibilities, services, and tasks of district curriculum leaders and principals. There were several delimitations that applied.

1. The district curriculum leaders and principals in this study were limited to five school districts of urban, suburban, and rural settings in a Mid-western state as instructional leadership was thought to possibly differ from district to district within a state region.
Table 1

Conceptual Themes and Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Themes</th>
<th>Citations in Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Dantley, 2005; Montgomorie, 1991; Ogawa &amp; Bossert, 2000; Williams-Boyd, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Beach &amp; Reinhartz, 1989; McEwan 2003; Oliva, 1993; Sullivan &amp; Glanz, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 1

Conceptual Themes and Citations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Development</td>
<td>Garmston, Lipton, &amp; Kaiser, 1998; Glickman, 2002; Gordon, 2004; Oliva, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Glatthorn, 1997; Marsh &amp; Willis, 1995; Oliva, 1984; Ornstein &amp; Hunkins, 1993; Shepherd &amp; Ragan, 1992; Tanner &amp; Tanner, 1995; Wiles &amp; Bondi, 1984; Zais, 1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The teachers in this study were limited to those perceived by the researcher to be in most need of instructional leadership services. The term “new” was thought to be too vague for this study. Therefore, the term “untenured” was used for this study to
classify a group of teachers who generally were in need of guidance with limited experience or new to a particular district.

3. To establish a familiar point of reference, this study was limited to elementary and middle schools where teachers were expected to have K-3 or 4-9 certifications/licensures as oppose to content specific certifications/licensures needed for high schools.

Definition of Terms

*Academic content standards.* This refers to State curriculum models that express, in general terms, the expected knowledge and skills to be acquired by students as a result of lessons in specific content areas.

*Accountability measures.* This refers to state or federal mandated testing and reporting requirements about student and school performance. Test scores are often the central portion of these measurements and used to determine a school or district’s student achievement level. In Ohio, this accountability is reported by school and district report cards.

*Curriculum.* Curriculum can be defined as “the formal and informal content and process by which learners gain knowledge and understanding, develop skills, and alter attitudes, appreciations, and values under the auspice of that school” (Doll, 1992, p. 35).

*Curriculum development.* This is the process where goals and objectives are established to guide curricular decisions regarding design, implementation, and evaluation or conduct related to those plans.
Curriculum implementation. This is the process where curriculum and instructional leaders plan and establish the manner a curriculum document or innovation is to be delivered through instructional strategies in the classroom.

Curriculum leader. For this study, a curriculum leader refers to an individual who, by authority and/or skill, gives direction to or has managerial responsibility for curricular processes (curriculum alignment and/or classroom instruction) and implementation that will directly affect the instruction of teachers and the academic achievement of students.

Differentiated instruction. For this study, differentiated instruction refers to the notion that individuals have different needs and learn in different ways. As such, instruction should be varied to meet specific needs, to help individuals develop, and to help them learn.

Instructional leadership tasks. This refers to the moral obligations of administrators for assisting instructors with growth and development of instructional skills, strategies, and knowledge.

Instructional leadership responsibilities. For this study, instructional leadership responsibilities refer to instructional obligations which administrators are legally or contractually accountable.

Instructional leadership roles. This refers to various viewpoints that represent the instructional leadership relationship of administrators to instructors.

Instructional leadership services. For this study, instructional leadership services are programs or services established within schools districts or by administrators for conveying instructional assistance to instructors.
Instructional supervision. This refers to the managerial duty of administrators to supervise, monitor, and report on teachers’ instructional practices through personal and classroom evaluation. It also includes administrative recommendation to instructors to modify to improve instructional performance and student performance.

Instructional support. This refers to actions and services provided by curriculum and instructional leaders and other administrators to facilitate teachers with classroom management and instruction to improved student learning.

Leadership. This refers to the process by which an individual influences the work of another, by direct or indirect interaction. In schools, both teachers and administrators can use their skills and authority to direct the attitude, knowledge, and behavior of other administrators, teachers, and students.

Professional development. This refers to the on-going development of educators, based on the needs of students and teachers, for improved instructional effectiveness. This includes both formal and informal learning opportunities for the faculty.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a multi-dimensional literature review on curriculum and instructional leadership. There are four distinct sections in this chapter. The first section frames this study by defining leadership and introduces the major conceptions of leadership. These ideas set the context for understanding how leadership operates, and impacts school administration, specifically curriculum and instructional leadership. The second section reviews the historical development of curriculum and instructional leadership. These historical factors provide constructs which compare and contrast current instructional leadership practices. The third section reviews the philosophical values and aspects of curriculum and instruction. Also in this section, there is a discussion of the major theories of learning and how they influence curriculum and instructional leadership. The fourth section reviews various professional development services that were used by instructional leaders to support teachers’ instructional practices. The concepts reviewed from this literature are used to analyze and explain instructional leadership responsibilities reported by administrators and teachers in the process of instructional support.

Leadership

Much of the literature on effective schools credited effective leadership as a key aspect in the success of instructional improvement (Johnson & Snyder, 1990). The
quality of leadership by local (principals) and central office administrators was crucial in developing effective instructional practices in classroom teachers (Daresh, 2002; Edmonds, 1979; Ferris, 1989; Klein, 1995; McEwan, 2003). Although administrators were and are school leaders, the concept of leadership extends beyond them and involves many aspects of the organization’s life. It was also very complex (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Daresh, 2002). Burns (1978) states, “leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (p. 2). Nevertheless, research has helped us understand some general concepts of leadership.

Definitions of Leadership

Although the concept of leadership was not fully understood (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Burns, 1978), leadership has been defined in variety of ways. Many of these definitions were either descriptive or normative. A descriptive analysis of leadership defined what leadership was. These definitions gave “a particular set of identifiable, observable behaviors, actions, traits, or characteristics” on leadership (Daresh, 2002). For instance, Sergiovanni and Corbally (as cited by Duffie, 1991, p. 6) described leadership as behaviors that build “an identity for both the employees and the organization, increasing understanding both inside and outside the organization, and making the work of other more meaningful.” Another descriptive analysis of leadership was provided by Gardner (1990), who suggested that “[l]eadership is the process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group or pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers” (p. 3). For Bolman and Deal (1991), leadership was expressed as “a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in
the service of purposes and values of *both* the leader and the led” (p. 296). In addition, Burns (1978) defined leadership as “inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leader and followers” (p. 19).

Normative views of leadership defined what leadership should be and what leaders should do under specific situation (Daresh, 2002). Blake and McCanse (1989) designed a grid model to conceptualize and analyze leadership through two dimensions of attitude concerning people and production. The leader’s concern for followers was shown by a vertical axis. The horizontal axis represented the leader’s concern for production and organizational issues. The two dimensions were placed on a continuum from 1 (low) to 9 (high). The dimensions were united in many ways and represented various theories on the use of power to connect subordinates to production. The usefulness of the grid was that leaders determined the most effective set of leadership attitudes to choose and act upon for a particular organization (Blake & McCanse, 1989; Daresh, 2002).

Among many of these theories, six were benchmarks. The leader with a 9,9 orientation had a high concern for both people and production. To solve organizational problems, the leader emphasized that fact and understanding were acquired. Also, to gain full commitment from the subordinates, this leader sought the input from others and engaged interdependence among them to form a common goal (Blake & McCanse, 1989).

The leader with a 9,1 orientation had little concern for people and a high concern for production. The subordinates were expected to implement jobs. However,
any contributions from them were denied. This resulted in a lack of ownership by the subordinates for the organization’s outcome. Another leadership orientation was 1,9. When the leader had a 1,9 orientation, emphasis was placed on subordinates and establishing friendly relationships. However, the leaders had little concern for the goals of the organization. Production was sacrificed (Blake & McCanse, 1989).

The third orientation blended 1,9 and 9,1. The leaders with this orientation were paternalistic. They attempted to conceal their imposed authority over the subordinates. Through the leader’s thoughtfulness, positive attitudes and compliance from the subordinates were stimulated. Another orientation was 5,5. The leader with this orientation balanced the necessity of production and maintained the subordinates’ morale. The leader sought to keep the subordinates happy, but made known the importance of production. The final orientation in this model was 1,1. The leader with the 1,1 orientation had little concern for both subordinates and production. The leader was distant or apathetic. Little assistance was provided to the subordinates for their understanding of the work or job comfort. As such, organizational effectiveness was lacking (Blake & McCanse, 1989).

Besides Blake and McCanse’s (1989) grid model, another normative view of leadership was provided by Reddin (as cited by Daresh, 2002, p. 102). This 3-D Theory model consisted of a grid with four quadrants of descriptive leader classifications. The model was useful for describing and analyzing leadership. For this model, leadership was again analyzed through people and production dimensions. The dividing quadrants were Separated, Related, Dedicated, and Integrated leaders.
Leaders labeled as Separated had low orientations for both relations and task. Those leaders were often viewed as non-supportive or bureaucratic in some cases. The leaders who were classified as Related had a high concern for relationships but a low concern for task. They were frequently regarded as being either evangelistic or developmental leaders. Others leaders were described as Dedicated. They had low concerns for both people and relationships. However, their concerns for tasks were high. Dedicated leaders were considered to be either autocratic or benevolent depending on the unique circumstance of the situation. Some others were ranked in accordance to this model as Integrated leaders. The Integrated leader also had a high degree of concern for both relations and tasks. However, the Integrated leader was described as being more or less a compromiser and an executive. According to this leadership model, all quadrants could be appreciated. The combinations within the quadrants were not considered as better or worse among one another. Rather, each single combination was thought to be appropriate depending on the specific situation (Daresh, 2002).

Leadership Theory

Burns (1978) identified distinctions in leaders’ interactions and behavior. The differences were classified into two major classifications of leadership, transactional and transformational. Transactional leadership was built on the view that the leader and subordinates had separate organizational objectives. The leaders had to create incentives by making trades and developing clear transactions for rewarding organizational objectives. According to Burns (as cited by Bass, 1985; and Bolman &
leaders “approach their followers with an eye to trading one thing for another” (p. 11; p. 439, respectively).

Transactional leadership set clear job descriptions and itemized duties and the “rewards” to be gained so that the subordinates had confidence in the organization’s possibilities (Bass, 1985). Leaders acknowledged the goals of subordinates by attending to their physical, security, social or ego needs (Bass, 1985; Konnert & Augenstein, 1990; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999; Sergiovanni, 1995).

Sergiovanni (1995) pointed out how transactional leadership worked in schools. “Positive reinforcement is given for good work, merit pay for increased performance, promotion for increased persistence, a feeling of belonging for cooperation” (p. 119).

Through transactional leadership, the first order of change was often met by producing the expected performance of subordinates (Bass, 1985; Konnert & Augenstein, 1990). However, Burns felt there was a leadership quality that went beyond transactional leadership. This was transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership assumed that the leader and subordinates both had a common goal for shaping the organization. This leadership type was concerned with a higher order of change that involved subordinates’ at a deeper level of motivation. The leader built in the subordinates an awareness of the importance of reaching the common goal (Bass, 1985; Konnert & Augenstein, 1990).

Transformational leadership focused on higher-order psychological needs and moral obligations of each subordinate (Bass, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1995). Transformational leaders had a better influence on the motivation and development of subordinates such that they even changed attitudes, beliefs, motives, and confidence
(Bass, 1985; Konnert & Augenstein, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1995). Burns (as cited by Sergiovanni, 1995) stated that “leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (p. 118). Through this leadership both the leader and subordinates were bonded together in a moral commitment to raise the goals of the school (Sergiovanni, 1995). Transactional leadership and transformational leadership were two very distinct leadership models but could both operate in a school to improve teaching and learning. Having viewed general concepts of leadership, we will now review educational leadership.

**Educational Leadership**

Much like leadership, educational leadership was also a very complex phenomenon. Initially, concepts of educational leadership were formulated by ideas of scientific management. Inspired by scientific management, educational leaders managed schools efficiently in both cost and time. As such, educational leaders often established rules and procedures. They also employed the practice of as top-down management for organizational effectiveness (Dantley, 2005; Montgomorie, 1991; Ogawa & Bossert, 2000; Williams-Boyd, 2002). Traditional definitions of educational leadership were often narrowly defined by variables that reflected the corporate world. Such definitions generally focused on psychological, sociological, and business management perspectives and overlooked issues that were specifically related to schools (Montgomorie, 1991; Williams-Boyd, 2002).

However, considerable advances had been made in educational leadership conceptions through the decades. Conceptions of educational leadership had shifted. Contemporary thoughts on educational leadership had begun to expand and become
more comprehensive. Educational researchers had considered other perspectives of social science such as cultural, ethical, historical, moral, political, and sociological aspects of schools to gain an understanding of what educational leadership now means (Dantley, 2005; Montgomorie, 1991). Sergiovanni (as cited by Montgomerie, 1991) provided one definition that focuses on cultural aspects of schools:

Leadership within the cultural perspective takes on a more qualitative image; of less concern is the leader’s behavioral style, and leadership effectiveness is not viewed merely as the instrumental summation of the link between behavior and objectives. Instead, what the leader stands for and communicates to others is considered important. The object of leadership is the stirring of human consciousness, the interpretation and enhancement of meanings, the articulation of key cultural strands, and the linking of organizational members to them. (1984a, p. 8)

Such a definition seems to emphasize the importance of establishing shared organizational values and commitment. Until now, traditional and contemporary conceptions of educational leadership have been reviewed. Next, specific forms of leadership as it relates to curricular and instructional leadership will be viewed.

*Instructional Leadership*

Instructional leadership had been interpreted in various ways (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989; Oliva, 1993). Many forces and changes in the social environment of American schools had determined various definitions of instructional leadership. Instructional leadership was a contemporary term for supervision. Traditional definitions of supervision had generally been interpreted as a process for directing others (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989). For instance, Wiles and Lovell (as cited by Beach & Reinhartz, 1989) defined supervision as “a way of modifying teacher behavior” (p. 7). Also, Glatthorn (as cited by Beach & Reinhartz, 1989) claimed that “[s]upervision is a
process of facilitating the professional growth of a teacher, primarily by giving the teacher feedback about classroom interactions and helping the teacher make use of that feedback in order to make teaching more effective” (p. 7).

Instructional leadership, the contemporary conception of supervision, embraced collegiality, democracy, service, and cooperation (Olivia, 1993; Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). The term instructional leadership referred to specialized services offered to individual teachers and teacher groups for the improvement of instruction (Olivia, 1993). Instructional leadership helped to develop instructional skills by providing teachers with information on their instructional behavior (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989).

McEwan (2003) defined instructional leadership as the ability “to fulfill essential management functions through skillful delegation and collaboration while excelling in creating a learning community” (p. 5). Another contemporary definition of instructional leadership was defined by Alfonso, Firth, and Neville (as cited by Oliva, 1993) as “behavior officially designated by the organization that directly affects teacher behavior in such a way as to facilitate pupil learning and achieve the goals of the organization” (p. 11). Also, Jane Franseth (as cited by Oliva, 1993) defined instructional leadership “as leadership that encourages a continuous involvement of all school personnel in a cooperative attempt to achieve the most effective school program” (p. 10).

Instructional leadership practice has been plagued with ambiguity. Instructional leaders were neither staff nor administration. Lately alternative practices of instructional leadership were explored out of dissatisfaction with traditional methods and to seek change. Figure 1 presents levels of leadership.
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Varying views and functions of instructional leadership become more pronounced as one reviewed the historical context in which it developed. Such a historical review was important because it clarified the origin of many contemporary instructional leadership issues and showed the changing leadership roles. This historical richness provided more effective concepts and coding categories for later analysis of my survey.

In the United States instructional leadership developed at various periods and from many factors (Daresh, 2002; Oliva, 1993). Americans have historically held varying expectations on how schools should be guided (Daresh, 2002; Glickman,
1992). They agreed upon the importance of instructional leadership but often disagreed on the goals and how to fulfill them (Glickman, 1992).

Colonial Period

When American schools were founded, many people were farmers and did not associate formal education with economic gains. Their main interest was for spiritual salvation (Cubberley, 1948; Powers, 1970; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). In communities with the same religious values, children read the Bible, prayed, and observed religious holidays together (Lazerson et al., 1985). In addition, they were expected to follow adult standards of religious and moral behaviors. In addition to religious curriculum, which served as the initial basis for formal education, some colonists later advocated education as the means for sustaining unity within their respective colony (Cubberley, 1948; Tanner & Tanner, 1990).

By the mid 1600s, each region in America established differing types of schools, managerial methods and curriculum for their children (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). The New England colonies, for instance, initially established apprenticeship laws that made both the family and community responsible for educating children. Families taught their children religious principles, basic laws, and an occupational trade. In addition, apprenticeship laws included provisions for outside authorities to intervene in child rearing to support both the child and the colony when education was not furnished by the family as deemed necessary (Kincheloe, Slattery, & Steinberg, 2000; Marks, Stoops, & Stoops, 1971; Urban & Wagoner, 2000).
The “Old Deluder Law” of 1647 in Massachusetts established ownership of schools through local district management. This also marked the beginning of formal curricular and instructional leadership in America. Religious leaders often gave this early leadership. These leaders assumed that religious beliefs and practices should be preserved and passed on to each new generation (Daresh, 2002). Communities with 50 families were required to set up and run schools to educate children. Local housewives were appointed to teach reading, spelling, and writing instruction along with religious principles (Butts, 1978; Kincheloe, et al., 2000; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Parents compensated those teachers with modest fees for services rendered as there were no taxes for salaries. Children of literate parents were usually instructed at home while children from non-literate families were provided a formal education through schools using the Bible, Hornbooks, and primers (Marks, et al., 1971; Urban & Wagoner, 2000).

Furthermore, community members in Massachusetts villages with 100 or more families were also required to establish Latin grammar schools for boys, to prepare them for college. Those boys were taught Latin grammar, English language, composition, Greek, and Hebrew. In comparison, domestic skills were most often taught to girls after completing their formal education (Butts, 1978; Kincheloe et al., 2000; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Urban & Wagoner, 2000).

In New England during the 1700s, there was a major shift in the organization of schools and the curriculum was also significantly altered (Tyack, 1974). Frequently housewives taught basic reading and other lessons, depending on their ability, to neighboring children within their homes. Those tutoring sessions were called Dame
schools. Dame schools and writing schools integrated to form one-room schoolhouses. The teacher was often assigned to twenty students who varied in ages and intellectual abilities (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Many of these teachers had little formal education (Daresh, 2002). A wide range of individualization in both teaching and learning were required. The curriculum included reading, writing, basic arithmetic, and religion/morals. The general teaching method was through recitation and readings (Beauchamp, 1964; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997). During this time, administrative monitoring of teachers was primarily to identify deficiencies in teachers (Daresh, 2002; Olivia, 1993). Teachers were expected to adhere to the commonly endorsed curricular content and pedagogy (Waite, 2000). The administrators, often religious and civic leaders, had responsibility for overseeing the local schools. They made frequent unannounced classroom visits to monitor instruction and correct inaccuracies within lessons. Teacher evaluations often included criteria on teachers’ “fidelity of implementation” of curriculum and instruction. This type of oversight dominated throughout the 17th century in American (Daresh, 2002; Sullivan, 1997; Waite, 2000).

1700-1800s

Through the Revolutionary War, national resources focused on labor issues rather than education. During this period, many schools regressed, failed, or closed (Butts, 1978; Cubberley, 1948; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Illiteracy increased drastically (Cubberley, 1948; Tanner & Tanner, 1990). Also during the 1700s, schools were subservient to the community (Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Schools operated both as educational institutions and as social centers that helped to integrated the...
community. After the Revolutionary War, the religious orientation of instruction gradually shifted to more secular content. Leadership in curricular issues passed more and more to secular groups of community members. These community members held strong convictions in their control of curricular and supervisory decisions for schools (Daresh, 2002; Tracy, 1995; Tyack, 1974). Lessons on Nationalism were added to the curriculum that still was dominated by basic skill and religious instruction (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1990). During this period, the promotion of self-government was emphasized in the curriculum through English literacy (Lazerson et al., 1985; Tanner & Tanner, 1990).

Also during this period, less focus was placed on the quality of instruction (Daresh, 2002). Immigration had increased during this period. This brought about high illiteracy and social complications. Many reasoned that national survival depended on the educational and cultural training of citizens (Lazerson et al., 1985; Tanner & Tanner, 1990). Thus, an important value in curriculum planning was to socialize individuals to accept American norms. This included democratic civic values and English literacy to help those individuals function and participate as Americans (Lazerson et al., 1985; Leinwand, 1992).

Nineteenth Century

During the first part of the 19th century, cities in central and northern states became ethnically and socially stratified. The Emancipation Proclamation, the ending of the Civil War, and the educational jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs all created changes in the national economic system and in the system of education (Cubberley, 1948; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997). By the late 19th century,
industrialization had expanded (Spring, 1990; Tyack, 1974). Increased numbers of citizens left countrysides in search of work in cities (Cubberley, 1948; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Densely populated cities, run-down housing, unsanitary living conditions, crime, intemperance, and poverty all increased during this influx into cities (Cubberley, 1948; Spring, 1990; Tyack, 1974). Many saw the need for a better education of children to help prevent those social problems (Cubberley, 1948). Many school reformers saw public education as a social panacea (Urban & Wagoner, 2000; Vassar, 1965).

Many reformers felt that public schools could promote the spread of democratic values (Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Vassar, 1965). Others dismissed that thought (Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Many southerners, for example, resisted public schools and some had difficulty matching local educational values to the values of the nation as a whole (Church, 1976). Furthermore, efforts to promote public education in the south were unfavorably swayed by its limited amount of urbanization, its agrarian economic system, and its persistent class and caste system (Urban & Wagoner, 2000). So the nation did not have a strong central curricular focus for public education. School leadership was decentralized, which lead to widespread variability in the quality and type instructional and curricular leadership of schools. The state legislatures fought over and eventually passed significant funding laws and outlined the development of local districts (Beauchamp, 1964; Butts, 1978; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Formal education eventually became free for all white children (Church, 1976; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Urban & Wagoner, 2000).
During the latter part of the 19th century, immigrant children were taught the English language and American customs in school. These instructions were to help these children transition into United States life and to prevent social problems (Spring, 1990; Tyack, 1974). Also, to guard children against labor houses, compulsory attendance laws were put into effect. Yet, it took a long time for them to be enforced faithfully (Tyack, 1974).

Along with public education during the 19th century came modifications in the governance structure of schools. Centralized school boards were established with curricular and fiscal responsibilities (Tyack, 1974; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). In Massachusetts school districts held annual elections for school board members. Appointed board members, which generally consisted of clergy, merchants, and representatives of other professions within the community, were entrusted with certifying, hiring, and firing teachers for their schools (Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Tracy, 1995; Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

For other cities, there were no elections. The mayor and city council appointed individuals to serve on school boards. Those school boards were the subsidiary of the local government. Appointed members served to relieve the city from administrative tasks (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tyack, 1974). Aside from their other responsibilities, board members determined the discipline policy, schedule, and curriculum for their schools (Tracy, 1995). They visited classrooms and inspected teachers’ instructional techniques (Marks et al., 1971; Tyack, 1974). School boards sought professionally trained administrators for school supervisor (Olivia, 1993). Both city and state
superintendents were selected to oversee schools (Marks et al., 1971; Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

Most superintendent candidates held advanced degrees but were not trained in the superintendency. A selection was based primarily on the religious persuasion of candidates (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Local superintendents had a wide array of administrative tasks. They examined students for promotion, classified students into age-graded classrooms, arranged for repairs, set clocks, compiled statistics, wrote reports, bought supplies, met with the board, and established graded courses of studies (Burton, 1922; Pierce, 1935; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Rarely did they supervise instruction (Marks et al., 1971; Morrison, 1943).

With rapid increases in the size and diversity of the student population, the role of the local superintendent and the school board changed. Local superintendents took on less school tasks and functioned more politically (Tyack, 1974). Some of their authority was delegated to others for management and curriculum planning (Goldman, 1966; Marks et al., 1971; Pierce, 1935). However, they still had primary authority over local instruction.

State superintendents had little official authority. The character and personality of these individuals (mostly men) determined their type of leadership. Often their influence over teachers came through their activity in educational associations where they edited journals and published new regulations for both school boards and teachers to observe. Generally, they were minimally paid. Only a few females were hired for the superintendency during the 19th century, most were Caucasian males; who were career educators, married, middle-aged, and Protestant (Tyack & Hansot, 1982).
By the mid-19th century some school boards appointed principals to oversee some of the administrative responsibilities formerly held by superintendents (Goldman, 1966; Olivia, 1993). School boards selected principals based on their length of service, grade levels taught, and knowledge of instructional methods, children’s characteristics, and common school problems (Pierce, 1935). Although principals were usually in charge of general operational procedures in school buildings their tasks varied (Goldman, 1966; Pierce, 1935). Sometimes they fulfilled both administrative and nonadministrative tasks, which included teaching, clerking, and interacting with the community (Jacobson, Reavis, & Logsdon, 1963; Pierce, 1935; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Instructional supervision, however, was not initially an administrative responsibility of the principal (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). As uniform courses of studies were made and distributed within the graded school system, the principal’s responsibility evolved to include supervision (Jacobson et al., 1963; Pierce, 1935). Eventually, superintendents freed principals from their teaching duties to devote more time assisting others for classroom effectiveness (Goldman, 1966; Pierce, 1935).

Despite significant changes in the governance structure, the curriculum did not change as quickly during the 19th century. While public schools had gradually replaced religious teachings with character education and citizenry, subject-centered curriculum designs were only slow to emerge. Children learned reading, writing, arithmetic, morality, and patriotism (Lazerson et al., 1985; Leinwand, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1990) as they led for a hundred years. However, after changes were slow to come, popular textbooks contained specific content for each grade and served as the primary curriculum resource (Beauchamp, 1964; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997).
The Lancaster model of education was generally used, by which teachers instructed their advanced students who in turn tutored schoolmates through rote and drill techniques (Tanner & Tanner, 1980; Tyack, 1974). However, reading and writing lessons were still the primary focus (Tanner & Tanner, 1990). Natural and physical sciences and advanced mathematics were often not included in textbooks or teachers experiences and therefore were not central to the curriculum (Powers, 1970; Tanner & Tanner, 1990).

Urban-industrialization brought greater emphasis on conformity and uniformity (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tyack, 1974). The prominent curriculum emphasized knowledge but ignored student individuality and special needs. Immigrant students who were immersed into the dominant American culture were trained to conform to the existing curriculum and instructional methods (Butts, 1978; Tanner & Tanner, 1990). As the school became more efficient in their procedures and services the classroom became more rigid (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Schools were more conventional than its mixed clientele warranted. Many children from all social classes began dropping out. Educators were called to restructure schools in response to the existing situation (Butts 1978; Tyack, 1974). Opposing groups pressured schools. Some educators and parents preferred the existing curriculum. For them varying subjects and teaching was too difficult. Others rationalized that the curriculum should expand to meet new demands in a changing society. They held that knowledge begins early and that young children can understand simple concepts (Tanner & Tanner, 1990).

In the latter 19th and early 20th centuries, curriculum and instructional methods gradually changed. Curriculum began to be informed by psychology and changing
social demands. State laws expanded the curriculum to include new subjects, special programs, and instructional methods. Reading, spelling, English grammar, composition, geography, government, civics, history, arithmetic, science, drawing, and music were now all a part of the curriculum (Beauchamp, 1964; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Tyack, 1974). Also, European instructional styles were introduced to America (Beauchamp, 1964). Pestalozzian object teaching and the activation of students’ senses, reasoning, and judgment were stressed by some (Beauchamp, 1964; Butts, 1978; Hughes & Schultz, 1976). Students were to learn concepts through direct experiences with concrete objects (Hughes & Schultz, 1976). Others promoted sensory learning, developing lessons to match students’ interest and background knowledge (Spring, 1990). Gradually the subject-centered curriculum shifted, and greater emphasis was placed on child-centered teaching approaches (Beauchamp, 1964; Butts, 1978).

**Twentieth Century**

By the early 20th century the governance structure of schools had changed. Superintendents were burdened with greater amounts of administrative duties related to their community’s economic and social conditions (Burton, 1922; Tyack, 1974). Superintendents were able to hire more supporting administrators in cooperation with board approved specifications (Tyack, 1974). Non-teaching staff expanded remarkably. Administrators, supervisors, and other administrative specialists, such as curriculum directors and counselors, were hired (Olivia, 1993; Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).
With expansion came specialization, as school district employees continued to differentiate their tasks to meet varying community demands. This was evident with increased concern about curriculum developed for future employees and an improved quality workforce (Butts, 1978; Spring, 1990). Public schools began establishing comprehensive high schools. Those schools consisted of differentiated curriculums and elective courses that provided both academic and occupational preparations (Butts, 1978; Lazerson et al., 1985; Spring, 1990).

Furthermore, scientific management procedures were borrowed from businesses and began reshaping schools (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tyack, 1974). As such, scientific management methods also influenced curricular and instructional leadership. Various rating scales and observational instruments were developed for appraising teachers. Teaching evaluation used systematic classroom observations (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Instructional leaders looked for teaching principles based on research to prescribe sets of rules for improving teaching (Olivia, 1993). Scientific methods and efficiency concerns continued throughout the 1950s (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000), as the “cult of efficiency” influenced curricular leadership (Callahan, 1962).

At this time, a wide variety of assessments were used to measure and identify differences in students’ abilities, interests, and intelligence to fulfill needs (Spring, 1990; Tanner & Tanner, 1990; Tyack, 1974). Unfortunately, after analysis of students’ abilities, efforts to lessen gaps in achievement were usually ineffective (Spring, 1990). Frequently inequality was fostered. Curricular tracks reinforced ethnic and social class differences (Butts, 1978; Spring, 1990; Tyack, 1974). Children from lower socioeconomic groups were most often directed to a vocational curriculum while others
from upper socioeconomic groups were typically led to a curriculum for college 
preparation (Spring, 1990).

Sometime during the 20th century, curricular values shifted to human capital 
and national economic growth (Lazerson et al., 1985; Spring, 1990). As awareness of 
the effects of education on the national economic system grew, school attendance laws 
were gradually enforced more faithfully among the states (Leinwand, 1992). 
Instruction began focusing more on human relations and group dynamics. Interpersonal 
skills were emphasized. Collaboration among leaders and subordinates became an 
important focus of instructional leadership (Olivia, 1993). Also, the future occupations 
of students were bound to the school. Schools started awarding students with 
credentials to endorse satisfactory achievement of their curricular program (Lazerson et 
al., 1985; Spring, 1990).

During the 1950s citizens were concerned about the ability of public schools in 
keeping the nation as a world power (Tyack, 1974). Legislatures and other instructional 
leaders emphasized science, mathematics, and space technology (Reinhartz & Beach, 
1997). Also, as the 1960s approached, some doubted whether schools could improve 
equal job opportunities for all the nation’s children (Tyack, 1974). These equality 
concerns eventually led to enforcement of civil rights laws and desegregation of public 
schools (Spring, 1990). Also, instructional leadership was affected by justice and 
equality concerns. Many began to criticize instructional leadership practices. Educators 
began looking at instructional leadership critically. During this era, democratic 
instructional leadership practices were clarified and extended (Sullivan & Glanz, 
2000). The focus of instructional leadership was “developing mutually acceptable
goals, extending cooperation and democratic methods of supervision, improving
classroom instruction, promoting research into educational problems, and promoting
professional leadership” (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000, p. 18).

Through the National Defense Education Act of 1958, varying committees tried
to change the public school’s curriculum during the 1960s and 1970s. New
mathematics and science curriculums were developed (Urban & Wagoner, 2000).
There were other curricular changes as well. Those changes included individualized
instruction, open school structures, flexible scheduling, education rights to all handicap
children in the least restrictive environment, and emphasis on energy conservation &
environmental protection (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tyack, 1974; Urban & Wagoner,
2000).

The Nation at Risk report in 1983 influenced over a decade of reform to
curricular, instructional, and organizational policies. Basic academic subjects and
traditional discipline policies were advocated. The consequence of those reforms
resulted in more testing for proficiency of teachers and students. In addition, other
public school reforms included increases in academic requirements for graduation,
formal partnerships with businesses, and site-based management (Gutek, 2000; Spring,
1990; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). Instructional leaders and leadership continued to be
criticized for being autocratic and overbearing. Other alternative conceptions of
leadership continued to be advanced. For instance, participatory democratic or
transformational instructional leadership methods gained much attention during the
beginning of this decade. Such instructional leadership methods involved the teacher
and supervisor in a shared process and focused on improvement of instruction (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

Over the last decade, there has been an increased call for accountability. This has led to emphasis on testing and increased demands for teachers to follow curriculum standards (Cooley, 1990; Gutek, 2000; Ohio Legislative Office of Education, 1991; Urban & Wagoner, 2000). This has also led to increased calls for renewing teaching credentials, teacher education, and instructional leadership for improved teaching.

The review of the historical development of curriculum and instructional leadership showed how governance changes gave increasing control of the curriculum to local boards. As schools became more complex, leadership tasks became more differentiated. That is, the idea and task of instructional leadership evolved through school expansion, varied levels of hierarchy, and demands from the commonwealth (for increased control over the curriculum) (Glickman, 1992; Sullivan & Glanz, 2002; Waite, 2000). The superintendent, principal, and other administrators became increasingly more accountable for curricular and instructional improvements. In addition, instructional leadership encompassed both managerial and facilitative functions (Waite, 2000).

Furthermore, the review of the historical development of curriculum and instructional leadership showed that during these periods many differing curriculum philosophies and basic educational values emerged. Social, political, economic, technological, and moral issues influenced and shaped the values that guide curricular and instructional leadership (Sullivan & Glanz, 2002). Also the historical review indicated the century-old disagreement over the basic characteristics of instructional
leadership (Blase & Blase, 1998). From the early colonial days to the late 1800s, inspectional instructional leadership methods prevailed (Sullivan & Glanz, 2002).

However, by the 20th century, instructional leadership emphasized more collegiality. Later more stress was placed on principles of equality, reflection, and growth (Blase & Blase, 1998). Thus local educational leaders operated within the social values of the broader regional, state, and national communities. Social changes brought new values and philosophies that would influence new directions for curriculum and instructional leadership. In the next section, major curriculum values and philosophies in American education are discussed as they inform and influence understanding of instructional leadership.

**Philosophical Values and Learning Theories of Curriculum and Instructional Leadership**

As the previous review of curriculum and instructional history showed, educational context influenced nearly all curriculum decisions and had varying amounts of impact over the curriculum and instruction (Hunkins, 1980; Ornstein, 1995; Zais, 1976). In this section, various educational philosophies were reviewed. These set theoretical and intellectual foundations provided standards for addressing curriculum decisions (Oliva, 1992; Ornstein, 1995; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Curriculum and instructional leaders often relied on those established philosophical positions of education for making choices that effected both children and school (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Frequently, curriculum and instructional leaders established curricular aims based on an ideology or a value that was framed by these philosophies or themes (Oliva, 1984; Ornstein, 1995). This first
section reviewed four educational philosophies that have had a significant impact on curriculum: perennialism, essentialism, progressivism, and reconstructionism (Ornstein, 1995; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). It then reviewed the role of learning theories.

Perennialism

Perennialists ascribed a great deal of long term validity to facts (Doll, 1992; Hunkins, 1980; Oliva, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Perennialists reasoned that “the cement of education is the common nature of man” (Doll, 1992, p. 30). Since humans could reason, then education was to focus solely on intellectual development. Perennialists believed intellectual development was more important than skill development (Doll, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995; Wiles & Bondi, 1993).

The philosophy of perennialism held that students needed to obtain facts from a basic curriculum. They also believed the intellect was developed through grammar, rhetoric, logic, classical and modern languages, mathematics and the “Great Books” of the Western world. Within the curriculum such subjects as vocational studies, practical studies and physical education, were excluded as these subjects were assumed not to foster intellectual development (Doll, 1992; Oliva, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Students were expected to strive for proficiency, as they were taught through listening, drill, and behavior control techniques (Doll, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993).

Robert Hutchins (as cited in Hass & Parkay, 1993) explained his thoughts on the perennialist’s curriculum this way:

I do hold that tradition is important in education; that its primary purpose, indeed, is to help the student understand the intellectual traditions in which he
Religious and civic leaders expressed a perennialist view of curriculum and instructional leadership during the early history of American education. The educational concern or value then was for spiritual salvation of children. To ensure that religious principles were taught through reading and writing, those curriculum and instructional leaders held inspections to verify compliance to the values and desires that were based on a covenant with God and were generally accepted by the community (Neville & Garman, 1998).

**Essentialism**

Another influential educational philosophy that influenced the public school curriculum was essentialism. Essentialism proposed to prepare students for life by promoting intellectual development and transmitting the American heritage (Oliva, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). There were core factual knowledge and basic skills that all American children needed to know, according to this philosophy (Armstrong, 1989a; Ornstein, 1995). Much like perennialism, the goals of essentialism were for cognitive and intellectual development through a subject-centered curriculum design (Hunks, 1980; Oliva, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995).

Essentialism strove for academic excellence (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Through the curriculum and rigorous examinations, essentialism tried to identify students who were academically talented (Oliva, 1992; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997). To facilitate learning, alternative high schools with differentiated and separate tracks were encouraged for students of varying academic
abilities (Oliva, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Within the curriculum were academic subjects like English (grammar, literature, and composition), mathematics, science, history, and modern foreign languages (Oliva, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Less relevant subjects such as the arts and vocational studies were sometimes included as well (Hunkins, 1980; Ornstein, 1995; Tanner & Tanner, 1980). For the essentialist, the curriculum and instructional leader was considered the most knowledgeable of the standard body of facts. Thus, they were to impart that knowledge to classroom teachers for instructing students in content (Glickman, 1990). Bagley (as cited in Hass & Parkay, 1993), a well-known essentialist, pointed out the significance of this type of education.

There can be little question as to the essentials. It is no accident that the arts of recording, computing, and measuring have been among the first concerns of organized education. Every civilized society has been founded upon these arts, and when they have been lost, civilization has invariably collapsed. Nor is it accidental that a knowledge of the world that lies beyond one’s immediate experience has been among the recognized essentials of universal education and that at least a speaking acquaintance with man’s past and especially with the story of one’s country was early provided for in the program of the universal school. (p. 23)

Essentialism was strongly exhibited throughout the 18th and early 19th century by state legislators, local school board members, and principal-teachers (who were most often the curriculum and instructional leaders then). Those leaders placed emphasis on preserving religion and their cultural heritage within the curriculum. To ensure that religion and cultural values were conveyed in lessons, leaders monitored and inspected instruction. Teachers, materials, and activities were each examined for compliance to the community’s accepted values and desires. Although, curriculum and
instructional leadership by inspections persisted throughout the early 19th century, that leadership practice eventually began to decline (Neville & Garman, 1998).

**Progressivism**

In contrast to the European origins of perennialism and essentialism, progressivism and reconstructionism were developed in America (Ornstein, 1995; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Progressivism emerged because of contention over the existing curriculum which plead too much emphasis on prior knowledge and transition and too little on investigation during the 20th century (Tanner & Tanner, 1980). Progressivism was a pragmatic philosophy that built on processes of discovery and democracy (Armstrong, 1989a; Oliva, 1992; Ornstein, 1995; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Tanner & Tanner, 1995).

For the progressivist, the world was continuously revealing new discoveries (Wiles & Bondi, 1993). To their way of thinking, truth was indefinite, contextual, dynamic, and based on existing knowledge (Hunkins, 1980; Oliva, 1992; Ornstein, 1995; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Progressivist believed that age-old remedies were inappropriate to guide completely modern problems. That was because modern problems faced by each generation were substantively different from previous generations. Although learning about how previous generations solved problems was essential and educational and helpful, progressivists believed discovery and skills of discovery were just as important (Armstrong, 1989a; Doll, 1992; Ornstein, 1995; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993).

Progressivism held that there was no single curriculum that was right for everyone. Individual differences in one’s nature, interest, social conditions, and culture
must be considered when constructing a curriculum (Oliva, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). An improvement of thinking and advancement of social conditions took precedence over content mastery within this curriculum (Armstrong, 1989a; Doll, 1992; Oliva, 1992; Ornstein, 1995; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Tanner & Tanner, 1995; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Progressivism upheld a child-centered curriculum. Social subjects, experimentation, discovery learning, units of study, interdisciplinary teaching and development of problem-solving skills were some of the cherished curriculum features (Armstrong, 1989a; Doll, 1992; Oliva, 1992; Ornstein, 1995; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Wiles & Bondi, 1993).

In the progressivist classroom, a wide variety of instructional resources were used. Teachers acted as facilitators and advisors (Oliva, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Students gained knowledge through active involvement in role playing, using manipulatives, analyzing issues, solving problems and conducting scientific investigations (Doll, 1992; Oliva, 1992; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Some student choice in learning was allowed. Cooperation was promoted as academic achievement was determined by assessing the progress a student made in comparison with his or her initial performance (Armstrong, 1989a; Oliva, 1992).

Kilpatrick (as cited in Hass & Parkay, 1993) compared progressivism with other curriculum types:

The older curriculum was made in advance and given to the teacher who in turn assigned it as lessons to the pupils. It was bookish content divided into separate subjects, in a result remote from life. The pupil in turn “learned” the lessons thus assigned and gave them back to the teacher in recitation or examination, the test being whether what was given back was the same as what had been given out... The curriculum here sought is, then, built jointly by pupils and
teacher, the teacher remaining in charge, but the pupil doing as much as they can... For these learn by their thinking and their decisions. (p. 27)

During the 20th century as local schools gained centralized authority, progressivism in education prevailed. Curriculum and instructional leaders had more control in establishing instructional goals. During that time, leadership progressed through several stages of development. As such, instructional leaders implemented several differing practices to adjust to the influx of students. They initially sought and emulated industrial management processes to improve productivity. The practice of holding inspections continued. However, leaders now gave teachers suggestions and provided them with on the job training. Later during this century, instructional leaders began structuring systematic observations and using rating scales that set the standard for determining teacher effectiveness (Neville & Garman, 1998).

Reconstructionism

Reconstructionism dated back to the 19th century and came from a blend of pragmatist and existentialist philosophies (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). This educational philosophy stressed democracy (Doll, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Reconstructionism embraced the notion that changes in societal conditions allowed for the development of better civilizations (Tanner & Tanner, 1995). Schools existed primarily for rebuilding the existing society. This educational philosophy attempted to increase social values through student activism in political, economical, and social processes (Armstrong, 1989a; Doll, 1992; Oliva, 1992; Ornstein, 1995; Tanner & Tanner, 1995).
A society-centered curriculum was promoted by reconstructionists (Doll, 1992; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). For these educators, the value of a curriculum was in teaching problem-solving strategies and transforming attitudes (Doll, 1992; Ornstein, 1995;). The reconstructionist educator used many instructional materials and promoted social agents through involvement in such issues as unemployment, ethnic problems, health and housing needs (Doll, 1992; Oliva, 1992). A curriculum based on this philosophy:

(1) critically examines the cultural heritage of a society as well as the entire civilization, (2) is not afraid to examine controversial issues, (3) is deliberately committed to bring about social and constructive change, (4) cultivates a future planning attitude that considers the realities of the world, and (5) enlists students and teachers in a definite program to enhance cultural renewal and interculturalism. (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993, p. 55)

In the following excerpt, Theodore Brameld (as cited in Hass & Parkay, 1993), expressed his thoughts on schools and social problems:

The prime responsibility of the curriculum on any level... is the confrontation of young people with the array of severe, indeed ominous, disturbances that now beset the “naked ape” himself... These disturbances are by no means of exclusive concern to the “social studies.” Rather they pervade every aspect of human life across the planet... Education is compelled to create new models of the curriculum that express and dramatize this universality... The new curriculum models and applications of them in experimental practice repudiate and supersede the entire conventional structure of subjects and subdivisions of knowledge that, for much too long a time, have reflected a grossly outworn, atomistic model of both the universe and man. (p. 28)

Curriculum and instructional leadership was influenced by reconstructionism. Notions of leadership were interpreted as a democratic and transformational venture through that philosophy. Curriculum and instructional leaders began serving as agents for developing teaching and improving learning. Leaders employed collaborative procedures that helped to build relationships with teachers. Teachers were more
empowered than before. Both leaders and teachers began working together formally in the process of establishing school communities through shared decision making and policy setting (Neville & Garman, 1998; Glanz, 1998).

Philosophic views of education were important aspects of curriculum and instructional work. These philosophies were useful for instructional leaders in establishing their own basic curriculum and instructional views (Daresh, 2002; Ornstein, 1995). When instructional leaders had knowledge and understanding of themselves, they were often able to use that acquired knowledge as a preface and basis for working more effectively with others (Glickman, 2002). In addition, these philosophies had a profound impact on curricular and instructional decisions. When instructional leaders knew their own philosophical views, priorities were established more effectively. This knowledge allowed instructional leaders to understand their actions, identify their views, and determine if changes were needed in planning the curriculum and instruction (Krajewski, Martin, & Walden, 1983).

Theories of Learning

Educational philosophies were not the only theories that guided curriculum development, instructional development, and leadership. Learning psychologies also served as tools for making decisions on curriculum content and process (Armstrong, 1989; Doll, 1992). Since the 1950s, curriculum and instructional leaders used educational psychologies to help guide their decisions in promoting learning (Armstrong, 1989; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). This section highlights some of the major learning psychologies that influenced instructional leadership. Among differing theories of learning there were two broad groups for which curriculum and
instructional leaders considered and used. The major categories were association theories and field theories (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976).

*Association Theories*

Between these two categories, associative theories of learning were the oldest and longest leading theories within America. Around the end of the 19th century association theories grew as scientific association was developed and incorporated with classical association. Within scientific association were such theories as behaviorism, connectism, stimulus-response, associations, and reinforcement (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). Scientific associationists identified and focused on three variables of behavior: 1) the stimulus situation, 2) the organism’s response to the situation, and 3) the connection between stimulus and response (Zais, 1976, p. 251). For them, learning resulted mechanically through a bonding relationship among stimuli and responses. Scientific associationists reasoned that through a specific stimulus situation an individual becomes motivated to respond in a self-satisfactory way (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976).

With respect to that, the scientific associationist saw individuals’ responses as a confirmation of their knowledge. They also assumed that conditioning or S-R bonding happened through trial-and-error. As a person received extrinsic consequences that person gradually learned to discriminate and recognize responses which were satisfactory (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976).

Association theories held that learning progressed from simple to the more complex (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). To learn new and more complex information operant conditioning must occur. Scientific associationists thought that
behavior was regulated through repetitive experiences of consequences within the environment (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976).

Further, the scientific associationists assumed that consequences effected a person’s response pattern differently. That is, depending on the appropriateness of the consequence for the person and the specific incident a behavior was either reinforced or reduced (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Scientific association theories recognized observable human behaviors only, and were sometimes criticized by their opponents as being “empty box” theories (Doll, 1992; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976).

Within the category of scientific associationism the main theory used by educators for curriculum and instruction during the latter half of 20th century was behaviorism (Doll, 1992). Curriculum planning by behaviorists, involved selection of content (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997), identification of both the students’ existing behavior (Wiles & Bondi, 1993), and finding the desired behavioral outcomes (Armstrong, 1989; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Wiles & Bondi, 1984). Then desired structured learning experiences to foster the behavioral outcomes were established (Doll, 1992; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993).

Scientific associationists held that “the whole is equal to the sum of its parts” (Zais, 1976, p. 259). Thus to structure learning experiences, curriculum developers studied and determined the smallest units of learning within the curriculum (Armstrong, 1989; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1984; Zais, 1976). Then they sequenced those units logically to lead to their predetermined desires (Armstrong, 1989; Doll, 1992; Oliva, 1992; Ornstein &
Hunkins, 1993; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). Instructional leaders with a behaviorist orientation were interested in seeing changes made in students’ behavior (Armstrong, 1989). They assumed that students would model given behaviors as needed from ample practice and proper reinforcements (Doll, 1992; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997).

Thus, they favored establishing and manipulating classroom environments for learning (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). At school students participated in the behaviorist’s curriculum passively (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Instructional techniques included behavioral objectives, skill training, direct instruction, mastery learning, time-on task, educational technology, fixed curriculums, didactic (question-answer) formats, programmed instruction, drill, and standardized testing (Doll, 1992; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Wiles & Bondi, 1993).

Field Theories

As an alternative to associationism, field theories developed during the mid-1920s (Zais, 1976). In contrast, theories within this family attempted to explain the internal operations of learning (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Shepard & Ragan, 1992). Among many theorists who contributed to field theories there were Abraham Maslow, Carl R. Rogers, Earl Kelley, Lawrence Kohlberg, Robert Havighurst, Jean Piaget (Shepard & Ragan, 1992), and Vygotsky (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997). The field theorists assumed that people influenced the learning of one another, yet each person was “the captain of his or her own ship” (Shepard & Ragan, 1992). They also assumed that learning occurred through personal understanding. For field theorists learning was
the reorganization of an individual’s perceptual field along with their observable behaviors (Zais, 1976; Shepard & Ragan, 1992).

A leading opinion of field theorists was that “the whole is more than the sum of its parts” (Zais, 1976; Shepard & Ragan, 1992). Knowledge for them was insight of the total situation along with the existing relationships held among the parts (Zais, 1976; Shepard & Ragan, 1992). They maintained that personal understanding first comes from one’s perceptions of the whole situation before there was recognition of the relationship of parts (Oliva, 1992; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976).

For the field theorist, learning occurred when students restructured their perception to form a new integrated understanding superior to their original perceptions (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). Thus, their curriculum design often highlighted major concepts or problems for students to investigate for relationships held among the details (Zais, 1976). In addition, field theorists assumed there were irregular time periods for which students learned (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). Furthermore, they also thought that motivation was intrinsic and resulted from an agreement between the student’s perceptions and his or her response (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976).

Included within the field theory family were cognitive developmentalism and humanistic theories (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). All field theories were considered developmental in that they specified and focused on developmental changes of students as they interacted within their environment (Doll, 1992; Shepard & Ragan, 1992). Development theories covered cognitive, social, emotional, physical, and spiritual areas (Doll, 1992). Developmentalists saw maturational change and readiness...
of students as precursors for curriculum development (Armstrong, 1989; Wiles & Bondi, 1984). For the developmentalist, the potential for learning was enhanced when there was a match between the developmental levels of students and their instruction (Armstrong, 1989; Doll, 1992; Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1984).

Piaget (1896-1980) and Vygotsky (1896-1934) were theorists of cognitive developmentalism and educational psychology. Comparably they attributed human intelligence to interactions among internal and external factors. They also saw learning as a qualitative, action-oriented process (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997). The “zone of proximal development” was a term coined by Vygotsky to distinguish between levels of learning. Vygotsky believed that student processed information at two different levels. He explained that the first level was a child’s independent performance level. The second level was the child’s potential level through adult support (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997).

In addition, Vygotsky recognized that children gained knowledge through active engagement in learning activities. As children explored their environment they constructed knowledge. He also discovered that development was inseparable from the socio-cultural environment that an individual was embedded. Development could be either assisted or hindered by that socio-cultural environment. In addition, Vygotsky declared that learning was necessary for the overall development of an individual. He thought that development initially occurred between or among individuals to regulate social behavior. Then development gradually became internalized for one’s self-regulation. Also, Vygotsky believed that language or speech led cognitive development. He thought that egocentric or private speech held a self-regulative
function for individuals in solving new and complex problems. To foster higher levels of achievement among students, Vygotskian theory suggested continuous monitoring and evaluation of progress for planning instruction within the student’s zone of proximal development (Hamilton & Ghatala, 1994; Reinhartz & Beach, 1997).

Piagetian theory was another cognitive developmental theory. This theory assumed that students used a mental filing system known as schema or background knowledge for learning. As students learned, information was either assimilated into their existing mental file or accommodated by the creation of a new file. Furthermore this theory suggested that students strived to maintain a state of equilibrium among those mental processes (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997).

Piaget established four cognitive stages of developmental behaviors—Sensorimotor, Preoperational, Concrete, and Formal. The Sensorimotor stage generally emerged from birth to age 2. This stage was characterized by the child’s coordination of sensory perceptions with his or her environment. Next came the Preoperational stage. This stage occurred most often between the ages of 2 and 6. During this stage the child was very egocentric; but his or her language and conceptual development improved more. The Concrete stage was third stage in the progression. This stage usually happened between the ages of 7 and 11. During this stage the child’s cognitive processing matured which allowed him or her to perform logical operations. The final developmental stage was the Formal stage. This stage frequently occurred from age 11 through adulthood. This formal stage was characterized by the individual’s ability to function at the abstract level and use hypothetical reasoning (Reinhartz & Beach, 1997).
In addition to cognitive developmental theories, there were humanistic theories. Abraham Maslow (1908-1970) advanced a theory that all behaviors were driven by psychological needs. He identified five psychological needs that emerged as lower level needs were met (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993; Zais, 1976). The psychological needs he named were (a) survival, (b) safety, (c) belonging and love, (d) respect and self-esteem, and (e) self-actualization (Wiles & Bondi, 1993; Zais, 1976).

Maslow assumed that as lower level needs were met, energies were freed-up for seeking more complex need satisfactions (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). However, if basic needs were unfulfilled the individual began to take on deficiency-motivated behaviors, as he or she perceived distortions in self and the surroundings (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). Maslow further assumed that when persons’ basic needs were satisfied they were less wrapped up by the need and were more psychologically healthy. The person interpreted situations more objectively. The person self-actualized or demonstrated growth-motivating behaviors (Zais, 1976). Maslow’s theory had implications for the curriculum as it suggested that there was a connection between one’s attitude and learning (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993).

Instructional leaders who subscribed to field approaches either cognitive or humanistic theories, were concerned about the mental processes of students as a support for adequate development (Armstrong, 1989; Oliva, 1992; Tanner & Tanner, 1995; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Through positive experiences they attempted to help their students develop respectable self-concepts as well as an understanding of the world (Oliva, 1992; Wiles & Bondi, 1993). In addition, instructional workers who subscribed to field theory approaches were likely to incorporate creativity, active involvement, and
manipulation of content within their programs so that students constructioned knowledge for themselves (Armstrong, 1989; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Wiles & Bondi, 1984). These curriculum and instructional workers were likely to structure the curriculum so that relationships among parts were shown (Oliva, 1992). Furthermore, they planned curricular instructions based on student needs and interests to foster natural motivation (Wiles & Bondi, 1993). Often, these curriculum and instructional workers tried to make curriculum content relevant through simulations of experiences held by their students. To enhance comprehension they were apt to provide students with opportunities to explore (Oliva, 1992).

Theories of learning also had a profound impact on curriculum and instructional leadership. These broad theories of learning promoted views of intelligence that were integrated into curricular and instructional choices (Doll, 1992; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). Each theory had its own distinct virtue, materials, techniques, and roles for helping students to learn (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993; Wiles & Bondi, 1984). As such, instructional leaders were given opportunities to examine theories of learning for incorporating various aspects of them into the curriculum and instruction for more effectiveness (Doll, 1992; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993).

As understandings of philosophies and theories changed, new views of curriculum and instructional leadership also emerged. Different foci from in the past -- self-renewal, reciprocal group relationships, and learning partnerships -- had been advanced. New knowledge on teaching and learning showed that a school’s culture influenced professional practice much more than knowledge gained about teaching. As such, contemporary curriculum and instructional leaders took on roles as architects of
social ecology and built curriculum on teacher communities and relationships. Also, they began getting more skillful at influencing and supporting healthy school systems (Garmston, Lipton, & Kaiser, 1998).

Thus far, this literature review has presented the historical and philosophical foundations that undergird instructional leadership. The next section defines the functions of professional development and specifically illustrates instructional leadership in contemporary practice.

Professional Development and Curriculum Leadership

Practices and Components

Professional development programs have been an important way schools have fostered change and improved teaching and learning. In this forth section, components of professional development will be reviewed and miscellaneous components of curriculum development will be review.

Curriculum Forms and Classifications

Shepard and Ragan (1992) identified three traditional curriculum classification systems. Included within this curriculum classification system were (a) courses, (b) documents, and (c) experiences. The category of courses included the school’s entire program of study, a series of course offerings, and any particular course offered (Shepard & Ragan, 1992; Zais, 1976). Documents were the guides, developed plans, designs, and action plans of writers and educators for program implementation. The categorical conception of experiences defined a curriculum as “that reconstruction of knowledge and experience that enables the learner to grow in exercising intelligent control of subsequent knowledge and experience” (Tanner & Tanner, 1995, p. 189).
Additionally, Caswell & Campbell (1935) stated curriculum was “composed of all the experiences children have under the guidance of teachers” (p. 66).

Curriculum Levels

Aside from various ways in which a curriculum can be classified, there were several levels of curricula. These were the recommended, written, taught, resourced, experienced, and tested curriculums (Glatthorn, 1997; Goodlad, 1979; Hill, 1990). The recommended curriculum consisted of instructional recommendations from scholars and professional organizations in various fields of study (Glatthorn, 1997). The written curriculum provided the structural outline for subjects. It was the formal document from the state department of education. The taught curriculum was locally produced documents. Included within this curriculum level were such records as the district level curriculum guides and the scope and sequence (Goodlad, 1979; Hill, 1990).

The resourced curriculum included textbooks and other learning resources that were useful in supporting the curriculum (Glatthorn, 1997; Goodlad, 1979; Hill, 1990). Vast amounts of commercially made instructional materials were available for assisting programs (Goodlad, 1979). The experienced curriculum included background knowledge, motivation, learning style, experiences and that which was actually mastered by the student. The tested curriculum used a variety of measurement instruments and strategies. Such instruments typically incorporated standardized assessments, interviews, anecdotal records, and state-mandated testing for identifying cognitive outcomes from the curriculum (Glatthorn, 1997; Goodlad, 1979; Hill, 1990).
**Curricular Purposes**

In addition to varying forms and levels of a curriculum, disagreement existed on the purpose of curriculum and its aims, goals, and objectives. Curriculum aims were influenced by societal views that directly or indirectly shaped school programs (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). They were value-laden needs that revealed philosophical positions of a society (Oliva, 1989; Oliva, 1993 Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). Aim statements specified educational desires for students that schools were to foster through the curriculum (Hunkins, 1980; Oliva, 1984; Pratt, 1980).

Curriculum objectives provided more specificity and guidance than curriculum goals and aims. Objectives were needed for planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating programs (Kelly, 1977; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). A curriculum objective stated the specific changes to occur because of the learning experience (Pratt, 1980; Shepherd & Ragan, 1992).

**Instructional Development**

Curriculum development and instructional development were related concepts (Gordon, 2004). Curriculum development was associated with what the document stated needed to be taught. In contrast, instructional development, however, was affiliated with how the curriculum was taught within classrooms (Gordon, 2004; Oliva, 1984). The goal of professional development in instructional development was to foster quality instruction. Professional development aimed at improving teaching and learning often involved development of new instructional strategies such as student-centered instruction and differentiated instruction (Gordon, 2004).
In regards to instructional leadership and instructional development of teachers, knowledge gained over the decade on teaching and learning had been extensive and continued to grow (Glickman, 2002; Garmston, Lipton, & Kaiser, 1998). There were new learning standards, assessments, new roles, and new responsibilities for educators (Glickman, 2002). This suggested that instructional leaders’ work with individual teachers was an on-going process. Consequently, a more efficient way for educators to gain and maintain proficiency was through group oriented professional development activities (Garmston et al., 1998).

*Student Achievement*

Increase calls for accountability have increased many states’ interest in assessing student achievement at regular intervals. The state ordered many schools to administer high-stakes tests to students. As such, teachers were obligated to prepare students for these tests. Besides preparing students for testing, teachers sensed a need to ensure that quality instruction was provided as well. Through professional development teachers worked to improve authentic (teacher-made) assessments to be used at the classroom level. Teachers learned to measure learning and how to modify tests for at-risk learners. They were provided help in constructing higher order and clearer test items. For example, test items may have been constructed thorough Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy. Of many classification systems, Bloom developed a taxonomy that theoretically divided objectives into three domains: 1) cognitive 2) affective, and 3) psychomotor (Zais, 1976). Objectives that applied to intellectual tasks were classified in the taxonomy under the cognitive domain. For instructional and
curriculum planning, this cognitive taxonomy was most useful for formulating the objectives (Tanner & Tanner, 1995; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993).

Within the cognitive domain were six levels of thinking ranging from simple to complex (Zais, 1976). They were (a) knowledge, (b) comprehension, (c) application, (d) analysis, (e) synthesis, and (f) evaluation (Wiles & Bondi, 1984). Cognitive objectives that were thoroughly defined focused on students, specified the action, explained the conditions, and determined performance (Oliva, 1984). Some opponents, however, disapproved the use of behavioral objectives for planning. These objectives did not apply to complex tasks that involved (a) internalization of values, (b) analytic thinking, and (c) synthetic thinking (Zais, 1976).

The next domain was affective. This domain encompassed objectives for interest, feelings, attitudes, appreciations, and values (Zais, 1976; Tanner & Tanner, 1995). The intangibility of some objectives in the affective domain made learning difficult to confirm. As such, there were certain indicators of learning that were not measurable (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993).

The psychomotor domain was the final domain within the taxonomy. This domain involved objectives that focused on the development of fine and gross motor skills. This psychomotor domain was divided into four skill levels (Zais, 1976). The levels were (a) observing, (b) imitating, (c) practicing, and (d) adapting (Wiles & Bondi, 1984).

Also, teachers learned to align performance tasks directly to curriculum objectives. Curriculum alignment was an effort to maximize the academic achievement of learners as measured through their scores on standardized tests by matching the
Uniformity was provided through curriculum alignment and fragmentation was minimized (Glatthorn, 1997; Marsh & Willis, 1995). Curriculum alignment was a process that aligned all curricular levels for accountability between local school schools and the state (Glatthorn, 1997; Marsh & Willis, 1995; Shepherd & Ragan, 1992). English (as cited in Glatthorn, 1997) confirmed that curriculum alignment had been established two ways, by either “developing the curriculum first and then finding a test to match; … (or locating) the test first and then developing a curriculum to match.” (p. 79)

Also, among many methods for assessing learning, teachers constructed rubrics. The rubrics were then used as an instrument for assessing learning and an instructional aid to show the criteria needed. When students were given opportunities to explain their work, teachers gained a better understanding of their learning processes.

**Instructional Service Structures**

In addition to grounding curricular and instructional decisions in historical, philosophical, and contemporary issues of instructional leadership, instructional leaders must also know various instructional services structures that can be established to support teachers’ understanding and implementation of an innovation. In this section, various instructional service structures were reported. Also components of those services were reviewed.

Later the tasks of instructional leaders are described. The reported instructional service structures comprised (a) training, (b) reflective inquiry, and (c) collegial support (Gordon, 2004). Descriptions of the instructional leaders’ approaches and tasks
in each of the implementation process will be provided. Next the planning and evaluation components for these instructional services are described. The functions of professional development will follow (curriculum development, instructional development, and improvement of student assessment).

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision was a specific form of direct classroom supervision intended for improvement of instruction and increased professional growth of individual teachers (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). This structure was usually used in line relationships (Glickman, 2002). The supervisor collected data for the teacher. Then provided the data and helped the teacher to use the information for effective instructional improvements (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Sergiovanni & Starratt (1998) stated that clinical supervision assumed:

...that the school curriculum is, in reality, what teachers do day by day, that changes in curriculum and in teaching formats require changes in how teachers think about and understand their teaching and how they behave in classrooms; that supervision is a process for which both supervisors and teachers are responsible; that the focus of supervision is on teacher strengths; that given the right conditions teachers are willing and able to improve; that teachers have large reservoirs of talent, often unused; and that teachers derive satisfaction from challenging work. (p. 232)

Among many models for observing and assisting teachers, clinical supervision was often thought of as an observational process consisting of various stages. (Oliva, 1993). Among many models, Glickman (1990) described a five-step model of clinical supervision for assisting teachers. The steps were (a) pre-conferencing, (b) classroom observation, (c) analysis of the observation and selection of conference approach, (d) post-conference, and (e) critique. The first step was pre-conferencing. During the pre-
conference the instructional leader and the teacher determined the purpose and focus of the conference. Also, they decided on the times for the classroom observation and the post-conference. The next step was the actual classroom observation. The plans that were established between the instructional leader and teacher, during the pre-conference, were followed.

The analysis of the classroom observation and selection of a conference approach was determined for the third step. During this step, the instructional leader studied the collected data form the observation to form interpretations about the classroom instruction. The post-conference was the fourth step. The post-conference was held for the teacher’s reflection and for clarification of plans for additional instructional improvement. A fifth step completed the clinical supervision process. During this final step the teacher critiqued the format and procedures of this process for the instructional leader to make possible revisions (Glickman, 1990).

Many professors and textbook authors endorsed the use of clinical supervision. Clinical supervision suggested that through a prescribed formal process of collaboration, teaching could be improved. However, many schools rejected clinical supervision. Yet the goal of instructional supervision during the 1970s remained for the improvement of teaching and student learning through democratic practices (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

Professional Development

Besides clinical supervision, professional development was another training service structure provided to teachers by instructional leaders for maintaining or upgrading their quality of instruction (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989). Professional
development, however, was a broad term that encompassed in-service education for both professional and personal development (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Professional development for some involved working both formally and informally with individuals or groups of teachers for development of new knowledge or skills that were sometimes beyond the staffs’ current assignments (Olivia, 1993). Among a myriad of professional development models, Sergiovanni (1995) identified a professional development set that included three models. The models were (a) in-service, (b) staff development, and (c) renewal.

The in-service model, however, sought to bring about conformity by reducing the range of teaching alternatives. Teaching was perceived as a job in which teacher were limited in their capacity to problem solve (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). The in-service model focused specifically on the informal training of teacher groups (Olivia, 1993). Thus, it was approached from the top-down and required a high degree of administrative planning and scheduling (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993; Sullivan, 1997). Instructional leaders assisted teachers by helping them to identify their instructional needs or deficits. They gathered this information through surveys, observations, and requests from teachers.

In contrast, the staff development model emphasized less training and more professional development (Sergiovanni, 1995; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Emphasis was placed on the teacher’s competence, needs, and interest. Teachers contributed data and information, analyzed and solved problems. Instructional leaders and teachers worked as colleagues to improve teaching and learning (Sergiovanni, 1995). Staff development was a program of training or focusing to improve the organization
(Olivia, 1993). Staff development sought to increase the range of teaching alternatives (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). This model provided teachers with an environment filled with instructional materials, media, books, and instruments for their review (Sergiovanni, 1995).

The renewal model was another model of professional development. This model was driven by the teacher’s commitment to teaching as a vocation. Emphasis was on the individual teacher and his or her personal and professional growth. A teacher’s growth and development was through exploration and discovery. For this model, teachers engaged in teacher development for his or herself while on the job. In addition, this model sought to increase the teacher’s range of alternatives. Growth depended on problem solving and changing of self (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). This model focused on instructional leaders encouraging teachers to reflect and to engage in discussions. Emphasis was on creating caring communities (Sergiovanni, 1995).

In addition, Glatthorn (1990) identified another set of professional development models. This set included five distinct models. The models were (a) skill development, (b) curriculum related, (c) linkage, (d) cognitive, and (e) personal. The first model in this set was skill development. The focus of this model was on the refinement of either basic or advanced (subject specific and particular teaching models) teaching skills. Instructional leaders provided a small number of sessions. The format of these sessions usually included a theory and research presentation, a discussion of application issues, and skill modeling (Glatthorn, 1990).

Teachers were provided ample training in the proper use of the innovation (Armstrong, 1989c). The instructional leaders lead the professional development
program through a “fidelity” perspective. The professional development program played an important part in facilitating the implementation. A feeling of competence in using the innovation often came through expanding the teachers’ knowledge and skills about the innovation (Armstrong, 1989c; Hunkins, 1980; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993).

Emphasis was placed on the technological proficiency of teachers in using the innovation (Marsh & Willis, 1995; Snyder et al., 1989). From this perspective, implementation was a linear process that was tightly prescribed. Teachers were to deliver the innovation as planned and instructed by the designers with little to no latitude for making variations in teaching methods (Marsh & Willis, 1995; Snyder et al., 1989).

The next model was called curriculum related. This model focused on supporting and implementing curriculum changes. This model was designed to help teachers understand, translate, and acquire needed skills for effective implementation of a new curriculum. Some theorists thought that the curriculum related model was more effective when attention was given to teachers’ stages of concern. Hall (as paraphrased by Glatthorn, 1990, p. 229) stated that teachers moved through six stages of concern when presented with a new curriculum. Table 2 presents the Stages of Concern.

For increased implementation, some instructional leaders responded to teachers’ stages of concern by leading the professional development program through the concern-based adoption approach. The concern-based adoption approach aided implementation by focusing on acceptance or rejection of a new curriculum innovation through examining levels of use by individual teachers (Armstrong, 1989c; Hall, 1992;
Table 2

Stages of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 0</th>
<th>Awareness. Little concern about the innovation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Informational. Interested mainly in learning about the innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Personal. Chiefly concerned about demands of the innovation and its personal impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Management. Attention focused on efficient use of innovation and management concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Consequence. Concerns about impact on students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Collaboration. Focus is on coordination and cooperation with others in using innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Refocusing. Focus is on exploring general benefits of innovation and possibly modifying it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Marsh & Willis, 1995). For this approach, instructional leaders helped teachers develop diagnostics for guiding their independence in using the curriculum. Information was gathered through focused interviews. The gathered information was useful in supporting the individual needs of teachers in implementing the new curriculum (Hall, Wallace & Dossett, 1973; Loucks, Newlove, & Hall, 1975; Marsh & Willis, 1995).

The third model in this professional development set was the linkage model. This comprehensive model focused on both skill development and professional skills. The professional skills were usually associated with cooperative or peer coaching/peer
supervision. In this model, teachers learned about the theory and research that grounded the innovation. Also, they were given experiences to practice using the skill for further development (Glatthorn, 1990).

The cognitive model was next. This model accepted the notion that teaching was a cognitive decision-making process. Also, this model showed interest in how teachers think and act. For this model professional development was for broadening and deepening teachers’ knowledge base. As such, the cognitive model emphasized teacher reflection and dialogue for examining content and instructional concerns (Glatthorn, 1990). For this model Wildman & Niles (as cited by Glatthorn, 1990) offered some suggestions for aiding teachers in using this model. They recommended that teachers (a) learn reflective inquiry skills, (b) be prepared for the risks involved in thinking about their own practice, (c) given time for reflection, (d) administrative support and (e) colleague support.

The final model in Glatthorn’s (1990) professional development set was the personal development model. This model provided workshops and seminars that focused on the personal concerns and life stages of development. Some instructional leaders planned professional development that responded to stage specific issues predicted by adult development theory. Others reasoned that there were many other forces that influenced teachers besides adult development. For them, when planning services, adult life stages of development increased both their understanding of individual uniqueness and sensitivity to important issues at each stage of development.
Reflective Inquiry

Aside from both clinical supervision and staff development many commissions and research studies called for instructional leaders to provide a new and different form of professional development structure that would be more extensive and would maintain implementation. As such, a regard to organizational change was suggested in addition to individual development. To this way of thinking, both teacher and school development was to occur simultaneously to prevent organizational constraints that could eliminate gains in either area (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997).

Teachers in previous professional development programs were somewhat passive participants that attempted to implement new knowledge and skills within classrooms with differing degrees of mastery (Sparks & Hirsh, 1997). In contrast Lieberman stated (as cited in Sparks & Hirsh, 1997), “teachers must have opportunities to discuss, think about, try out, and hone new practices” (p. 3). Also, Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin explained (as cited in Sparks & Hirsh, 1997), “Professional Development today also means providing occasions for teachers to reflect critically on their practice and to fashion new knowledge and beliefs about content, pedagogy, and learners” (p. 3).

This lead to the notion of various types of study groups and action research teams. Successful instructional leaders began organizing and facilitating such structures to be used either by a school, a small group, or an individual. The goal was for the members to identify strengths, weakness, and to decide on how to refine teaching accordingly. Study groups often explored theory or research through guided book, article, or research reviews for potential application. Sometimes study groups
concentrated on planning, implementing, or assessing school improvement efforts. Through study groups, teachers had opportunities to choose their own topic professional study and to dialogue with colleagues on the practical application of an innovation (Gordon, 2004).

Another service often led by instructional leaders was action research. Action research was a problem solving process for curriculum or instructional implementation. It involved a group of instructors and instructional leaders meeting regularly to analyze curricular or instructional concerns and to develop a plan of action for improvement. A plan was developed by the group and put into action (Grundy, 1987; Kemmis, 1981; Marsh & Willis, 1995). During this process, the group observed, reflected, evaluated, and made revisions in their plans (Marsh & Willis, 1995). The group continuously revised their plans of actions throughout this process (Haltrup & Bickel, 1993; Marsh & Willis, 1995; Tripp, 1985).

Some instructional leaders approached action research from a mutual adaptation perspective or a “process perspective” of implementation. This implementation viewpoint was based on interactions (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Marsh & Willis, 1995; Snyder et al., 1989). Many instructional leaders following this viewpoint thought that curricular and instructional changes were unavoidable (Snyder et al., 1989). To meet local ordinances, teachers were encouraged to help shape the curriculum (Snyder et al., 1989). For mutual adaptation, successful implementation was the agreed-upon choices of both the instructional leaders and teachers (Marsh & Willis, 1995; Snyder et al., 1989).
The final part of this section concludes with an overview of the roles various administrators played in the development of curriculum and instruction. Traditional and emerging role definitions are reviewed. In addition, this part suggests essential skills necessary to ensure the success of contemporary curriculum administrators.

Key Administrators’ Role in Curriculum and Instructional Development Processes

For favorable implementation of a curriculum and instruction, there were several administrative levels of leadership necessary. They were the principal, central office administrators, and the curriculum program leader (Armstrong, 1989b; Beauchamp, 1975; Gordon, 2004; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Poll, 1970). Direct participation in the development of a curriculum and instructional leadership was difficult for most principals because of time constraints. Yet, in the United States principals were often expected to be involved in curricular and instructional processes. Their support was often necessary for effective curriculum and instructional implementation (Armstrong, 1989b; Beauchamp, 1975; Doll, 1992; Pratt, 1994).

Principals

Principals held dual positions within the school system. Within their buildings, they established the atmosphere for professional development and discussions. In addition, they were also the chief administrators of their building and were responsible for fulfilling district decisions. Nevertheless, they were directly accountable for the quality of curriculum delivery within their schools (Armstrong, 1989b). To reach those goals principals: (a) monitored and supervised the curriculum for determining achievement (Glatthorn, 1997; Educational Research Service, 1982; Taba, 1962), (b)
helped with curriculum alignment (Glatthorn, 1997), and (c) provided insight for curriculum management (Armstrong, 1989b).

Blase and Blase (2001), Leithwood (1992), and Siegrist (1999) respectfully (as cited in Gordon, 2004) concurred that for the 21st century, principals needed to be transformational leaders. That was, principals needed to “create a collaborative culture, fosters teacher development, and facilitates teacher development” (p. 138). Similarly, Darling-Hammond (1997) (as cited in Beerens, 2000) advocated that:

Principals must know how to lead organizations in which leadership and decision making are shared, and continual learning is fostered for staff and parents as well as students. In a learning organization, the primary job of management is professional development…teaching and learning. To lead the schools of the future, principals will need to appreciate adult learning and development as well as that of children and know how to nurture a collaborative environment that fosters continual self-assessment. They will also need to be able to envision and enact new organizational arrangements in schools so that time, staffing patterns, and relationships between teachers and among teachers, students, and families better serve the goals of serious learning and high-quality teaching. (p. 3)

Aside from managerial proficiency, the contemporary principal needed to be proficient in the following areas: (a) personal, (b) organizational, (c) group process, (d) professional development, (e) curriculum development, (f) instructional development, (g) student assessment, and (h) parent and community outreach (Gordon, 2004).

Central Office

A second essential group for the curriculum implementation included superintendents and other central office administrators besides the curriculum administrators (Armstrong, 1989c; Pratt, 1994). Superintendents and other central office administrators had a broad range of responsibilities that sometimes made their direct and active participation in curriculum development impossible (Armstrong,
1989c). However, these administrators helped to provide the organizational structure and goals for which a district was to operate (Armstrong, 1989c; Pratt, 1994). They allowed for curriculum planning, work on support projects, and communication with the personnel (Doll, 1992; Pratt, 1994). They supplied instructional resources and allocated funds for in-service training (Armstrong, 1989c). In addition, these administrators also monitored and evaluated the curriculum planning or designing process (Doll, 1992; Pratt, 1994).

For the 21st century, superintendents and central office administrators should be supportive of school focused professional development. These administrators should continue providing support for professional development through allocating resources and regularly expressing the importance of professional development. These administrators could exemplify support by (a) attending planning sessions, (b) participating and sometimes leading professional development sessions, and (c) visiting schools and classroom to assess the progress of professional development efforts (Gordon, 2004).

Curriculum Program Leader

Another important person for curriculum and instructional implementation was the curriculum program leader. This individual was typically charged with overseeing the curriculum and instruction at the district, building, and classroom levels (Armstrong, 1989c; Beauchamp, 1975; Oliva, 1992). This leader had managerial responsibility for curriculum development and for ensuring internal curriculum consistency with the goals of the district. Among program leaders, there were distinct
tasks. Most were responsible for managing curriculum work (Armstrong, 1989c; Beauchamp, 1975; Oliva, 1992).

Some curriculum program leaders were generalists. Others were specialists. The task of the generalist included curricular leadership, decision-making, programmatic, and instructional planning. The task of the specialist was confined to a particular grade level or subject, such as early childhood or reading (Oliva, 1992). The work of curriculum program leaders varied according to their district’s size. For some large districts, a curriculum program leader may have directed a staff of curriculum specialists. For smaller districts, he or she may have been the sole person bearing responsibility for developing the curriculum (Oliva, 1993).

Grove (2002) and Killion and Simmons (1992) respectfully (as cited in Gordon, 2004) concluded that in order to provide effective support for profession development, the task of the new curriculum program leader needed to focus on facilitation rather than direction. To facilitate professional development in the 21st century there was a necessity for the program leader to gain an in-depth understanding of the school’s culture. Also, program leaders were needed to assist the school community in building its own vision and to focus of school improvement and professional development (Gordon, 2004). Nowak (1994) and Slavin (2001) respectfully (as cited in Gordon, 2004) maintained that the program leader supported the program with (a) services, (b) resources, (c) opportunities for reflection, and (d) feedback.

In summary, the leadership of principals, central office administrators, and curriculum program leaders were essential. Through their influence, these leaders helped to alleviate the transition of a new curriculum to teachers. These individuals
encouraged teacher commitment by providing instructional advice, financial and emotional support, and special training (Armstrong, 1989c).

Summary of Literature Review

This chapter reviewed basic understandings of leadership, the history of American curriculum, the educational philosophies and learning theories that informed curriculum leadership, and key aspects and tasks of curriculum leadership. The literature on leadership suggested that a component of successful instructional improvement was effective leadership. Leadership was most often interpreted in one of two ways—descriptive or normative. The descriptive definitions gave interpretations of the leadership process. Where as the normative definitions, however, classified leadership characteristics. In addition, two general leadership theories were presented. Distinctions were made between those leadership theories regarding their leader-subordinate interactions (motivations), organizational goals, and leadership approaches.

Next, the literature on the history of American curriculum gave a historical representation of curriculum and leadership development in education. Educational leadership began early during colonial times and continued to evolve throughout the 20th century. The literature also indicated that historically American has undergone many changes in its national economic system, social and ethnic population as well as school governance. The literature showed that during various times throughout that history, many diverse educational philosophies, values, and issues influenced both the curriculum and educational leadership. Furthermore, the literature also indicated that
school management and facilitation tasks eventually became responsibilities for the curriculum and instructional leader in the United States.

Educational philosophies and learning theories were observed next in the literature. Four basic philosophies—perrenialism, essentialism, progressivism, and reconstructionism—were identified. Leaders were assisted by educational philosophies in their understanding of personal views of education and guided in their curriculum and instructional decisions. In addition, two major families of learning theory ensued. Within those families several theories were identified and analyzed for comparing the underlying theoretical perspectives those theories embraced regarding knowledge, learning, content, and pedagogy. The literature suggested that both educational philosophies and learning theories served as lenses that informed curricular and instructional decisions.

Lastly, the literature attended to professional development and curriculum leadership practices and components. This part specifically defined a curriculum. Several forms and levels of a curriculum were also determined. Curricular aims, goals, and objectives were contrasted for clarification. Purposes for professional development were explained as well. The literature suggested that group oriented professional development activities were a cost-effective way for schools to provide “on-going” professional development for teachers. Various definitions of instructional leadership were later given. Most of those definitions however, alluded to the notion that instructional leadership regarded tasks for improving teaching skills and achievement of school goals. Several support service structures used by instructional leaders were then reported and described in detail. The literature ended with a discussion of the key
administrators that were needed for effective implementation of curriculum and classroom instruction. Although those key administrators had distinct tasks, an implied commonality was that curriculum and instructional leaders both provided various support services for teachers to facilitate successful implementation of a curriculum and classroom instruction. Each of those rich areas of the literature will later be used to inform the survey and interview research outlined in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the research questions and purpose, the research design, participant selection, data collection, and data analysis techniques used in this study. As stated earlier, this case study sought to determine the specific instructional leadership principals and district curriculum leaders report they provided to untenured classroom teachers. It seeks to delineate, understand, and interpret the instructional services these administrators provide to untenured teachers.

Research Purpose and Questions

This study attempts to demarcate the unique and overlapping instructional leadership responsibilities of principals and district curriculum leaders in servicing untenured teachers through case study research. As such, it was guided by these research questions:

1. How do district curriculum leaders and principals describe their instructional leadership responsibilities for supporting untenured teachers?

2. According to district curriculum leaders and principals, how are their instructional leadership responsibilities overlapping or unique?

3. How are the instructional leadership responsibilities reported by district curriculum leaders and principals corroborated by untenured teacher reports?
Research Design

A case study design was appropriate for this study because it used multiple sources of data to explore and describe the instructional leadership responsibilities, services, and tasks of instructional leaders to untenured teachers. This method was chosen because it attempts to describe phenomena using district job descriptions, survey data, and interviews to fully detail a given practice. Merriam (1988) stated, [n]onexperimental or, as it is often called, descriptive research is undertaken when description and explanation (rather than prediction based on cause and effect) are sought, when it is not possible or feasible to manipulate the potential causes of behavior, and when variables are not easily identified or are too embedded in the phenomenon to be extracted for study. (p. 7)

The unit of analysis was the expressed perceptions of the instructional leadership responsibilities involved in supporting untenured teachers in the use of the curriculum and instruction. Interviews with five district curriculum leaders, six principals, and thirteen teachers served as main sources of data concerning the nature of these services for this study. Each participant shared detailed personal experiences and narratives regarding instructional leadership responsibilities through these interviews. However, a survey instrument and documentation of job descriptions were also made. Given the multiple sources of data, this qualitative descriptive research was best managed as a case study design.

An effective case study design managed four crucial criteria for good research in a unique way. Those four areas were (a) internal validity, (b) external validity, (d) construct validity, and (e) reliability (Yin, 1993; 1994). The design for this study meets these criteria for case study exploratory research.
Internal validity or “truth value” for quantitative studies often referred to the degree in which a study showed a close relationship between two factors or variables though the descriptive elimination or control of other influencing factors. This descriptive qualitative study did not seek to prove causality or even establish exclusive relationships between variables. As such, it did not seek to establish internal validity that was more specific for a quantitative study. For qualitative studies as this, internal validity or “truth value” was concerned with the investigator’s ability to maintain or preserve the precise words, perspectives, and interpretations of the participants through the member checking strategy (Gall & et al, 2003; Merriam, 1988/2002; Yin, 1993/1994).

Several procedures were used to preserve internal validity or “truth value” in both the data collection and in the data presentation stages of this study. First a multiple data collection and multiple sources strategy (triangulation) was used to form converging lines of evidence for validating statements about the instructional services provided by administrators. Besides the triangulation of both documentary and interview sources, a few other strategies were helpful to preserve the internal validity of this study. The pilot study data were reviewed by a committee on the Educational Foundation and Leadership at The University of Akron. This allowed for external critique of the researcher’s procedures and processes through a systematic check on strategy. The participants were asked to assess the investigator’s interpretations of their data for plausibility (see Appendix B). If the findings were implausible, the participant was asked to provide additional data for clarification of their perspectives (Gall et al., 2003; Merriam, 1988/2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 1993/1994).
The second criterion—external validity or transferability of findings to other populations was not necessary here because such a generalization was not desired. However, this qualitative study did seek to add information to the existing body of literature on instructional leadership and untenured teacher instructional support. This study proposed to build a thick and detailed description of instructional leadership by triangulating documents and interview descriptions of instructional leadership responsibilities to untenured teachers within the context of a limited number of school settings. Thus, this study did not have sampling necessary for generalization of the findings to a specific population (Gall et al., 2003; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1993/1994). However, the triangulation of data not only helped to ensure internal validity of findings but also sufficient detail so that it would inform the research scholarship and future research.

The third criterion for a valid qualitative research design concerned construct validity. Construct validity often pertained to correct instrument usage and proper evaluation standards for indicating and supporting evidence (Yin, 1993/1994). For this study, construct validity was enhanced in a similar but slightly different way. First, the resulting constructs were triangulated through converging lines of evidence from the multiple sources of data—documents of job descriptions, district curriculum leaders and, principals, and untenured teachers (Denzin, 1970/1978; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Yin, 1993/1994). The participants’ viewpoints provided valuable data for this study that contributed to strengthening the validity of this investigation applicable. Also, the member checking strategy again served to help this study meet construct validity by allowing the participants to review their statements for
correctness and to ensure proper evaluation standards (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003; Yin, 1993/1994).

The final criterion was the reliability of the research findings. Reliability referred to the consistency of findings across forms and items, participants, or time by other researchers following the exact procedures for the same case (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Yin, 1993/1994). This study preserved reliability in that one researcher did all document collection and analysis, all coding of interviews, interviews, and conducted all surveys.

In addition to preserving these four qualities, this study was in compliance with Institutional Review Board requirements for ethical research. IRB approval was secured after the doctoral dissertation committee approved this study (see Appendix C). Confidentiality and anonymity of the participants, school district, school building, county, and city was maintained throughout this study.

Participant Selection

For this study, the focus was on the instructional support services of principals and district curriculum leaders provided to untenured teachers. As such, sets of participants were needed from the same district: one curriculum leader with one or two principals and two or three untenured teachers per principal. To limit the study, the focus was on elementary and middle school principals and untenured teachers. Principals and their district curriculum leaders and untenured teachers from five districts within a midwestern state were invited to participate in this study. Each group of participants were from a school and/or district within the same region of a state. One set (curriculum leader, one or two principals, and corresponding untenured teachers)
came from an urban district, another set from a suburban district, and the last set from a rural district.

Since untenured teachers were needed, selection of a set of participants started by contacting districts within a region of a mid-western state trying to find schools that had two to three untenured teachers on staff. Those administrators and teachers that were invited to participate were on contract with a school district. In addition, they held a valid administrative or teaching certificate or license. All participating administrators (principals and district curriculum leaders) and teachers were interviewed.

A letter of request was made to the Board of Education of each district to secure contact numbers for schools with two or more untenured teachers. The letter of request also explained the research and the specific role expected of the participants (see Appendix D). The Board of Education made initial approval for researcher contact prior to any telephone or email contact and well before any interviewing of participants.

Upon Board approval, each potential participant was contacted by phone or emailed. Once a set verbally agreed, interviews were set up. Participants returned the volunteer and acknowledgement of rights form (see Appendix E). It was also acknowledged that a possible follow-up telephone interview might be required. As such, a request for scheduling telephone interviews at a mutually convenient time was made and confirmed at the time of the direct interview. The participants were asked to provide telephone numbers and convenient times for the researcher to contact them by telephone. All participants remained anonymous throughout this study. A standardized
open-ended interview format was constructed to reduce the chance of bias (Gall & et al, 2003; Vierra & Pollock, 1992; Yin, 1993).

Data Collection

Once specific teachers and their principals and district curriculum leader agreed to participate, the research then solicited the official job description for all administrators involved in the study. These were reviewed and used to inform the interview stage of data collected. For this study, direct interviews were the main data collection method. Both biographic and demographic data (see Appendix F) were collected. The biographic data were gathered through a short questionnaire. The biographic information included the special characteristics of the respondents such as their job position, years of service (in their position), and total number of years in education (Gall et al., 2003). The demographic data provided vital information on the special characteristics of each school and district. Such information included student enrollment, the number of professional staff members, and number of schools within the district. Besides biographic and demographic data, additional information was collected on the qualifications and responsibilities of the administrators through job descriptions and professional resumes (Gall et al., 2003).

Telephone interviews were used to supplement direct interviews with more anecdotal and explanatory comments should confusion emerge during the interview process. Together with the district job descriptions, coding categories were developed using concepts from the literature review as well as some key descriptors that were outlined in Appendix G (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).
Data Analysis

Throughout the entire investigation, data analysis was an ongoing process. Data analysis of the biographic and demographic questionnaire consisted of simple frequency counts and ranges. The summary of the biographic data for this study was reported through tables. The raw data from the open-ended interviews were first transcribed, read, analyzed and coded around the research questions (Gall et al., 2003; Seidman, 1998). Then rigorous analysis of the coded transcripts brought forth the individual case findings of the instructional leadership responsibilities and perceptions of instructional leadership responsibilities between the district curriculum leader and principals.

Next, the data was reanalyzed and sorted into frequently occurring categories for additional coding likely to match components of the literature review and coding categories grouped in Appendix H. This reanalysis revealed similarities and differences within the data. Also, emerging patterns connected to the research questions were discovered. At that point the emerging patterns were sorted and labeled to form categories or themes using the theoretical framework presented in the literature review for explaining and describing instructional leadership (Gall et al., 2003; Merriam, 1988; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Seidman, 1998; Yin, 1994).

This ongoing coding procedure helped to address the research questions by linking the collected data to the research questions and assigning units of meaning to that data. Bliss, Monk and Ogborn (as cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994) stated, “a word or a phrase does not “contain” its meaning as a bucket “contains” water, but has the meaning it does by being a choice made about its significance in a given context”
(p. 56). Such interpretative analysis procedures were useful for revealing and describing the salient themes or constructs of a study. Figure 2 provides the model used for this process.

**Data Collection and Analysis Process**

- **Interviews**
- **District Job Descriptions**

**Data Analysis:**

- Interviews Transcribed
- Raw Data Coded
  (Around Interview Questions)
- and
- Job Descriptions Reduced
  (By Instructional Leadership Responsibilities)

**Individual Case Findings:**

- Instructional Leadership Responsibilities
- and
- Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities

**Analysis of Data across all Cases:**

- Instructional Leadership Responsibilities
- and
- Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities

Figure 2. Data collection and analysis process
Once the interview transcriptions were completed, the researcher went back to
the research questions to come up with codes to organize the data collected from the
interviews. The first question had six codes: “DCLR,” “PR,” “DCLT,” “PT,”
“DCLS,” and “PS.” “DCLR” coded explanations of the instructional leadership
responsibilities of district curriculum leaders. “PR” coded explanations of the
instructional leadership responsibilities of principals. “DCLT” coded explanations of
the instructional leadership tasks of district curriculum leaders. “PT” coded
explanations of the instructional leadership tasks of principals. “DCLS” coded
explanations of the instructional leadership services of district curriculum leaders. “PS”
was used to code explanations of the instructional leadership services of principals.

The second research question had two codes. The overlapping or similar
responsibilities were coded “O” for district curriculum leaders and principals. The
unique or differing responsibilities were coded “U” for district curriculum leaders and
principals. Six codes were used for the third question. “TPS” coded teachers’
confirmation of principals’ instructional leadership services. “TPT” coded teachers’
confirmation of principals’ instructional leadership tasks. “TDCLS” coded teachers’
confirmation of district curriculum leaders’ instructional leadership services. “TDCLT”
coded teachers’ confirmation of district curriculum leaders’ instructional leadership
tasks. The code “TO” was used for the teachers’ confirmation of the overlapping or
similar responsibilities and tasks among the district curriculum leader and principal.
The code “TU” was the final code and used for explanations that confirmed unique or
differing responsibilities and tasks of the two administrators (see Appendix H).
The sampling unit for this study was limited to district curriculum leaders, principals, and untenured teachers. A total of 24 participants in five different school districts volunteered to be interviewed on-site. The volunteers consisted of 5 district curriculum leaders, 6 principals, and 13 teachers. All five schools for this study were from a mid-western state. The communities of those school districts (n = 5) were composed of three different geographic types—suburban, rural, and urban. Three were suburban school districts, one was a rural district, and the other was urban.

Instructional leadership was a holistic concept in the sense that instructional leadership was dependent on the distinct circumstances that were often embedded within this process. As such, this study initially reports the findings from the five school districts as separate case studies. Later, in Chapter V, the emerging themes among the school districts are identified and discussed at length.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter reports the findings from document analysis and interviews of educators from five districts. The first section provides a table and explanation of the participants of this study, specifically the general characteristics the five districts and those interviewed. The second through sixth sections each provide an overview of each of the five districts: (a) alpha, (b) beta, (c) gamma, (d) delta, and (e) epsilon. Each of these sections reviews the findings from the interviews and then reviews the job descriptions of those in the district.

The sampling unit for this study was limited to district curriculum leaders, principals, and untenured teachers. A total of 24 participants in five different school districts volunteered to be interviewed on-site (see Table 3). The volunteers consisted of 5 curriculum coordinators, 6 principals, and 13 teachers. All five schools for this study were from a Midwestern state. The communities of those school districts were composed of three different geographic types—suburban, rural, and urban. Three were suburban school districts. One was a rural district and the other was urban. Pseudonyms were used for the names of each school building, school district, and participant to ensure confidentiality and anonymity.
Table 3
District Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Buildings</th>
<th>Student Pop.</th>
<th>% of Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader 1 Principal 2 Teachers</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 High 1 Middle</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>8% 330 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader 1 Principal 2 Teachers</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 High 1 Middle 4 Elem.</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>18% 449 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader 1 Principal 2 Teachers</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 High 3 Middle 7 Elem.</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>25% 1,292 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader 2 Principals 4 Teachers</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 High 1 Middle 3 Elem.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>17% 306 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsilon</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader 1 Principal 3 Teachers</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13 High 7 Middle 40 Elem.</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>60% 16,540 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha District

The Alpha district is located in a residential community close to two small cities. The district has five schools. At the time of the interviews the first school was a primary building for students in pre-kindergarten through third grades. The second was an elementary school for students in second through third grades. The third school was an intermediate building for fourth and fifth graders. The fourth school was a middle school for students in sixth through eighth grades. The final was a high school for
students in 9th through 12th grades. During the school year, approximately 4,100 students were enrolled in this district. Among those students 8% of them were eligible for a free or reduced lunch (see Table 4).

Table 4
Alpha District Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Buildings</th>
<th>Student Pop.</th>
<th>% of Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader, 1 Principal, 2 Teachers</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 High, 1 Middle, 3 Elem.</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>8% 330 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four educators from this district participated in this study—one district curriculum leader, one principal, and two teachers. Alice Apricot, the district’s curriculum leader, held a master’s degree with thirty additional graduate credits. She had tenure, and was between 60 and 69 years old. She had over 30 years of teaching experience, and 10 years as a curriculum leader.

The principal, Andrew Apple was between 30 to 39 years old and had been in education for about 15 years. He had a master’s degree with 15 additional graduate credits. Andrew served as an elementary school principal for about 6 years. His building had about 40 teachers, and 560 students, with 70 of those students on either a free or reduced lunch.

Two untenured teachers were interviewed, Alana Artichoke and Audrey Anchovy. Alana was between 50 and 59 years old and had a master’s degree with 30
additional graduated credits. She had at least 16 years of teaching experience but never applied for tenure. Audrey, was in her 20s. She had a bachelor’s degree and had taught school for less than 5 years (see Table 5).

Table 5

Alpha District Biographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnic or Racial Group</th>
<th>Yr. in Position</th>
<th>Yr. in Education</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Tenured Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Curriculum Leader</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Alpha District

Curriculum Leaders

The curriculum leader in the Alpha District was responsible for providing instructional leadership for development and implementation of the district’s curriculum, assessment, and intervention programs. The curriculum leader was to assist with leadership in accomplishing and maintaining educational programs and services. Some of the key instructional leadership responsibilities of the district curriculum leader were to assist with the assessment program, coordinate curriculum development, assist with resource selection, district-wide staff development, and the entry year
program. Also the district curriculum leader was to manage the on-going evaluation of curriculum implementation (see Table 6).

Table 6

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Alpha District Curriculum Leaders

- Aligns the Consolidation Local Plan of federal grants to the continuous improvement plan
- Assists with policy manual updating
- Assists in preparation of the budget
- Assists with the district assessment program
- Assists in assimilation of information necessary to complete local, state, and federal reports including grants
- Coordinates district-wide curriculum development
- Coordinates textbook and resource selection
- Coordinates entry-year program, new teacher orientation
- Coordinates placement of student teachers
- Coordinates the district-wide staff development program
- Coordinates the school improvement plan work
- Directs continuous evaluation of curriculum implementation
- Supports the district’s intervention programs
- Makes teacher observations and assists in the selection and use of teaching materials for improved instruction
- Prepares reports for the Board upon request
- Supports the district intervention program
- Works with the Local Professional Development Committee
- Writes, manages, and submits grant reports

Note. Source: District provided job description.

Alpha District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

There were two broad responsibilities for the instructional leadership of the district curriculum leaders in the Alpha District. Those two responsibilities were for implementation and program management. Among many instructional leadership tasks
for the implementation responsibilities, the district curriculum leader provided professional development, observed instruction, and provided feedback for untenured teachers. Instructional leadership tasks for the responsibility of program manager comprised planning programs for teachers, writing grants for the district, and obtaining board approval for the curriculum (see Table 7).

Table 7

Alpha District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works on development of curriculum maps and common assessments</td>
<td>• Assists with the Entry Year Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides group and individual help</td>
<td>• Writes courses of studies with teacher assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts observations and give feedback</td>
<td>• Obtains board approval for curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distributes curriculum documents</td>
<td>• Writes grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides staff development</td>
<td>• Plans for staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides non-consumables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts curriculum meetings about standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answers questions about the curriculum and make suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Models [effective teaching]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.
Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Alpha District Curriculum Leaders

Alice Apricot, stated that her instructional leadership often involved helping untenured teachers to implement the district’s instructional program. She explained that,

[t]he most important role would be one of support and helping them [teachers] with their curriculum issues… We work on curriculum mapping and common assessments and matching our materials to both our curriculum and knowing that our assessments cover those materials.

Later, Alice expressed the notion that sometimes her instructional leadership involved observing teachers. She commented, “[i]n some cases, I’ll do some observations and give feedback to them [teachers]. I don’t do a lot of that. I talk with principals and hear their thoughts and concerns and make suggestions.” She also acknowledged that she worked with the entry year program. She explained, “[w]hen we first hire teachers…we have an entry year program that they participate with all year long…We have two lead mentors that work with that program as well as myself.”

Alice provided an illustration of the Entry-year program that she offered as an instructional leadership service to new untenured teachers. Later, she provided examples of other instructional leadership services given to teachers in her district. She said,

[w]e don’t make a lot of difference between tenured and untenured. We have an extra support program for our new teachers but as far as the rest of our teachers…we provide the same kind of support for the tenured as to the untenured. We have an entry year program that they [new teachers] participate with all year long. We have two lead mentors that work with that program as well as myself. The mentor observes them five times and they [new teachers] observe master teachers six times during the course of their first year…they observe for targeted things.
In addition, Alice gave a couple of examples of instructional leadership services that were for both new and veteran teachers. She stated, “[w]e have staff development that they [teachers] are required to attend. Then she also mentioned, “[w]e have a whole structure of communications called professional learning communities.”

Table 8

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Alpha District Curriculum Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation program</td>
<td>Assists in the use of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mentor program</td>
<td>Models [effective teaching]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Acquaints teachers to the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Gives materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network opportunities</td>
<td>Works with the entry-year program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional learning communities</td>
<td>Works on curriculum mapping and common assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send teachers for training</td>
<td>Meets with teachers on specific things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-year program</td>
<td>Makes suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observes teachers and gives feedback</td>
<td>Shares information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writes and distributes the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gains board approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.
Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Alpha District Principals

In general, the Alpha District principal was to provide instructional leadership for educational programs within the building. The principal was to manage, supervise, and evaluate all district instructional programs and activities within his school. As such, there were a number of essential instructional leadership tasks to be fulfilled. The principal was to direct and evaluate the instructional program of all personnel, encourage professional or personal growth of the staff, observe classrooms and lesson plans and conduct conferences.

In addition, the Alpha District principal was to organize and direct all student activities, make requests for instructional resources, coordinate his building activities with those of the district. Furthermore, the principal was to maintain proper student conduct, enforce needed discipline, evaluate the curriculum, schedule faculty meetings, and develop goals for the building.

Table 9
Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Alpha District Principals

- Responsible for all organization, administration, and supervision within the building
- Directs, supervises, and evaluates the instructional and guidance programs
- Responsible for the requisition of supplies, textbooks, equipment, and other materials for the school
- Prepares all reports and maintain such records required by law, regulations, or request of the superintendent
- Coordinates the activities of the school with the activities of the district
- Maintains good public relations with the community
- Responsible for securing substitute teachers, assignments, and reporting the use of substitute teachers

(table continues)
Table 9 (continued)

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Alpha District Principals (continued)

- Responsible for the general supervision of the grounds and building
- Evaluates the curriculum, seek improvement of educational programs, and make an annual report with recommendations
- Maintains high standards of student conduct and enforces discipline as necessary according to board policy and student due process right by establishing guides for proper conduct and maintaining student discipline
- Makes classroom visits, review lesson plan books, and have follow-up conferences
- Fosters professional and personal growth of all teachers
- Shall be responsible for scheduling faculty meetings in the building
- Develops building goals and work to meet them

*Note.* Source: District provided job description.

*Alpha District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks*

The Alpha district principal held implementation and program management responsibilities. The Alpha district principal conducted both observations and conferences with untenured teachers for the implementation responsibility. The principal also provided opportunities for professional development. For the program management responsibility, the Alpha district principal assisted with district-wide program planning (see Table 10).

*Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Alpha District Principals*

Andrew Apple noted that one instructional leadership service required a vast amount of time. He also described some of the tasks involved in this service. Andrew explained,
Table 10

Alpha District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts formal and informal observations</td>
<td>• Schedules conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meets with teachers in small and large groups</td>
<td>• Provides staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps with aligning curriculum to standards</td>
<td>• Plans for observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides opportunities for staff development and in-service</td>
<td>• Participates in district discussions on curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides instructional materials</td>
<td>• Monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works with mentor teachers</td>
<td>• Provides follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talks with teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Source: Interview with principal.

[What takes most of my time would certainly be the formal observation as required by law and all of those kinds of things. But, that requires a great amount of time to prep for that, to actually do the observation, to do the typing and following up, scheduling the conference, do the conference and, if you need to follow up on the conference, that too.]

Then, Andrew added another statement about his instructional leadership as a building principal to teachers. He said,

I would not distinguish between tenured and or untenured teachers. It’s my role as building principal to lead and be in the lead in terms of instruction, to do my best with the curriculum, assessment, State models, content standards, all of it. It doesn’t matter what the status of the teacher is… I feel it’s one of my main responsibilities to provide support to the teachers. That is a huge responsibility
and again it’s making myself available, making sure that they have what they need to be effective teachers.

Andrew gave a commentary on the instructional leadership services and tasks he performs for teachers working in his building. He identified several different tasks within his statement. Andrew told me,

I think of a variety of different things. I make myself available; I am involved in the curriculum and instructions aspects of what they [teachers] do. I am in the classrooms a lot, formally and informally. I meet with them in small groups and large groups to take a look at curriculum and to make sure that what we are doing is aligned with our State model and content standards.

Table 11

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Alpha District Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alpha District Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal and informal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Availability Provides materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works with mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepares for observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Types observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schedule conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follows-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talks with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meets in small and large groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with principal.
The Overlap in Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Alpha District Curriculum Leaders and Principals

An administrator gave a report on the overlapping instructional leadership services. Alice stated that,

[i]n many ways it’s [instructional leadership services] the same because… if a teacher requests individual help from either a principal or from myself…we help at an individual level. We help in group settings. Then, when there is planning for a total staff development…we do that too… Sometimes we get into other things that support curriculum like grant writing.

Andrew also shared the same sentiment regarding the overlap in the instructional leadership tasks both administrators perform. He stated,

[o]ur teachers know that they can easily receive a phone call or voice mail or email or a personal visit from our curriculum staff or building principal. It’s interchangeable… It’s a combined effort.

The Uniqueness of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Alpha District Curriculum Leaders and Principals

In addition to the overlap in instructional leadership responsibilities, participants also reported distinctions in their instructional leadership services. Alice said, “We go into more detail…We support both the principals and the teachers as that’s [the curriculum] implemented at the building level.” Later she told of an instructional leadership service and elaborated on the tasks,

I don’t evaluate teachers—um to go in and do formal observations and evaluations in the classroom. Um, the kinds of management tasks that I have to do are…more making sure the curriculum is written and board approved and distributed and available to teachers, parents that kind of thing.

Andrew also identified a distinction held among the administrators’ instructional leadership responsibilities. He voiced the notion that,
[t]he building principal is not just the manager. The building principal is not just the disciplinarian…Their [curriculum leaders] focus is curriculum and instruction and assessment. They [curriculum leaders] are the initiators…the building principal’s focus is a little bit varied—probably a little bit more diverse, encompasses a little bit more.

*Alpha District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities*

Audrey and Alana each gave statements concerning the instructional leadership of their district and building level administrators. Initially the teachers addressed the instructional leadership responsibilities of the district curriculum leader. “They [curriculum leaders] provide us [teachers] with the materials to use for our classroom,” said Audrey. “They [curriculum leaders] give us [teachers] curriculum maps that we use. We work together and…set a plan for what must be covered. They give us a notebook that has all this information in it,” expanded Alana describing the instructional materials that were furnished to her. Then Alana provided more commentary on the district level instructional leadership services. She stated, “They [curriculum leaders] are also very good about sending us [teachers] to conferences and workshop. They will provide money and time off to go to those.”

The teachers continued the discussion on instructional leadership responsibilities of their district curriculum leader. Alana declared, “Well, it is their [curriculum leader] responsibility to make sure that all curriculum is being met.” “Our curriculum director, she really makes sure that we know the content area… for whatever grade that we’re teaching… and making sure that those are then taken into the classroom. So, she’s right there to help, if we have any questions with any of the indicators,” Audrey elaborated.
Afterwards the interview was redirected towards the principal’s instructional leadership responsibilities. Alana voiced her opinion that, “If we have individual questions, he is very willing for us to come in. He is willing to come to our rooms…He has often given us the opportunity to…observe another teacher, perhaps a veteran teacher for ideas.” Then, Audrey concurred with Alana’s statement. She said, “They [principals] are there to support you with any assistance you may need within the district, with supplies…being there for you, if you have problems.”

As the interview progressed, the teachers were asked to consider the similarities and uniqueness that existed among the administrators’ instructional leadership responsibilities. However, the teachers only reported a couple. Audrey stated, “They overlap and decide what do we need to be telling our teachers that they need to be doing.” Then Alana added that they “allow us [teachers] to attend the in-services and curriculum workshops.”

The teachers were also able to identify distinctions among the instructional leadership responsibilities of their administrators. “Well, I think the principal has a lot broader job,” admitted Alana, “He does help us with the curriculum; but, then he has so many other areas that he is responsible for too.” Audrey also gave a comment to help contrast the instructional leadership responsibilities. Audrey added, “Their [curriculum leaders] focus is on really getting that content out there for the teachers to know and to learn and to use” (see Table 12).
Table 12
Alpha District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities and Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Curriculum Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Management Responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides curriculum maps</td>
<td>• Chairs curriculum Grade level meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps teachers coordinates curriculum with standards</td>
<td>• Chairs professional learning committee meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides notebooks</td>
<td>• Answers questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funds workshops and conferences</td>
<td>• Attends in-service meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answers questions about indicators</td>
<td>• Provides supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides instructional materials</td>
<td>• Staff meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps teachers know, learn, and use content and indicators</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides in-service</td>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Source: Interview with district teachers.

Beta District

The Beta district is situated in a suburban community. In this district there are six schools. There are four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. Approximately 2,600 students were enrolled in this K-12 setting. Eighteen percent of those students were identified as being eligible for free or reduced lunch.
Two administrators and two teachers agreed to be interviewed. The district’s curriculum leader, Betty Banana, was in her 50s. She had been an educator for more than 31 years and had achieved tenured status. Betty had obtained several graduate degrees as well. She held master’s degrees in school psychology, supervision of instruction, and school administration.

The other administrator was Brian Bacon. Brian had been employed as an elementary school principal for about 6 years. At his school, there were approximately 20 teachers and at least 200 students. Brian had a master’s degree with 15 additional graduate credits. As a teacher he obtained tenured status. In addition, he had served as an educator for about 6 years (see Table 13).

Table 13

Beta District Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Buildings</th>
<th>Student Pop.</th>
<th>% of Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader, 1 Principal, 2 Teachers</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 High, 1 Middle, 4 Elem.</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>18%, 449 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One untenured teacher, Barbara Beet, held a bachelor’s degree. She was in her 20s and had about 5 years’ teaching experience. Her colleague, Bert Bean, was also in his 20s and untenured. Bert had earned a bachelor’s degree as well as 15 additional graduate credits. He had about 10 years of teaching experience (see Table 14).
Table 14

Beta District Biographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnic or Racial Group</th>
<th>Yr. in Position</th>
<th>Yr. in Education</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Tenured Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betty Banana</td>
<td>Curriculum Leader</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Bacon</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Beet</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Bean</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Beta District

Curriculum Leaders

The district curriculum leader in the Beta District was responsible for directing curriculum and instruction for the district. The district curriculum leader was specifically responsible for organizing curriculum changes, supervising the development of the district’s courses of study and other curricular documents. The district curriculum leader was to develop and implement district-wide staff development plan, and coordinate the new teacher orientation program. Some other responsibilities are to select instructional resources, assist untenured teachers in developing teaching practice, and guide instructional modifications and interventions. Also, the district curriculum leader was accountable for overseeing the district’s testing program, and analyzing test results (see Table 15).
Table 15

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Beta District Curriculum Leaders

- Develops, evaluates, coordinates, and implements curricular change
- Strives to improve the methodology of teaching
- Responsible for supervision, selection, preparation, and effective use of teaching materials
- Responsible for the direct supervision of the development of course of study and curriculum guides
- Responsible for development and review of the district continuous improvement plan
- Provides leadership in the development of academic objectives and goals for the district and individual schools.
- Oversees the work of the entry year coordinator
- Assists new teachers in developing sound practices and procedures
- Oversees K-12 state-wide standardized and alternative testing programs, analyze test results, and provide staff direction for instructional modifications and interventions
- Develops and implements a district-wide staff development plan for certified staff
- Coordinates new teacher orientation, in-service days, early-release days and opening day activities for certified staff
- Keeps staff apprised of state and federal curriculum mandates
- Serves as a member of the Board of Education curriculum committee

Note. Source: District provided job description.

Beta District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

There were two instructional leadership responsibilities that the Beta district curriculum leader performed. They were implementation and program management responsibilities. A few of the instructional leadership tasks associated with the implementation responsibility of the district curriculum leader were holding meetings with untenured teachers and providing professional development opportunities. For the
program management responsibility the district curriculum leader reviewed continuous
improvement plans, analyzed data, and supervised programs (see Table 16).

Table 16

Beta District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared
to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides professional development</td>
<td>• Supervises the entry year program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides staff development</td>
<td>• Assists with the development of a cohort group program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sends teachers to workshops</td>
<td>• Establishes curriculum committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meets and works with grade level teacher groups</td>
<td>• Conducts data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides leadership opportunities for teachers</td>
<td>• Reviews continuous improvement plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides substitutes to cover for teacher training</td>
<td>• Surveys teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Beta District Curriculum Leaders

Betty was the first administrator in the Beta District to describe her instructional leadership. She provided a few examples. In the following statement, Betty told me that, “I do professional development and… I surveyed all… teachers where they see areas of personal need for professional development.” Then Betty continued to describe her instructional leadership tasks. She explained,

[i]f a principal is feeling that a teacher is needing some help academically, they [principals] call me and I come and work from that standpoint. But again the
direct helping with discipline, helping with organization is not a role I generally perform for the teachers.

When Betty was asked to tell about the instructional leadership service and task that she provides to untenured teachers (see Table 17). She made the following comment and explanation, “I also supervise the entry year program,” Then she explained,

[we] assign a mentor to the teacher—that first-year teacher, all throughout the year to specifically help them with their training so that when they receive their observation at the end of the year (to receive their license) that they’re successful.

Table 17
Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Beta District Curriculum Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Surveys teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-year program</td>
<td>Supervises the entry-year program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Helps individual teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for workshops</td>
<td>Organizes substitute teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District-wide mentor program</td>
<td>Develops cohort groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trains cohort members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides release time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets with teachers and works on curriculum maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reviews continuous improvement plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.
Job Description Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Beta District Principals

To encourage the district’s educational program, the Beta principal was to use administrative, leadership, and supervisory skills. Some of the instructional leadership responsibilities the principal was to perform included supervising the district’s educational program, organizing and implementing programs within his school, and assisting with curriculum development and evaluations. The principal was to supervise the staff, provide new staff orientation, and assist with training the personnel. In addition, the principal was to provide in-service, conduct staff meetings, encourage proper student conduct and enforce discipline (see Table 18).

Table 18

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Beta District Principals

- Supervises the school’s educational program
- Recommends, designs, and implements programs to meet school needs
- Assists in the development, revision, and evaluations of the curriculum
- Supervises all staff members
- Provides orientation for new staff members
- Assists with the coordination of support services
- Provides staff in-service
- Encourages high standards of conduct and enforces discipline
- Organizes and administers the school’s public relations program
- Conducts staff meetings

Note. Source: District provided job description.

Beta District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

The Beta district principal fulfilled implementation responsibilities. Instructional leadership tasks were related to their implementation responsibilities.
Some instructional leadership tasks for the implementation responsibility of the principal were conducting observations, monitoring program implementation, and providing opportunities for professional growth and development.

Table 19

Beta District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows for professional development</td>
<td>• Monitors teachers’ implementation of the district’s program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts observations and formal observations</td>
<td>• Monitors teachers’ implementation of the district’s program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages teachers to follow the program</td>
<td>• Monitors teachers’ implementation of the district’s program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides additional resources</td>
<td>• Monitors teachers’ implementation of the district’s program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assists with problems solving with teacher teams</td>
<td>• Monitors teachers’ implementation of the district’s program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Source: Interview with principal.*

*Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Beta District Principals*

My conversation with Brian resulted in an illustration of his instructional leadership. However, during our discussion he made a point and told me that he provided support to all of his teachers. The tenured or non-tenured status of a teacher did not matter to him. “I’m the source that they [teachers] need to come to,” he stated, “[i]f there would be a problem or…additional resources or additional materials that need to be provided.”
In addition, Brian also made reference to a task that he provided. He noted, 
“[t]here are certain tasks that are going to be held accountable… I need to oversee to make sure that these untenured teachers are making sure that those things are getting done.” He then added, “[f]or an untenured teacher, they need to have four observations and two formal written observations, according to our contract.”

During Brian’s conversation, he proceeded in telling about instructional leadership services. Brian continued his discussion by describing his preferred instructional leadership service as, “[p]rofessional development opportunities through in-staff housing.” He explained that, “[w]e’ve done early release days where we’ve picked topics for a yearlong subject, rather than just go with services that were ‘catch and miss’ where they [teachers] go to a day workshop, come back and never apply it.”

Table 20

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Beta District Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beta District Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal and informal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides resources and materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with principal.
The Overlap in Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Beta District Curriculum Leaders and Principals

The views from the district curriculum leader and principal on the overlap in their instructional leadership matched. The matching instructional leadership responsibility centered on what the administrators ultimately perceived as the purpose for providing instructional leadership services to teachers. Brian mentioned that, “[t]he curriculum director and myself probably have the same vision of where we want the buildings to take off to.” “We’re looking at the same goal, making sure that they [students] make adequate progress…So, I think our goals are probably the same in regards to making sure that those goals are met for the school year,” he continued.

In comparison, Betty’s understanding of her instructional leadership overlap was very similar to Brian’s viewpoint. As a summation she echoed,

I think we all have the same goal. We want high academic achievement from the students and from that point of view we have to support high quality instructional techniques, making sure that teachers have good quality instructional materials in their hand, that they have access to the supplies that they need, that they have resources if they are struggling with something whether it’s discipline or instruction. And that we’re just giving them plain good moral support that they need in order to go in and do a top job every morning.

The Uniqueness of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Beta District Curriculum Leaders and Principals

Both the district curriculum leader and the principal acknowledged that between them there were some differences in their instructional leadership. Betty stated that the principal’s instructional leadership was “the strong role.” She explained more thoroughly,
he’s there, she’s there day to day. They often witness where teachers need support or assistance or additional training...They’re there to sit with the teacher when they are having parent conferences for the first time, to model behavior that they would like to see in their building.

Yet, when Betty described her instructional leadership to untenured teachers, she used a metaphor. She said, “[m]y role I see is much broader. I’m not saying it doesn’t have impact…I’m painting with a broader brush.”

Much of Brian’s response focused mainly on his own instructional leadership. However, he did make a few references about the instructional leadership of the district curriculum leader. Brian described the instructional leadership of the district curriculum leader as the “overseer of all the events that are happening.” He also added that, “[s]he’s probably the resource for me.” As Brian attempted to describe the uniqueness among their instructional leadership, he said, “[m]y role would probably be the implementation that the curriculum director wants, and probably the one that would encourage the teachers to do or to follow into the buy-in of the program.”

Beta District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities

When the teachers were asked to describe the instructional leadership of their district curriculum leader Bert responded first. He rattled off a list of instructional leadership tasks and services. According to Bert, “[t]hey [curriculum leaders] provide me with direction as far as what we’re teaching and help with preparing things for the proficiency test.” He said that the curriculum leader gave him “in-service training,” “materials,” and ensuring that he had the “latest stuff” (see Table 21).

Barbara, the other teacher in Beta District, also told about the instructional leadership of the district curriculum leader. However in contrast, she only gave a brief
Table 21

Beta District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities and Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Curriculum Leader</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Responsibilities</td>
<td>Program Management Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Provides standards</td>
<td>Establishes and plans district curriculum meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides opportunities to work with teachers</td>
<td>Analyze test data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides courses of study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides expectations for the State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides in-service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informs about State changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides money for supplemental books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with teachers.

synopsis of one instructional leadership service that was made available to her. Barbara
told me that,

[w]e have early release days where we get together with the other teachers in our district as a whole group— even high school, middle school. She [district curriculum leader] might bring in something that meets the needs, like this year… they taught us like how to redesign our lesson plans.
A discussion on the instructional leadership of the principal followed.

According to Bert, the instructional leadership service and task of the principal are “that he keeps up on whether or not we’re following through with meeting the state standards, and checks lesson plans.” “When we get observed twice a year, we get pulled into his office…He reviews things that we’ve done well that he’s seen—maybe things that we need to work on and how we can improve on that lesson that he observed,” added Barbara. Then she explained more about that observational process. She stated, [h]e provides us with extra feedback of what he’d seen and how we can work on our lesson plans and our teaching strategies.”

Bert maintained that the instructional leadership services of the district curriculum leader and principal were pretty much the same for him. He said, “I’d have to say that they both are doing about the same thing for me …they’re both again, making sure that I have my standards, that I’m meeting my standards, and that I have the training.” Barbara’s opinion was the same as Bert’s. She made the comment that, [t]hey both make sure we get the things that we need…they’re both making sure at the same time that we’re getting the services that we need and that are required for us to stay teaching and updating our license each year.

Gamma District

Gamma district was third to participate in this study. Similar to the other two districts, the Gamma district is also located in a suburban community (see Table 22). The enrollment was identified as approximately 5,200 students. Of those students, 25% qualified for a free or reduced lunch. Throughout this district there are 11 schools.
Seven schools are elementary buildings. Three are middle schools, and one is a high school.

Table 22

Gamma District Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Buildings</th>
<th>Student Pop.</th>
<th>% of Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader 1 Principal 2 Teachers</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 High 3 Middle 7 Elem.</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>25% 1292 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gloria Goulash was the district curriculum leader (see Table 23). She has held that position for about 5 years. Gloria was in her 50s. During her educational experience, she earned a master’s degree along with 15 post-graduate credits and tenured status. She had been in the educational field for about 11 years.

Gabrielle Gum served as the local principal for about 10 years and had been an educator for slightly longer. There were approximately 20 teachers and roughly 400 students at her school. Gabrielle was also in her 50s and had earned a master’s degree plus 30 additional post-graduate credits.

Gayle Guacamole had a bachelor’s degree along with 30 additional post-graduate credits. She had been an educator for over 10 years. Six years were in her current teaching position. Gayle also was in her 50s and untenured. The other teacher was Gwen Gumbo. She was in her 40s and had taught for more than 15 years. Gwen had a bachelor’s degree along with 15 post-graduate credits. She was also untenured.
Table 23

Gamma District Biographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnic or Racial Group</th>
<th>Yr. in Position</th>
<th>Yr. in Education</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Tenured Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Goulash</td>
<td>Curriculum Leader</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle Gum</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Guacamole</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Gumbo</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Gamma District

Curriculum Leaders

The overall general tasks of the district curriculum leader in the Gamma District were to plan, organize, implement, and evaluate the district’s educational program (see Table 24). Several of the district curriculum leader’s instructional leadership duties are to assist with supervision and evaluation of the professional staff, provide leadership in the curriculum development process, and to determine effective programs and instructional practice through research. The district curriculum leader was to monitor and evaluate instructional programs that were piloted, support principals with instructional improvement, and help with the development and implementation of the district-wide staff development program. Furthermore, the
district curriculum leader was to supervise the selection of resource materials, and coordinate the testing process for the district.

Table 24

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Gamma District Curriculum Leaders

- Assists in scheduling, recruiting, interviewing, supervising, and evaluating all professional and support personnel
- Provides leadership for the design, implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive curriculum development process
- Conducts on site research to determine effective programs and practices
- Encourages, monitors, and evaluates pilot programs that are implemented
- Supports the activities of principals for improvement of instruction
- Supports the formulation and implementation of a district-wide staff development
- Supervises the selection of textbooks, instructional materials and resources
- Coordinates assigned aspects of the districts and classroom assessment process
- Coordinates federal assistance programs
- Assists in budget planning process and follows district budgeting, purchasing, and inventory procedures as related to curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Participates in group decision-making when appropriate
- Consults with and coordinates the services of district and county resource personnel
- Works to continually improve school-community relations
- Shares responsibility for maintaining good order and discipline

*Note.* Source: District provided job description.

*Gamma District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks*

There were numerous instructional leadership responsibilities for the Gamma district curriculum leader. The instructional leadership tasks were clearly and directly connected to the instructional leadership responsibilities that were established. Some of the instructional leadership tasks performed for the implementation responsibility were chairing council meetings, providing professional development opportunities, and
providing instructional materials. In addition, the instructional leadership tasks associated with the program management responsibility of the Gamma district curriculum leader were assisting with the new teacher orientation program and assisting with the district’s long range planning (see Table 25).

Table 25

| Gamma District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks |
|---|---|
| **Implementation Responsibilities** | **Program Management Responsibilities** |
| **Tasks** | **Tasks** |
| • Provides Curriculum Materials | • Assists with district orientation program |
| • Provides Supplemental Materials | • Assists with district mentor program |
| • Provides Professional Development | • Assists with master cohort program |
| • Provides Workshops | • Assists with teaching and learning council |
| • Provides Instructional Resources | • Assists with technology council |
| • Provides Opportunities to attend seminars and conferences | • Assists with a five year plan for the district |
| • Chairs teaching and learning council meetings | |
| • Chairs technology council | |
| **Other Responsibilities** | **Note.** Source: Interview with district curriculum leader. |
| • None | |

*Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Gamma District Curriculum Leaders*

Gloria Goulash described her instructional leadership as providing, “any type of support for them [teachers] to do their job better.” She explained that there were several instructional leadership services and tasks for teachers. Gloria said that she provided teachers with “curriculum materials” and “supplemental materials.” “She also
admitted to helping to arrange “professional development,” “on-line workshops,” “graduate credit workshops,” and workshops for “developing lesson plans.”

Gloria gave more information to describe the instructional leadership service and tasks she offers to Gamma District teachers (see Table 26). As such, she declared that,

[w]e do provide opportunities for teachers to receive professional development and went this week to help teachers sort through and get rid of out dated resources and materials. So just a variety of different ways-just try to be there for them and provide service.

Table 26
Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Gamma District Curriculum Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gamma District Curriculum Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orientation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentor program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Masters cohort program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching and learning council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.*
Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Gamma District

Principals

The general responsibility of the Gamma principal was for administration, evaluation, implementation, and supervision of curricular programs and activities within her school in accordance to Board of Education policy, and applicable state and federal laws. Among the instructional leadership responsibilities, some duties include curriculum development, environment control of building and grounds, assessment, planning, and discipline. The principal was to supervise and evaluate the instructional program within the building. The principal was also accountable for directly supervising and evaluating the staff (see Table 27).

Table 27

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Gamma District Principals

- Works with the central office administration in all matters pertaining to development and implementation of educational programming
- Provides direction and leadership in planning, implementing, and supervising the educational program in the elementary school
- Works with teachers, coordinators, and curriculum department in the development of curriculum, staff development, and new programming
- Assists building staff and central office administration develop annual strategies to implement the school district’s strategic plan
- Assists in the screening, interviewing, hiring, and orientation of new staff members
- Responsible for the supervision, class/grade level assignment, and evaluation of certificated staff
- Provides direct supervision and participates in the evaluation of teachers, educational specialist, and all other approved personnel providing part-time services to the school
- Responsible for arrangement and coordination of staff meetings
- Provides leadership in the application of policies and procedures relating to discipline
- Establishes and maintains positive working relationships among staff, students, and the community

Note. Source: District provided job description.
Gamma District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

The Gamma district principals performed several instructional leadership tasks associated with instructional leadership responsibilities. Such instructional leadership responsibilities were for implementation, program management, and other. For implementation responsibilities the principal provided professional development, conducted observations, and provided supplemental instructional materials. For program management responsibilities the principal planned meetings, chaired meetings, and served on district curriculum committees. Further, the other responsibilities encompassed such tasks as assisting with parents and student intervention (see Table 28).

Table 28

Gamma District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides professional Development</td>
<td>• Chairs the continuous improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts formal and informal</td>
<td>• Plans staff development sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observations and evaluations</td>
<td>• Assists with the entry year program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts pre and post observation</td>
<td>• Plans professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conferences</td>
<td>sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides suggestions, notes, e-mail</td>
<td>• Serves on curriculum committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures appropriate planning, choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of materials, and instructional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides supplemental materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides staff development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assists teachers one on one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 28

Gamma District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assists teachers with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assists teachers with intervention assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Source: Interview with principal.

*Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Gamma District Principals*

Gabrielle Gum identified a few different instructional leadership services that she offered as a principal to untenured teachers. She said, “I provide a good portion of the professional development because being a small district we only have one curriculum coordinator… So, the principals have a pretty big role in that.” She maintained that there was no distinction made regarding the status of the teachers. As such, the availability of any professional development activity that she offered was made for all teachers. Then, Gabrielle told about another instructional leadership service that she had which dealt with teacher observations and evaluations. She professed that,

> I have to observe new teachers four times a year. Two times during the first half of the year and two times during the second half of the year…The rest of it is more on an informal basis—where I am in and out of classrooms, provide suggestions, little notes, e-mails—things like that.
In addition to providing information on the instructional leadership services of principals, Gloria talked about an instructional leadership task performed for teachers. She declared that,

[t]here is a support system for entry year teachers as a group. They meet as a group probably four times a year for some support…Our personnel person is the coordinator for our entry year program. And then, a committee (which I’m on), we plan those four sessions.

Gloria was asked to explain whether there was any overlap in the administrators’ instructional leadership. She replied, “[t]eachers can go to us with concerns and questions…we do provide similar things.” She added, “[w]e are trying to provide the best possible service based on teacher need which is ultimately based on student need. So, analyzing data that would be similar. Principals do that and so do we.”

Table 29

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Gamma District Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gamma District Principals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Services** | • Entry-year program  
| | • Professional development  
| | • Staff development  
| **Tasks** | • Entry-year committee member  
| | • Gives intervention assistance  
| | • Locates and finds materials  
| | • Finds funding  
| | • Mentor committee member  
| | • Helped to create a mentor handbook  
| | • Plan  

*Note. Source: Interview with principal.*
The Overlap in Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Gamma District

Curriculum Leaders and Principals

Gabrielle, the principal, replied. “[t]here are times when I will provide staff development sessions, professional development sessions, which they [district curriculum leaders] sometimes do as well.” More of Gabrielle’s thoughts were disclosed as she stated, “[w]e all work with teachers, we all do one-on-one, we all help support them [teachers] when they have difficulties. So, anybody in our district—coordinator or principal could be called upon to do pretty much the same thing if needed.”

The Uniqueness of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of District Curriculum Leaders and Principals

The administrators in the Gamma District found many ways in which their instructional leadership differed from one another. At beginning of their discussion, Gloria pointed out the variance in accessibility. She said that,

[t]he principal would be in the classroom on a daily basis - evaluating and observing and watching and providing feedback to teachers. Whereas we [district curriculum leaders] are meeting once a month in large group…So we aren’t seeing the day to day operation in the classroom.

“Basically my role [as a principal] is directed to the teachers in this building, and their [district curriculum leaders] role is district-wide,” asserted Gabrielle, “[t]hey [district curriculum leaders] do more in developing courses of study and curriculum. I don’t do very much of that unless I am on a committee.” Then Gabrielle gave more information to help clarify the differences among the instructional leadership of the principal and district curriculum leader in her district. She added,
[their district curriculum leaders] responsibilities are for aligning curriculum of the district to a state standard. Mine are to make sure people are following the curriculum day to day, that their planning is appropriate, and their choice of materials and instructional strategies. They’re [district curriculum leaders] responsible for more of the planning and creating of the curriculum and I’m more responsible to make sure that the curriculum is implemented.

**Gamma District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities**

Gwen announced the instructional leadership responsibilities of the district curriculum leader were for “making sure that our schools and teachers are aware of any changes in the standards or mandates from the state, try to maintain and keep update our materials. And somewhat help with coordinating and bring about in-service training.” The district curriculum leader likewise gathers teachers to “write new curriculum,” she added, “[t]hey also developed committees for getting, trying out, looking at new textbook materials and piloting those and getting feedback.” Gayle made another comment regarding the district curriculum leader’s service. She said, “[t]hey [district curriculum leaders] provide our extended workshops. They support us if there is new training that has to be done. They also supply us with supplies.”

Our discussion eventually focused on the instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal. Gayle explained, “[w]e would go to our principal and say we need more help in this area. If it’s a workshop or extended resources that she can do, she would provide it for us.” In addition Gwen stated, our principal “will help us with any kind of extra training we want or need…any kind of in-servicing…she’s helpful.”

The administrators’ instructional leadership that differs “I would think it would be the scope,” noted Gayle, “[s]he [principal] sees K-5…our district person would be
much more wide scoped.” Gwen concurred by stating, “[t]he curriculum director is involved in all the areas from high school down to kindergarten. Then the principal takes over with their building.” Also there was a similarity. According to Gwen, the administrators overlap with “the curriculum and standards.” She said, “[t]hey overlap just with the curriculum and standards—helping us with our materials and development” (see Table 30)

Table 30

Gamma District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities and Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Curriculum Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Responsibilities</td>
<td>Program Management Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides work-shops and in-services</td>
<td>• Establishes continuous improvement teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides supplies</td>
<td>• Plans cluster meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides extended resources</td>
<td>• Analyze test scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides State standards</td>
<td>• Establishes curriculum, textbook adoption committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinates in-services</td>
<td>• Analyze test scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist with rewriting courses of study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assists with parent conferencing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delta District

The fourth participating district is Delta. Unlike the other districts, the Delta school district is a rural community that accommodated several cattle and crop farms. Approximately 2,000 students were identified as being enrolled in this school district. 17% of the student population was identified as being eligible for a free or reduced lunch. This district had five school facilities. There were three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school (see Table 31).

Table 31
Delta District Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Buildings</th>
<th>Student Pop.</th>
<th>% of Free or Reduced Lunch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>1 Curriculum Leader, 2 Principals, 4 Teachers</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 High, 1 Middle, 1 Elem.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>17% 306 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diane Danish was the official district curriculum leader (see Table 32). She was in her 50s and had served as the district curriculum coordinator for about 5 years. Diane had earned a master’s degree along with 30 additional post-graduate credits. Although Diane had been involved in education for at least 31 years, she had not gained tenure status.

Daniel Dough was one of two principals that participated in this study. There were about 500 students at his middle school. Among those students approximately 100 of them received a free or reduced lunch. Daniel had served as a principal in this
current position less than 11 years. However, he had been an educator over 36 years and had gained tenured status.

Table 32

Delta District Biographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnic or Racial Group</th>
<th>Yr. in Position</th>
<th>Yr. in Education</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Tenured Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>Curriculum Leader</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonna</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Devonna Dairy worked as a mathematics teacher at the middle school. She was in her 40s. She had received a bachelor’s degree with 15 additional post-graduate credits. Devonna had been an educator for more than 15 years and was untenured.

Denise Dip was also a middle school teacher. She was in her 30s and had 5 years’ teaching experience. Denise earned a bachelor’s degree along with 30 additional post-graduate credits. She was untenured.
Another administrator in the Delta district was Darlene Dill. Darlene had been an educator for over 25 years. She had served as an elementary principal for about 10 years. Darlene was in her 40s and had tenure. At her building, approximately 200 students attended school. About 70 of those students were identified as being eligible for a free or reduced lunch.

Deborah Dressing was in her 30s. She had earned a bachelor’s degree and had about 6 years of teaching experience. Deborah was a pre-kindergarten teacher and untenured. Likewise, Drew Dijon was also an untenured teacher at the elementary school. Drew was in her 20s and had earned a bachelor’s degree as well.

*Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Delta District*

*Curriculum Leaders*

The district curriculum leader had a wide array of instructional leadership responsibilities to fulfill for assisting the district with curriculum and staff development activities and promoting an effective learning environment. For instance, the district curriculum leader was to direct the delivery and continuous improvement of curriculum and instructional services, and to help develop and implement the continuous improvement plan. Other responsibilities included working with schools to develop and implement instructional programs, serving on curriculum and professional development committees, and keeping current with State standards. The district curriculum leader was to help develop and evaluate curriculum, recommend and evaluate instructional resources, assist with the entry-year program, and monitor the district’s assessment program (see Table 33).
Table 33

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Delta District Curriculum Leaders

- Directs the delivery and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction services
- Helps develop and implement the continuous improvement plan
- Develops strategies to accomplish program objectives within specified time lines
- Provides staff leadership
- Helps resolve problems
- Maintains open and effective communications with staff and other stakeholders
- Monitors legislative activities, educational initiatives, and technology innovations
- Helps update administrative guidelines/procedures to comply with state educational policies and procedures
- Facilitates collaborative planning efforts
- Keeps current with K-12 courses of study, scope and sequence frameworks, and state standards
- Provides technical assistance
- Serves on curriculum committees
- Helps develop and evaluates curriculum for all K-12 course offerings
- Helps evaluate and recommend books, equipment, and other instructional materials
- Collaborates with supervisors to improve staff competencies
- Promotes ongoing opportunities for staff development
- Provides leadership in the planning and delivery of staff development programs
- Assists with entry year teacher mentoring programs
- Participates in staff selection, orientation, and evaluation process as requested
- Serves as a liaison for curriculum and instruction programs
- Encourages staff to develop and implement innovative instructional activities
- Monitors testing programs
- Provides direction for instructional modifications
- Participates in parent conferences when requested
- Helps prepare grant/program proposals
- Supervises the collection, entry, and verification of program data as directed

*Note.* Source: District provided job description.
Delta District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

In the Delta district the district curriculum leader had many instructional leadership responsibilities. To fulfill those instructional leadership responsibilities the district curriculum leader had implementation and program management responsibilities. For implementation responsibilities, the district curriculum leader provided various professional development for untenured teachers. The district curriculum leader conducted test analysis, established and planned professional development programs for program management responsibilities. In addition, the district curriculum leader also provided input for intervention and helped to write the entry-year contract as tasks for other instructional leadership responsibilities (see Table 34).

Table 34

Delta District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides all professional development</td>
<td>• Conducts test analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides in-service</td>
<td>• Establishes, plans and chairs the testing committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides workshop</td>
<td>• Establishes, plans, and chairs a professional develop committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helps teachers implement standards</td>
<td>• Organizes workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts grade level meetings</td>
<td>• Coordinates the textbook adoption committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assists teachers in analyzing test scores</td>
<td>• Gathers textbook samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Orders tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Works with lead mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishes, plans, and chairs the report card committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

/table continues
Table 34

Delta District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides intervention input as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped to write contract for the entry-year teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sits in on meetings requested by the principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.

*Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Delta District Curriculum Leaders*

The district curriculum leader told about the instructional leadership services and tasks that she performed. Those services and tasks centered on four general areas. Diane stated, “[a]nything that has to do with the Ohio Department of Education content standards, I help them [teachers] implement them in the classroom. I also provide all the professional development for the teachers in the district.” In addition she added, “I’m in charge of testing in the district.” “When we get back the test, we go through all the data analysis of it. I’ve done frequency distributions with them [teachers] to see trends. Then we go through the item analysis with all the tests,” she continued. “[t]extbook ordering is the other thing that I do.”

*Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Delta District Principals*

Delta principals were to use their administrative, leadership, and supervisory skills to foster the educational development of students. Their key instructional
Table 35

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Delta District Curriculum Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development program</td>
<td>Helps to implement content standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Assists with analyzing test scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizes workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Runs textbook adoption committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets book samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orders tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shares test results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides intervention input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizes the entry year committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.*

Responsibilities were to supervise, assist, and formally evaluate all staff and educational programs in their schools. They were to guide student conduct, maintain discipline, orient new staff, and assist in their development. Also, principals were to conduct staff meetings, conferences, and assist with curriculum development and instructional improvement (see Table 36).
Table 36

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Delta District Principals

- Supervise and evaluates school staff, providing assistance and making evaluations as needed
- Provide written recommendations on all staff members up for contract renewals
- Supervises the program to enhance individual student education and development
- Establishes guides for proper student conduct and maintaining student discipline
- Oriented newly assigned staff members and assists in their development
- Conducts staff meetings
- Assists in the recruiting, hiring, training, and assigning of school’s staff
- Makes arrangements for parent and teacher conferences
- Works with supervisors to develop curriculum and improvement of instruction

Note. Source: District provided job description.

Delta District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

Among the instructional leadership of Delta district principals, there were several categories of responsibilities. Those responsibilities were implementation, program management, and other. The Delta district principal completed many instructional leadership tasks related to implementation responsibilities. The principal maintained a professional library for untenured teachers, identified proper instructional techniques, and provided opportunities for untenured teachers to observe veteran teachers. Some instructional leadership tasks for program management responsibilities were assisting with the new teacher orientation program and planning various meetings. In addition, the Delta district principal aided untenured teachers with student and parent issues for other responsibilities (see Table 37).
Table 37

Delta District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts faculty meetings and in-services</td>
<td>• Plans faculty meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subscribes and maintains a professional journals</td>
<td>• Serves on various district curriculum committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have discussions</td>
<td>• Assists with teacher orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitors and evaluates</td>
<td>• Assists with planning in-service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides feedback</td>
<td>• Conducts data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides help through professional development, tools, or materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies proper instructional techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Answers questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sends teachers to observe and work with veteran teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provides support with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works with parents and assists with parent issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acts as an liaison between teachers and district curriculum leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with principals.

*Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Delta District Principals*

Daniel described instructional leadership tasks that he performed for teachers working in his building. He said,

I identify for them [teachers] proper instructional techniques, working with them to be sure that they are delivering those. Also, be a resource if they have any questions or having a particular difficulty in an area to get them some professional development or materials.

Darlene the second Delta District principal made a similar statement in regards to important instructional leadership services and tasks. She told me that,
If they [teachers] are having problems in the classroom, I am able to act as a liaison. If I don’t know the answer, I can find someone else to help them with them or send them places to work with other teachers.

The Overlap in Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Delta District Curriculum Leaders and Principals

The participating administrators provided commentary on the overlap in their instructional leadership responsibilities (see Table 38). One principal was the first administrator to speak. “Both of our goals is to improve instruction,” commented Daniel, “We work together a lot. We do some planning together—both from my building. And as a group of principals, we meet with her [the district curriculum leader] to provide from the district.”

Table 38

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Delta District Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delta District Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subscribes to journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains a professional library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies proper instructional techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides support with students and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Surveys literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works with teachers on classroom issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (table continues)*
Table 38

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Delta District Principals (continued)

- Meets with teachers to make instructional decisions
- Works with parent concerns and issues
- Textbook adoption at the building level
- Does data analysis
- Works on district-wide report card
- Planning

Note. Source: Interview with principals.

Likewise when I spoke to Diane, she also described a similarity among the administrators’ instructional leadership tasks. She replied that,

[w]e are on the same team. When we are analyzing test scores from a building…I’m doing it in partnership with the principal…[w]e’re all on the same page trying to make sure the kids are learning, and the teachers are teaching.

Then Darlene added another statement on the instructional leadership tasks of the administrators that was shared. She said, “[w]e have to be there for the teachers when they need help and be aware of the problems…and jump on those and try to get them solved before they turn into a major problem.”

The Uniqueness of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Delta District Curriculum Leaders and Principals

Next, the administrators were asked to tell about the uniqueness among their instructional leadership. Daniel commented, “[h]er scope—the coordinator’s scope would be wider than mine. Mine would be more narrow.” Darlene clarified the difference between her instructional leadership responsibilities and those of the district curriculum leader. She said, “[s]he [district curriculum leader] focuses mainly on
instructional. She does a lot of our data analysis and stuff. It seems most of my
time…is taken up with a lot of the parent concerns.” Darlene explained further. She
said, “I’m more involved in the day to day things that go on…a lot of the time I spend
with the teachers is working with parents--to get them [parents] on board.”

When Diane, the district curriculum leader, discussed the differences between
the administrators’ instructional leadership responsibilities, she commented, “I am a
support service.” She continued,

[1]he role of a principal is the instructional leader of a building. I am an
instructional leader of a district in the areas that I am responsible for…I’m the
instructional leader in making sure that the teachers are covering…standards
and that the kids are learning.

Daniel agreed. He said, “[m]y role is a building centered role. It’s dealing with
the teachers and in my building as oppose to teachers in the whole district. He then
informed me of his responsibilities by announcing that, “I’m responsible for my
building. She’s [district curriculum leader] responsible for the district. Again, in terms
of the focus. Mine would be more narrow than would be the coordinator’s.”

Darlene stated, “[s]he [district curriculum leader] see the whole big picture
across the district where I work more in the building on what we need.” Then she told
me that,

If we are doing instructional things like our textbook adoptions, she [district
curriculum leader] kind of oversees…where I just do it as a building level. You
know I can get input from my teachers as to what we want, and then I take it to
her and she kind of coordinates it altogether.

Delta District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities

Denise told me about the instructional leadership tasks that the district
curriculum leader performed for her (see Table 39). She explained that the district
Table 39

Delta District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District Curriculum Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Responsibilities</td>
<td>Program Management Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Provides resources, standards, in-services, textbooks, and supplemental materials</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures curriculum alignment</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Answers questions about standards and testing</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Provides information on workshops</td>
<td>Provides moral support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informs teachers of State policy changes</td>
<td>Sits in on parent conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finds need materials</td>
<td>Assists with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides extra supplies</td>
<td>Establishes lesson planning requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducts formal evaluations</td>
<td>Establishes common planning periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure effective teaching</td>
<td>Assists with problem students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides feedback</td>
<td>Establishes the number of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Informs teachers of workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with teachers.

The curriculum leader was “helpful in providing information with workshops… She’s provided me with in-service time… where we can work on curriculum alignment.” In addition, Deborah provided another affirmation of the district curriculum leader’s instructional leadership tasks. She stated, “[t]he curriculum coordinator helped in our
mentoring meeting...she helped in the running of those.” Then Deborah added, “I had to pick a new curriculum for the preschool...Any questions I would have concerning the curriculum she would be able to help with or licensing for the preschool.”

Somewhat later, Drew named various ways that her principal’s instructional leadership supported her. She announced, “[s]he gives us ideas to try. She’s there if we have problems. We can go to her—big or small problems.” To further illustrate the instructional leadership of the principal, Devonna asserted, “[h]e takes care of everything...If it’s a parent, if it’s a question about my book [lesson plan], if it’s a question about what I’m doing this year...that all falls on him.”

In regards to similarities in the instructional leadership of the administrators Devonna claimed, “[t]hey are both after the same goal...Whatever the state says she [district curriculum leader] has to make sure that we are doing it, and he [principal] has to make sure we are following through.” However in contrast, Deborah described a distinction within the administrators’ instructional leadership. She declared, “[t]he curriculum coordinator kind of oversees district wide instruction and the principal assures that it’s being carried out within the building.

Epsilon District

The Epsilon district was the fifth and final district that participated in this study. This district is located in a small urban community. The number of students enrolled there was roughly 29,000 in a K-12 setting. Out of those students, nearly 60% were eligible for a free or reduced lunch. The Epsilon district had 60 school buildings. Among those buildings, there were 43 elementary schools, 8 middle schools, and 8 high schools (see Table 40).
The official district curriculum leader in the Epsilon district was Emma Egg (see Table 41). Emma was in her 50s. She had earned a master’s degree and 15 additional post-graduate school credits. Although Emma had served in this position for less than six years, she had been an educator for over 25 years.
Besides Emma another administrator in this district was Ernest Eggplant. Ernest was in his 40s. He was an elementary school principal. At his school, there were about 270 boys and girls enrolled. Among those children, 100% of them were eligible for a free or reduced lunch. This was Ernest’s first year as a principal but he has been an educator for over 20 years. While working as a teacher, Ernest obtained tenured status. He also earned a master’s degree and 15 additional post-graduate credits.

There were three teachers from the Epsilon district that volunteered for this study. The first teacher was Edwina Endive. Edwina was in her 30s and untenured. During her career she earned a bachelor’s degree with 15 post-graduate credits. Edwina had been a special education teacher no more than 15 years.

The second teacher was Eden Enchilada who taught kindergarten. Eden was in her 50s. Within the previous month, she recently received tenure. Eden also earned a bachelor’s degree and 15 additional post-graduate credits. Eden had taught no more than 15 years.

Eva Empanada was another special education teacher that volunteered for this study. Eva was in her 30s. She also just recently received tenured status. Eva acquired a bachelor’s degree along with 15 post-graduate credits. She had no more than 10 years teaching experience.

*Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Epsilon District*

*Curriculum Leaders*

The general responsible of the district curriculum leader in the Epsilon District was for coordinating curriculum development. Several of specific instructional leadership tasks included assisting with program development, organizing programs,
and facilitating the new teacher orientation program. In addition, the district curriculum leader was responsible for observing, consulting, and assisting untenured teachers with their professional development. Furthermore, the district curriculum leader was to assist with organizing district-wide programs, chair curriculum development committees, provide staff development, and analyze test scores (see Table 42).

Table 42

Job Description of Epsilon District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities

- Confers with teachers on instructional techniques, classroom management, and course content
- Provides leadership in staff development for teachers and information for principals
- Coordinates and chairs committees in the curriculum development process
- Assists in policy development regarding language arts curriculum
- Provides leadership to coordinate the sequence of studies
- Observes classroom teachers
- Assists classroom teachers in developing learning objectives, methods, and course content
- Facilitates the induction program for new teachers
- Coordinates the ordering and maintenance of materials
- Assists in developing new programs and in the development of oversight of workshops
- Coordinates district-wide programs

*Note.* Source: District provided job description.

*Epsilon District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks*

The Epsilon district curriculum leader performed implementation program management and other responsibilities to fulfill instructional leadership. For implementation responsibilities the district curriculum leader supported untenured
teachers by developing graded courses of study, assessment tools, and pacing guides.

The district curriculum leader coordinated textbook adoptions, and monitored student achievement. In addition, the district curriculum leader also had other responsibilities that encompassed working with presenters for professional development (see Table 43).

Table 43

Epsilon District Curriculum Leaders’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides professional development, workshops</td>
<td>• Surveys teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develops and provides the graded course of study based on State standards</td>
<td>• Coordinates textbook adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides instructional strategies</td>
<td>• Plans and coordinates network meetings for each grade level (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develops and provides assessment tools</td>
<td>• Monitors achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purchases and provides materials and resources</td>
<td>• Works with professional development presenters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides a pacing guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts curriculum and instruction visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Responsibilities</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Epsilon District Curriculum Leaders

Emma told me about several of her services and tasks for untenured teachers (see Table 44). Initially she explained,
Table 44

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Epsilon District Curriculum Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epsilon District Curriculum Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum and instructional visits with feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Source: Interview with district curriculum leader.*

I talk with those teachers, survey those teachers. Find out what their needs are as far as professional development and try to provide that professional development for them. If there are materials and resources needed, that’s a part of my job also.

Then Emma told me about a service she provided for teachers who taught in the middle or high schools. She said, “[w]e [district curriculum leaders] have curriculum and instruction visits where we go into classrooms…and we visit with teachers while they are instructing, and then we provide a feedback sheet for them.”
Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Epsilon District Principals

The school principal’s general responsibility was to improve student achievement. Some key instructional leadership duties the principal had were to plan, implement, and evaluate the district’s continuous improvement plan, staff development, curriculum, and discipline program. The principal was to supervise and evaluate all personnel within the building and manage instructional resources. A few of the other obligations were to analyze and interpret test scores (see Table 45).

Table 45

Job Description of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Epsilon District Principals

- Supports teaching and learning through adherence to the State Administrative Standards
- Coordinates, implements, and evaluates the district’s and school’s continuous improvement plan, staff development, curriculum, teaching and learning environment, discipline, and supervision/evaluation of all staff
- Responsible for management and compliance of all federal, state, and local laws, policies and procedures
- Assists with supervising students and monitoring disciplinary procedures

Note. Source: District provided job description.

Epsilon Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

The Epsilon district principal had a few broad instructional leadership responsibilities to complete (see Table 46). As such the principals performed implementation, program management and other responsibilities. Some tasks
Table 46

Epsilon District Principals’ Instructional Leadership Responsibilities Compared to Instructional Leadership Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Responsibilities</th>
<th>Program Management Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observes teachers and provide feedback</td>
<td>• Gathers and analyzes data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides in-service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talks with teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides opportunities for workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides opportunities to work with veteran teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides opportunities to work on an intervention team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides ideas, suggestions, and information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assists with student discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Source: Interview with principal.*

performed for implementation responsibilities were providing opportunities for professional development, conducting observations, and providing feedback. For responsibilities of program management, the principal gathered and analyzed data for the school. In addition, the principal also assisted with discipline issues for other responsibilities.
Ernest Eggplant described several instructional leadership services that he provided for teachers at his elementary school (see Table 47). According to Ernest he provided at least four types of service. He asserted,

We do observe untenured teachers every year at least two to four times a year. We also have Waiver Day where we do some instruction and that’s with everybody…Also of the newer teachers…I’ve gotten them to go to some workshops, do some work with some more experienced teachers.

Table 47

Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Epsilon District Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epsilon District Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workshop opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities to work on an intervention team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observations and give feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Talks with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives ideas and suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides opportunities to observe and work with veteran teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducts “walk-throughs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assists with discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Source: Interview with principal.*

Following that discussion, Ernest then explained that there was one important task that was very time consuming for him. Ernest stated, “[y]ou know it’s not just untenured teachers…but discipline takes up a large part. Again, when a beginning
teacher does not know how to handle kids, they quite often run into problems, which ends up being problems in the classroom.”

*The Overlap in Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Epsilon District

*Curriculum Leaders and Principals

Ernest identified a likeness between the instructional leadership of the district curriculum leader and principal. He commented, “[t]he roles are similar…the goal is the same to make those people and the department successful.” In addition, Emma also expressed her thoughts on the overlapping role of the administrators. She said, “I would say that probably monitoring the achievement and monitoring the instructional approaches of teachers…is a major responsibility for all of us” that overlap among our tasks.

*The Uniqueness of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities of Epsilon District

*Curriculum Leaders and Principals

In contrast to the instructional leadership overlap, Ernest provided one example of the uniqueness that resided between the instructional leadership tasks of the two administrative groups in this study. He professed that, “If you’re a field administrator …You’re the one that’s going to give the immediate help. The district person is going to come out to help if I call…but they are dealing with a large amount of buildings.”

In addition, Emma the district curriculum leader conveyed another example of a difference among the instructional leadership tasks of the district curriculum leader and principal. Emma noted that, “[p]rincipals focus on the management end of the building…I’m dealing with the instructional staff or the teachers…They deal with all aspects of that school building.” She then added, “[t]hey have to look at so many
different aspects of the operation of the building…and I am specifically looking at curriculum all the time.”

_Epsilon District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities_

The Epsilon District teachers discussed the instructional leadership services that were extended to them by their district curriculum leader (see Table 48). Eden was the first to describe the district curriculum leaders’ instructional leadership services. She said, “[t]hey instruct us [teachers] on how to use the materials in the classroom and give us ways to differentiate instruction.” Edwina added, “I think that they’re [district curriculum leaders] a resource to provide answers to questions we [teachers] might have about how to implement the curriculum.” Then she stated that one district curriculum leader had spoke to teachers about “how the pacing guides…are being implemented.”

**Table 48**

_Epsilon District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Curriculum Leaders</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Responsibilities</td>
<td>Program Management Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides answers to curriculum questions</td>
<td>• Purchase materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orders textbooks</td>
<td>• Plan curriculum meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set pacing guides and ensures it use</td>
<td>• Plans professional development and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides textbooks, assessments, and other materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides State standards and new curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_(table continues)_
Table 48

Epsilon District Teachers’ Confirmations of Instructional Leadership Responsibilities (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provides instruction on how to use standards and materials</th>
<th>Provides suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides professional development and workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides specific content information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Responsibilities</th>
<th>Other Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensures that classrooms are running smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides instruction on collecting data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides support for parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deals with behavior issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Source: Interview with teachers.

In addition, the teachers also reviewed the instructional leadership services that were offered to them by their principal. Edwina said, “[t]hey provide support for us as far as if we have questions…they help us to make sure that our classrooms are running smoothly.” Moreover Eden stated, that “[t]he principal helps the teachers decide how to use the materials with their students.” Plus principals “back them [teachers] up as far as parents,” added Eva.

Next the teachers discussed the overlap in the instructional leadership tasks. Eden announced that both instructional leaders “need to provide the best curriculum, materials, and instruction for all students.” In addition, Eva explained that those two
administrators were “here to help the students achieve goals” and to “support teachers.” Those administrators “have the same goals in mind. Both are working towards maintaining the same standard of education throughout the district. They are both interested in how it’s being implemented and how the curriculum is being used,” Edwina concurred.

Then each teacher voiced their opinion on the differences in the instructional leadership tasks of the district curriculum leader and principal. Eva stated that the district curriculum leader was “going to deal more with academics where a principal… would be more of a behavior support.” Edwina provided another statement on the difference. She asserted that district curriculum leaders were to, “set up everything…while the principals are actually in the buildings helping.” Eden further explained that district curriculum leaders “are responsible for the whole district” and principals are responsible for “the principal’s own building.”

Summary

The literature suggested that historically there were changes among the instructional leadership of district curriculum leaders and principals. As such, this study centered on the prevalent instructional leadership performed by contemporary district curriculum leaders and principals. Findings from this study revealed both similarities and variations existed among and between the perceived instructional leadership performed by the administrators in each of the five school districts (see Table 49).

In the next chapter, the following categories serve as a classification system for this study. The categories are (a) instructional leadership responsibilities of district curriculum leaders, (b) instructional leadership responsibilities of principals, (c) a
comparison of those two administrator’s instructional leadership responsibilities and
(d) the teachers’ corroboration of those administrators’ instructional leadership
responsibilities.
Table 49
Biographic and Demographic Table of Five Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dist. Name</th>
<th>Dist. Type</th>
<th>No. of Bldg.</th>
<th>Student Pop.</th>
<th>% of Free or Reduced lunch</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnic or Racial Group</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Year in Ed.</th>
<th>Yr. in Position</th>
<th>Tenured Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Sub.</td>
<td>3 Elem.</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>C. Lead.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>la - Tchr.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Sub.</td>
<td>4 Elem.</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>C. Lead.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>la - Tchr.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>Sub.</td>
<td>7 Elem.</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>C. Lead.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>la - Tchr.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>3 Elem.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Curr. L.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>la - Tchr.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsilon</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40 Elem</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>C. Lead.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The case study method was used for this study to explore the perceived instructional leadership responsibilities of district curriculum leaders and principals as they pertain to providing instructional leadership to untenured teachers. To provide detailed descriptions for this study, district job descriptions and interviews were used. Interviews were conducted with five district curriculum leaders, six principals, and thirteen teachers in a mid-western state.

This chapter has four sections. The first section gives a synthesis of the demographic and biographic data of this study. The second section relates the findings (from Chapter IV) to the emerging themes that evolved from the job descriptions, interviews, and literature for each research question. Then the conclusion is presented. The final section in this chapter gives the implications and recommendations for future research.

This study sought to uncover overlapping, conflicting, or neglected instructional leadership responsibilities in five districts, six schools and among 13 teachers. As such, the following research questions guided this study:

1. How do district curriculum leaders and principals describe their instructional leadership responsibilities for supporting untenured teachers?
2. According to district curriculum leaders and principals, how are their instructional leadership responsibilities overlapping or unique?

3. How are the instructional leadership responsibilities reported by district curriculum leaders and principals corroborated by untenured teacher reports?

A Demographic and Biographic Synthesis of Five Districts and the Participants

This study was assisted by several school districts (n = 5) in a mid-western state with differing community types (n = 3). Among the communities, 60% were suburban, 20% were rural, and another one were urban. There were a total of 87 buildings within the general school districts for this study. The high schools accounted for 19.5% of the buildings. Fifteen percent were middle school buildings, and 65.5% were elementary school buildings. Approximately 42,900 students were enrolled in the schools (n = 87). Students receiving a free or reduced lunch comprised 56% of the student population (see Table 50).

Table 50

Demographic Synthesis of Five Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Community Type Frequencies and Percentage n = 5</th>
<th>No. of Buildings Frequencies and Percentage n = 87</th>
<th>Student Populations</th>
<th>% of Free or Reduced Lunches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• n = 3 Suburban 60%</td>
<td>• n = 17 High Schools – 19.5%</td>
<td>• Students n = 42,900</td>
<td>• 18,917 Students 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 1 Rural - 20%</td>
<td>• n = 13 Middle Schools – 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 1 Urban - 20%</td>
<td>• n = 57 Elementary Schools – 65.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three groups of participants volunteered in this study. There were 13 teachers, 6 principals, and 5 district curriculum leaders. Data analysis showed a majority were female (n = 20) as opposed to male (n = 4). The participants’ ethnicity or race comprised 92% Whites in comparison to 8% Blacks. The age ranges (n = 23) were from 20-69 years old. However, 40% of the participants were between 50-59 years old (n = 9). The years in education ranged from 1-40 years. Of the participants, 25% had 11-15 years of experience in education. Only one participant had 21-25 years in education and one other who had 36-40 years of experience. At least 50% of the participants had over 5 years of experience in their current positions. Most were untenured (61%).

Some untenured teachers (n = 8) had over 5 years’ teaching experience. Years of teaching for untenured teachers ranged from 1-5 years to 16-20 years. The reasons those untenured teachers had many years of teaching experience were unknown. Perhaps those untenured teachers did not gain tenured status because of professional development plans or coursework requirements needed to upgrade their licenses. Table 51 provides a biographic synthesis of the participants.

Table 51

Biographic Synthesis of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequencies and Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Curriculum Leaders</td>
<td>n = 5 – 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>n = 6 – 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>n = 13 – 54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 51
Biographic Synthesis of the Participants (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n = 24</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (n = 20) – 83%</td>
<td>Male (n = 4) – 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic or Racial Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks (n = 2) – 8%</td>
<td>Whites (n = 22) – 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29 years (n = 4) – 17%</td>
<td>30-39 years (n = 5) – 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49 years (n = 4) – 17%</td>
<td>50-59 years (n = 9) – 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60-69 years (n = 1) – 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years (n = 5) – 21%</td>
<td>6-10 years (n = 3) – 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years (n = 6) – 25%</td>
<td>16-20 years (n = 3) – 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-25 years (n = 1) – 4%</td>
<td>26-30 years (n = 2) – 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35 years (n = 3) – 12.5%</td>
<td>36-40 years (n = 1) – 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years (n = 12) – 50%</td>
<td>6-10 years (n = 9) – 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15 years (n = 2) – 8%</td>
<td>16-20 years (n = 1) – 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (n = 9) – 39%</td>
<td>No (n = 14) – 61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Results

A cross-case analysis of the interview transcripts showed that all district curriculum leaders fulfilled a few instructional leadership responsibilities. Those instructional leadership responsibilities were implementation and program management. One instructional leadership responsibility was for implementation. Studies from Marsh and Willis (1995), Ornstein and Hunkins (1993), and Snyder et al.
(1989) each support the concept of implementation. The other instructional leadership responsibility was for program management. This concept of program management was endorsed by Kowalski and Reitzug (1993), Matthews and Crow (2003), and Orlosky, McCleary, Shapiro, and Webb (1984). However, one district curriculum leader that participated in this study also reported other instructional leadership responsibilities in addition to implementation and program management responsibilities. For instance, if a principal requested, she would sit in on their meetings. Also, that district curriculum leader helped to write her district’s entry-year teacher contract.

Research Question One

How do district curriculum leaders and principals describe their instructional leadership responsibilities for supporting untenured teachers? The district curriculum leaders described their instructional leadership for all teachers as opposed to untenured teachers exclusively. A cross case analysis of the interview transcripts showed that most district curriculum leaders (n = 4) made provisions or assisted with either a mentor or entry-year program for untenured teachers. One district curriculum leader shared information about some of the activities involved in the entry-year program within her district. She said,

[w]e have for [the] very first year teachers a program set up where they must observe their mentor teacher five times during the course of the year with a targeted objective to learn about… [t]he mentor observes them five times and they observe master teachers six times during the course of their first year or they can extend it into their second year if they have trouble getting it all in the first year. And again, they observe for targeted things and…[t]hey write a reflection.
However, teacher status was not a major focus of instructional leadership for district curriculum leaders. That is, instructional leadership was not generally exclusionary. Regardless to the status of teachers, every district curriculum leader spoke about fulfilling instructional leadership services and tasks for all teachers in their districts.

District curriculum leaders. This study showed that frequently implementation responsibilities of district curriculum leaders referred to various instructional leadership programs that were sponsored by the school district or any instructional leadership services performed by district curriculum leaders for instructional improvement and student learning. All district curriculum leaders (n = 5) in this study fulfilled implementation responsibilities for untenured teachers through various models of professional development.

The professional development models that were used seemed to have had different formats and were delivered through varying group size settings. A district curriculum leader provided a statement that illustrated the various types of professional development in her district. In her statement, the district curriculum leader mentioned three types of professional development offered to untenured teachers. She said, “[a]s far as professional development, we have quite a few things in the district…[w]e bring in nationally known speakers.” She added, “We provide on-line workshops…. [w]e also provide graduate credit workshops.”

Regarding the district curriculum leader’s statement, Marsh and Willis (1995), Snyder, Bolin, and Zumwalt (1989), and Glickman (2002) indicated that the ways in which district curriculum leaders arrange teacher interactions for professional
development influences implementation. The formatting of professional development models for implementation may either increase or reduce the range of instructional alternatives. As such, to fulfill implementation responsibilities, many district curriculum leaders in this study offered a wide array of professional development opportunities. Among many professional developments there were master’s cohort programs, mentoring programs, conferences, and workshops.

Some district curriculum leaders worked independently and provided direct training for untenured teachers. Others made arrangements for more collaboration with teachers. That is, teachers assisted in providing professional development for other teachers. Still, there were others that presented professional development through various models and formats. Work from Glatthorn, Boschee, and Whitehead (2006) and Matthews and Crow (2003) further support these findings on different models of professional development.

Within the professional development formats, district curriculum leaders talked with teachers about curriculum and instructional issues. They worked along side teachers and had discussions concerning implementation. Sergiovanni (1995) also supported this finding on encouraging and engaging teachers in professional dialogues. One district curriculum leader gave an explanation of how she went about rendering professional development within her district. She said,

[i]t’s more from a training angle than from going into the classroom and modeling and teaching behaviors. We’ll [the district curriculum leader and teachers] take whole days where I’ll just meet with kindergarten or just first grade or second. We work on our language arts maps for the year or our math maps--maybe both.
Besides direct training, professional development was also rendered by some
district curriculum leaders through more collaborative formats. A few district
curriculum leaders in this study also reported establishing network meetings or
professional learning councils for teachers. Not only were those professional
development formats useful in allowing teachers an opportunity to collaborate and
share; but those professional development formats also aided the district curriculum
leader in decision-making for school improvement (Leithwood, 2001). One example of
this type of professional development was given by a district curriculum leader. She
expressed that,

I take a building team leader from each building and I work with them
training… I meet with all of them once a month. They met with teachers in
their building and they worked on just building level problems. They developed
lessons, shared them together.

Another district curriculum leader in this study gave another example that
showed collaboration. The district curriculum leader illustrated the dual benefits
received from professional development such as teaching and learning councils. She
said,

[w]e also give them [teachers] opportunities to participate in our teaching and
learning council that meets once a month. And we talk about what things are
going on in the classroom and things going on in the building. And they give us
ideas and suggestions on how we can improve that.

Implementation responsibilities of district curriculum leaders were also
accomplished sometimes through classroom observations and feedback. This was how
two districts in this study gave instructional leadership to untenured teachers. One
district curriculum leader gave a description of this type of instructional leadership
service. She said, “if I am in a classroom, and I am visiting or I am making an
observation… I can sit down then and maybe begin to try to help to map out some instructional strategies [for the teacher to improve instruction].”

In addition to the implementation responsibilities, all district curriculum leaders had program management responsibilities they fulfilled. Program management responsibilities alluded to administrative duties that impacted the instructional program for meeting the needs of the local school community. Kowalski and Reitzug, (1993) and Matthews and Crow (2003) support this finding through both of their works. All district curriculum leaders performed various program management responsibilities. Program management responsibilities usually encompassed a full range of instructional leadership tasks. Among program management responsibilities for instructional leadership district curriculum leaders that participated in this study, developed the curriculum, planned meetings, and made arrangements for receiving instructional materials (see Table 52).

Table 52

District Curriculum Leaders’ Descriptions of their Instructional Leadership Responsibilities for Supporting Untenured Teachers (n = 5)

- Provides professional development (n = 5)
- Chairs, conducts meetings (n = 5)
- Provides a mentor program (n = 4)
- Provides curriculum and materials (n = 3)
- Provides funding for specific workshops (n = 3)
- Supervises, assists with an entry-year program (n = 3)
- Assists with professional learning communities (n = 3)
- Writes and develops the curriculum (n = 3)
- Meets with teachers (n = 3)
- Conducts observations and gives feedback (n = 2)
- Conducts and Assists with Data Analysis (n = 2)
- Review Continuous Improvement Plans (n = 2)

(table continues)
Table 52 (continued)

District Curriculum Leaders’ Descriptions of their Instructional Leadership Responsibilities for Supporting Untenured Teachers (n = 5) (continued)

- Assistance teachers (n = 2)
- Plans staff development (n = 2)
- Assists with a cohort program (n = 2)
- Surveys teachers (n = 2)
- Establishes curriculum committees (n = 2)
- Models [effective teaching] (n = 1)
- Obtain Board approval for curriculum (n = 1)
- Writes grants (n = 1)
- Works with teachers (n = 1)
- Provides leadership opportunities (n = 1)
- Provides substitutes for coverage (n = 1)
- Assists with orientation program (n = 1)
- Organize workshops (n = 1)
- Coordinates textbook adoption (n = 1)
- Gathers textbook samples (n = 1)
- Orders tests (n = 1)
- Provides intervention input (n = 1)
- Helped to write entry year teacher contract (n = 1)
- Sits in meetings principals request (n = 1)
- Provides instructional strategies (n = 1)
- Monitors achievement (n = 1)
- Works with presenters (n = 1)

Note: Bold indicates common descriptions of instructional leadership responsibilities.
Source: Interview with district curriculum leaders.

Sometimes program management responsibilities meant the district curriculum leader’s efforts to design and gain district approval for the curriculum. One district curriculum leader confirmed this notion. She stated,

[t]he kinds of management tasks that I have to do are different from what they [principals] do… mine is more making sure the curriculum is written and board approved and distributed.
Other times program management responsibilities for instructional leadership involved the district curriculum leader’s supervision. For instances, a district curriculum leader said, “I also supervise the entry year program…That’s a stipend here—to be an entry year coordinator. But, I work with that person closely.”

*Principals.* Analysis of the data showed a few instructional leadership responsibilities for principals. The central instructional leadership responsibilities for participating principals clustered around implementation, program management, and other responsibilities. The six principals in this study acknowledged that they worked with their staff. Much like the district curriculum leaders, principals stressed that their instructional leadership was generally available for all teachers within their buildings regardless to the teacher’s teaching status.

An analysis of the interview transcripts reveals that all the principals provide untenured teachers with professional development for achieving implementation responsibilities. However, the professional development opportunities of principals had many forms. Sometimes opportunities for professional development were provided formally. At other times, professional development was informal. The findings on formal and informal professional development were supported by the work of Glatthorn et al. (2006).

Some principals at times planned and conducted district-wide professional development sessions. For example, during an interview one principal told about an added implementation responsibility of principals when working in a small school district. She explained,
I provide a good portion of the professional development because being a small district we only have one curriculum coordinator for all K through 12-- every subject area. So, the principals have a pretty big role in that [professional development].

Later, she added,

[w]e have after school 3:30 to 4:30 professional development, a whole variety of sessions that the principals actually (all of us) sign-up to offer…They [the central office] put a call out to anybody who really would like to share information or teach a session. The principals are requested—seriously requested to do at least one a grading period if not more than one.

However, for the most part, principals frequently provided professional development within their buildings through staff meetings. Some principals use their staff meetings to focus on instructional issues that addressed the specific needs of their buildings. A principal in this study justified this thought. The principal said,

“[w]e use our faculty meetings after school. Each one is devoted to a topic of interest of the building such as test scores and interpreting.” The principal felt this was a practical way of improving the instructional needs of the school.

Furthermore, to assist untenured teachers with instructional issues and to help meet implementation responsibilities mentoring was occasionally used as a form of professional development. Some principals used mentoring programs that were established by their districts. Others made informal requests of the veteran teachers that worked in their buildings to serve as mentors. When asked about instructional leadership services a principal commented, “[t]hey [untenured teachers] have mentors. We are very fortunate that the entry-year teachers in this building, we’ve been able to provide them with mentors from this same building.” The principal was pleased to
have had enough mentoring teachers directly in the building to assist with all of the untenured teachers there.

In addition, analysis of the transcripts showed that besides staff meetings and mentoring, many principals also used classroom observation and evaluations to fulfill their implementation responsibilities. Principals seemed to use clinical supervision or some modification of clinical supervision to help improve instruction and increase the professional growth of untenured teachers. A principal gave information about the time constraints involved in performing formal observations. The principal said,

[w]hat takes most of my time would certainly be the formal observation as required by law and all of those kinds of things. But, that requires a great amount of time to prep for that, to actually do the observation, to do the typing and following up, scheduling the conference, do the conference and, if you need to follow up on the conference, that too.

Another principal also gave a statement concerning observations and evaluations as a form of professional development. When asked about instructional leadership given to untenured teacher this principal said, “[p]robably supervision of them [untenured teachers]—monitoring them as they begin their careers [is an instructional leadership service]. Also, working through the evaluation process—providing them with information that I think will help them in terms of training, professional development, and so forth.” That principal’s sentiment seemed to suggest observations and evaluations are an important instructional leadership service.

Furthermore, program management responsibilities were another component of instructional leadership for principals. Most principals in this study reported planning, chairing, facilitating, and participating in building level meetings. Several principals were noted for having various decision-making committees within their schools. Such
committees included building leadership, continuous improvement planning, and student intervention. However, none of the principals in this study elaborated on those committees nor did they give details about the composition of them.

Nevertheless, such committees generally consisted of small groups of certified personnel (administrators and teachers) and parents. The committee members generally analyzed school-based problems, generated ideas, and made decisions for various school policies. Such collaboration allowed for representative groups to actively participate, share, and accept responsibility for the management of the local school building. Program management responsibilities that were achieved through collaboration, aided implementation by encouraging commitment among the representative members for obtaining a shared mission. Matthews and Crow’s (2003) work supports this finding on the use of collaboration for informing the learning community and strengthening students’ learning.

Additionally, program management for some principals included assisting the district curriculum leader in planning district-wide activities, documents, or programs. That is, some principals assisted with providing district-wide professional development sessions for teachers to attend. During the interview a principal said, “[o]ftentimes they [the central office] will send me to a district or state meeting, one of us [principals] because obviously one person [district curriculum leader] can’t go to all of them [meetings]… we’ll bring that information back.” This statement expressed the idea that when central office personnel are limited, the workloads of principals were often increased. Besides the attendance of principals at State meetings, some other principals
In this study, served on district-wide textbook adoption and report card development committees for achieving program management responsibilities.

In addition, most of the principals performed another instructional leadership responsibility that seemed indirectly related to implementation. That is, some principals in this study attempted to establish schools that were both safe and orderly. Those principals strove for smooth running buildings conducive to teaching and learning. Such an instructional leadership responsibility included assisting teachers with parent-teacher conferences, parent issues, and student behavior issues. Table 53 shows the principals’ descriptions of their perceived instructional leadership responsibilities for supporting untenured teachers.

Table 53
Principals’ Descriptions of their Instructional Leadership Responsibilities for Supporting Untenured Teachers (n = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development (n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans, schedules, and conducts meetings (n = 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal and informal observations (n = 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides materials and resources (n = 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives suggestions or feedback (n = 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors (n = 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks with teachers (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting in small and large groups (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives intervention assistance (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry year (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves on committees (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists with parents (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Research Question Two

According to district curriculum leaders and principals are their instructional leadership responsibilities overlapping or unique? Further analysis of the job descriptions showed that there were both overlapping and unique instructional leadership responsibilities between the two groups of instructional leaders in this study. Based on the job descriptions, instructional leadership responsibilities were dispersed between both groups, district curriculum leaders and principals, to ensure implementation and management of district programs.

Among each group of administrators (district curriculum leaders and principals) there were instructional leadership responsibilities that varied from district to district for each group (district curriculum leaders or principals). Possibly such variance among instructional leadership responsibilities was a direct result of differing interpretations that district administrators’ perceived of state policies and procedures (Glatthorn et al., 2006).
Furthermore, although the district curriculum leaders worked at the district level, there were distinctions among the titles they held. Two district curriculum leaders were directors. Two others were district curriculum coordinators, and one was a district instructional specialist. Instructional leadership responsibilities among the district curriculum leaders were similar in many aspects. Yet, there were also many variations among their instructional leadership responsibilities as well (Doll, 1992; Oliva & Prawlas, 2004).

Also, there were some instructional leadership responsibilities that were common among all districts for both district curriculum leaders and principals. Most district curriculum leaders and principals within a district shared instructional leadership responsibilities for curriculum development, professional development, supervision of the professional staff, and the entry-year/orientation program for new teachers (see Table 54).

Table 54

Common Job Descriptions: District Curriculum Leaders (n = 5) and Principals (n = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for the direct supervision, leadership, coordination, and evaluation of a comprehensive curriculum development process. Works with supervisors to assist in the development, revision, and evaluations of the curriculum, seek improvement of educational programs and new programming. Coordinates, implements, and evaluates the curriculum.</td>
<td>(n = 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides leadership, coordinates, develops, promotes, supports the formulation and implementation of district-wide, and ongoing opportunities for staff development for certified staff and information for principals. Fosters professional and personal growth of all teachers. Works with teachers, coordinators, and curriculum department in the development of staff development. Coordinates, implements, and evaluates, staff development.</td>
<td>(n = 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
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Table 54

Common Job Descriptions: District Curriculum Leaders (n = 5) and Principals (n = 6) (continued)

- Strives to improve teaching. Provides technical assistance for developing sound practices and procedures. Confers with teachers on instructional techniques, classroom management, and course content. Collaborates with supervisors, principals for improvement of instruction, staff competencies. Provides direction for instructional modifications and interventions. Responsible for providing supervision and providing assistance. (n = 11)
- Coordinates, assists, and oversees the entry-year program, and entry year coordinator.
- Provides assists in the orientation of new staff members and assists in their development. (n = 8)

Source: District job descriptions.

For implementation responsibilities, district curriculum leaders and principals reported several overlapping tasks they performed within their districts. Some overlapping tasks reported were with observations and feedback, group assistance, individual assistance, resource provisions, and professional development. One principal expressed how instructional leadership was shared within the district. The principal said,

I think that they [instructional leadership] overlap all the time. Our teachers know that they can easily receive a phone call or voice mail or email or a personal visit from our curriculum staff or building principal… [t]hey would not be surprised if they see anyone of us show up in the classrooms, attend their meetings. It’s a combined effort.

According to the above principal, both the district curriculum leader and principals shared instructional leadership responsibilities for assisting teachers individually in classrooms and within groups meetings.
Based on the job descriptions, most principals had evaluative authority for instruction. Not only were principals accountable in their districts for guiding and improving instruction, most were also accountable for formal evaluations within their buildings. In contrast, district curriculum leaders were not accountable for formal evaluations according to their job descriptions. Rather, most were accountable for attempting to improve instruction across the district.

Another example of a shared implementation responsibility among district curriculum leaders and principals within a district was provided. The district curriculum leader said,

I think… principals have to make sure that the right resources are in the hands of the teachers. Now that is from a building level standpoint. I look at it at a broader standpoint because I’m purchasing for the entire district.

Here, the district curriculum leader pointed out the idea that both district curriculum leaders and principals participated in making provisions for teachers to obtain needed instructional resources. Instructional resources were to aid the implementation process for effective teaching of the district-wide adopted program. Yet, each administrator attended to this implementation task differently and they each had a focus different from one another.

Furthermore, district curriculum leaders and principals also perceived overlapping program management responsibilities. Some program management tasks that were perceived to be overlapping included planning, data analysis, and textbook adoption. One district curriculum leader said, “[a]nalyzing data that would be similar. Principals do that and so do we. We look at district data. Principals are looking at building data to look for trends, strengthens, and weaknesses of students.” Despite the
notion that a program management task was shared, each administrator had a distinct objective for completing the program management task that was assigned.

*Research Question Three*

How are the instructional leadership responsibilities reported by district curriculum leaders and principals corroborated by untenured teacher reports?

Instruction was supported through various instructional leadership services and tasks according to the teachers. The participating teachers in this study confirmed receiving a number of instructional leadership services and tasks from district curriculum leaders and principals. The instructional leadership services reported by untenured teachers in this study did confirm the assertions from the district curriculum leaders and principals about the instructional leadership that they each gave. Many times for implementation, district curriculum leaders and principals focused on helping teachers to align instruction to the state curriculum framework and developing teachers’ professional growth.

*District curriculum leaders.* Much of the instructional leadership that the teachers reported receiving from district curriculum leaders for implementation was through professional development. Some types of professional development that were noted were in-services, workshops, and staff development meetings. The teachers also reported that district curriculum leaders performed various instructional leadership tasks. Such instructional leadership tasks of district curriculum leaders included writing curriculum, providing materials, and providing guidance.

Throughout many of the following statements, teachers indicated awareness and understanding that classroom instruction was not to be established by their own
preferences. Rather, classroom instruction needed to be aligned and guided by the larger state or the district’s curriculum framework. Classroom instruction that was guided by the state standards was to ensure that all students have equivalent exposure to the necessary content and skills for academic success (Squires & Cooper, 2004; Oliva & Pawlas, 2004).

When asked about the instructional leadership provided by the district curriculum leader, an Alpha district teacher gave an example of a professional development she had received. The teacher stated,

[w]ell, it is their responsibility to make sure that all curriculum is being met, I suppose. So, they [district curriculum leaders] do have these meetings where we [teachers] meet by grade level. We have professional learning committees that we are on, four or five teachers on a team, and they come to those meetings to meet with us and talk about how the curriculum is being covered… we talk about that in our groups and compare notes.

Then the teacher gave more information by explaining some of the instructional leadership tasks. She said, “[t]hey [district curriculum leader] give us curriculum maps that we use. We work together and develop the curriculum, and set a plan for what must be covered. Of course, we go with… standards. The teacher stated that the district curriculum leader’s instructional leadership task was for providing resources. Also, this statement established that some district curriculum leaders did organize professional development with small groups of teachers and allowed for them to enter into discussions with one another for their own professional growth. Such findings were supported by Glatthorn et al. (2006) and Sergiovanni (1995). For example, Glatthorn et al. (2006) explained that,

[t]hey [effective instructional leaders] work with small groups of teachers during preparation periods, over lunch, and in faculty meetings in a less
systematic and structured fashion, sharing ideas, discussing current educational issues, and engaging in some informal problem solving. (p. 235)

The interview with the Beta district teacher also revealed instructional leadership services and tasks. The Beta district teacher discussed materials received and professional development opportunities that were offered to her from the district curriculum leader. The teacher said,

[we] [teachers] are given the… State Standards and they [district curriculum leaders] have given us the opportunity this year to work with other first grade teachers to coordinate the… State Standards into the different months that we are going to be using the State Standards. And they also give us the… Course of Study. They also give us the opportunity to meet with other schools… to discuss our curriculum.

Although the Beta district curriculum leader probably could have aligned the curriculum independently, the above statement indicated that she allowed teachers to interact with one another and to participate in curriculum alignment along with her. Such involvement with curriculum alignment or curriculum development processes provided teachers with an opportunity to raise issues and offer solutions about the project (Glatthorn et al., 2006; Oliva & Prawlas, 2004).

When the Gamma district teacher was asked to tell about the instructional leadership services and tasks she received from the district’s curriculum leader. She expressed her thoughts this way. She said,

[well, I guess… making sure that our schools and teachers are aware of any changes in the standards or mandates from the state. Try to maintain and keep update our materials. And somewhat help with coordinating and bring about inservice training for different programs that have been adopted.

A teacher from the Delta district was also interested in telling about the instructional leadership furnished in her school district. According to the teacher, the
district curriculum leaders provided her with several instructional leadership services and tasks. The teacher said that the district curriculum leader “gives me everything I need. If I need books, if I need worksheets, if I need websites-- she finds everything.” Then she explained that the district curriculum leader “makes sure that we [teachers] have copies of all of our standards and if we have questions about the standards we can go to her and ask.” Before long she mentioned that she had also met with the district curriculum leader. She stated, [w]e spend days doing test analysis last year.”

Seemingly the instructional leadership tasks of the district curriculum leader according to this teacher was mostly for providing teachers with resources. Also the teacher indicated that district curriculum leaders assisted teachers with analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of students that were associated with the state standards for instructional improvement (Glatthorn et al., 2006; Matthews & Crow, 2003).

Another teacher from the Epsilon district explained her views of the instructional leadership responsibilities of the district curriculum leader. The teacher said,

I feel they are responsible for finding the materials for us to use… the reading curriculum, the math curriculum, the science curriculum whatever it is. Finding the materials that are teacher friendly that the kids can access and then putting, coordinating, putting it all together through the use of a [curriculum] guide so that we can deliver instruction to the students.

Then she stated that district curriculum leaders “take all the pieces of the puzzle—the [curriculum] guide, the state standards, the materials and put that all together in a packet for the teachers so that it’s more manageable.” Once again an instructional leadership task reported was for providing resources. This teacher also acknowledged that the district curriculum leader assisted with curriculum coordination.
Teachers were offered a [curriculum] guide to encourage alignment of the curriculum to state standards and to also ensure effective instructional delivery for maximizing student achievement. Table 55 provides the teachers’ perceived instructional leadership services and tasks of district curriculum leaders.

Table 55

Perceived Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of District Curriculum Leaders (n = 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Untenured Teachers (n = 13)</th>
<th>Perceived Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of District Curriculum Leaders (n = 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offers in-service meetings (n = 7)</td>
<td>Offers in-service meetings (n = 7)</td>
<td>Provides school workshops (n = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides school workshops (n = 4)</td>
<td>Provides school workshops (n = 4)</td>
<td>Provides staff development meetings (n = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides staff development meetings (n = 4)</td>
<td>Provides staff development meetings (n = 4)</td>
<td>Opportunities to work with other teachers/schools (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to work with other teachers/schools (n = 2)</td>
<td>Opportunities to work with other teachers/schools (n = 2)</td>
<td>Provides the mentoring program (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides the mentoring program (n = 2)</td>
<td>Provides the mentoring program (n = 2)</td>
<td>Provides professional development (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides professional development (n = 2)</td>
<td>Provides professional development (n = 2)</td>
<td>Provides regular notebook meetings (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides regular notebook meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Provides regular notebook meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Provides district meetings (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides district meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Provides district meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Conducts grade level meetings (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts grade level meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Conducts grade level meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Chairs professional learning committees (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs professional learning committees (n = 1)</td>
<td>Chairs professional learning committees (n = 1)</td>
<td>Chairs common assessment meetings (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs common assessment meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Chairs common assessment meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td>Funding for conferences and workshops (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for conferences and workshops (n = 1)</td>
<td>Funding for conferences and workshops (n = 1)</td>
<td>Opportunities to take courses (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to take courses (n = 1)</td>
<td>Opportunities to take courses (n = 1)</td>
<td>Provides new training (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides new training (n = 1)</td>
<td>Provides new training (n = 1)</td>
<td>Entry-year teacher program (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-year teacher program (n = 1)</td>
<td>Entry-year teacher program (n = 1)</td>
<td>Models (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models (n = 1)</td>
<td>Models (n = 1)</td>
<td>Provides curriculum, materials, standards (n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides curriculum, materials, standards (n = 10)</td>
<td>Provides curriculum, materials, standards (n = 10)</td>
<td>Announces expectations and makes sure standards are taught (n = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announces expectations and makes sure standards are taught (n = 7)</td>
<td>Announces expectations and makes sure standards are taught (n = 7)</td>
<td>Coordinates and writes curriculums (n = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinates and writes curriculums (n = 7)</td>
<td>Coordinates and writes curriculums (n = 7)</td>
<td>Gives ideas/suggestions (instructional strategies, lesson planning, curriculum implementation, etc.) (n = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives ideas/suggestions (instructional strategies, lesson planning, curriculum implementation, etc.) (n = 4)</td>
<td>Gives ideas/suggestions (instructional strategies, lesson planning, curriculum implementation, etc.) (n = 4)</td>
<td>Does data analysis (n = 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does data analysis (n = 4)</td>
<td>Does data analysis (n = 4)</td>
<td>Reports (n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports (n = 3)</td>
<td>Reports (n = 3)</td>
<td>Gives funds for supplemental materials (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives funds for supplemental materials (n = 2)</td>
<td>Gives funds for supplemental materials (n = 2)</td>
<td>Gives information (workshops, policy changes) (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives information (workshops, policy changes) (n = 2)</td>
<td>Gives information (workshops, policy changes) (n = 2)</td>
<td>Plans (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans (n = 2)</td>
<td>Plans (n = 2)</td>
<td>Initiates committees (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates committees (n = 2)</td>
<td>Initiates committees (n = 2)</td>
<td>Presents to the board (n = 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents to the board (n = 2)</td>
<td>Presents to the board (n = 2)</td>
<td>Provides guidance (n = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides guidance (n = 1)</td>
<td>Provides guidance (n = 1)</td>
<td>(table continues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of District Curriculum Leaders (n = 5) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Task</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does research (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps with re-certified (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brings in people presenters (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopts new textbooks (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits classrooms (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends for curriculum samples (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps with the entry year program (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gives supplies (n = 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes continuous improvement planning teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Bold indicates common instructional leadership services and tasks. Source: Interviews with teacher.

*Principals.* Furthermore, the participating teachers in this study also confirmed receiving a number of instructional leadership services and tasks from their principals. Much of the instructional leadership service that teachers received from principals for implementation were through professional development opportunities—that is, observations and evaluations. Teachers reported that instructional leadership tasks of principals frequently included monitoring instruction and giving suggestions. By monitoring classrooms and instruction the principal was able to learn about classroom events that were taking place in the school and were able to ensure that learning goals were met. Research by Levett-Lowe (2004) supports this finding on monitoring instruction. They said,

I learned that effective principals spend about 85 percent of their time in classrooms, monitoring, giving feedback, coaching, and mentoring. When I started spending more time in classrooms observing instructions and coaching teachers, the students’ outcomes improved consistently. (p. 132)
A teacher from the Alpha district told about the instructional leadership the principal provided. She stated that, “they [principals] are there to support you with any assistance you may need within the district, with supplies, with just… [b]eing there for you, if you have a problem.” She further explained that, “they have grade level meetings, staff meetings… to keep us [teachers] informed.” This teacher stressed that the principal’s instructional leadership tasks were for providing professional development opportunities and dissemination of important information.

Later, a teacher from the Beta district was asked to tell about the principals’ instructional leadership. During the interview, she told about instructional leadership tasks that the principal performed. The teacher said that the principal “gives me all the materials I need to be able to make sure that I’m teaching what I’m supposed to.” The teacher further added, “I know that he [the principal] keeps up on whether or not we’re [teachers are] following through with meeting the state standards and checks lesson plans.” This teacher perceived the instructional leadership of the principal to involve providing teachers with instructional resources and monitoring the use of state standards for classroom instruction. The principal frequently assisted teachers with identifying, locating, and attaining various resources that were available to them for meeting their educational goals. This finding on administrators assisting with resource selection was also supported by Oliva and Pawlas (2004). According to them,

[Lesson presentation involves a complex variety of skills. The supervisor can help teachers as they translate their units and lesson plans into action. The supervisor determines whether the teacher has chosen suitable resources and selected appropriate strategies, in accordance with relevant guidelines. (p. 159)
Then a Gamma district teacher offered information on the instructional leadership that was offered within her district. At the time of the interview, the teacher described a professional development opportunity she was given at her school. The teacher said that,

[s]he [the principal] will help us with any kind of extra training we want or need… At those times, it would just be the people in our building who wanted to share. And we [teachers] found that we learned more from each other. We didn’t have to go outside the school. We really learned a lot from each other. She was instrumental in helping us get those together. Any kind of in-servicing within the building, she’s helpful.

Professional development was emphasized once again by this teacher as an instructional leadership task. In addition, this teacher also noted the importance of the principal establishing a social context that allowed teachers opportunities to construct understanding of instructional issues by talking and learning from one another. Matthews and Crow (2003) endorsed this finding on social contexts of learning. They stated,

[1]earning occurs in a social context that is cultural and historical. Rather than the individualistic quality of learning emphasized in the traditional view, social constructivism assumes a community of learners. As teachers come together to make meaning of their collective experiences as learners and teachers, new learning develops. (p. 45)

When Delta district teacher was asked to tell about the instructional leadership given by her principal, the teacher provided a viewpoint that was very similar to the perspectives of other teachers participating in this study. The Delta district teacher said, “[s]he [the principal] provides me with feedback on different things I can do better in the classroom.” Then she continued to state that the principal helps “by pointing out different workshops and things I can go to in my weaker areas. She might see
something. She helps by coming in and observing in the classroom—providing feedback.” This Delta district teacher recognized a major instructional leadership task of the principal was for observing, evaluating, and providing feedback. The teacher perceived this instructional leadership task as a supportive process in helping teachers to improve their instructional ability. Oliva and Pawlas (2004) described such an evaluation. They said,

> [t]hose who maintain that supervision is not evaluation are thinking in terms of a process involving observation of the teacher’s classroom performance for the purpose of helping the teacher to improve instruction without the necessity for making personnel decisions….In contrast, those who see supervision in terms of evaluation have in mind administrative assessments based on data obtained both within and outside the classroom for purposes of making personnel decisions, such as contract renewal, tenure, merit pay, teaching assignments, and placement on a career ladder. (p. 54)

Then an Epsilon district teacher gave information about instructional leadership in her school district. The teacher said that instructional leadership of principals was through “staff development, helping teachers solve problems, being supportive for teachers, just being there and helping in anyway that they can.” Next, the teacher told about the instructional leadership untenured teachers needed. She said, “[a]gain, I would say just by helping them [untenured teachers], getting them the information that they need, providing them with materials. I guess if there is a problem, he [the principal] would deal with them and try to help them, and try to figure out what they are doing wrong.” Table 56 provides the teachers’ perceived instructional leadership services and tasks of principals.
Table 56

Teachers’ Perceived Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n = 13) Untenured Teachers</th>
<th>Perceived Instructional Leadership Services and Tasks of Principals (n = 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts evaluations (n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives instructional feedback (n = 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has staff meetings, (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides workshop (n = 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides inservicing (n = 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has staff development (n = 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends notebook meetings (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attends Professional Learning Community meetings (n = 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attends Grade level meetings (n = 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides extra training (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides extended resources (n = 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has teachers share within the building (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for collegial planning (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Models (n = 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives suggestions (n = 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists with behavior issues (n = 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives support with parents (n = 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes request and monitors (n = 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides information from/on the administration, workshops, school events, etc, (n = 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides support/assistance (n = 5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides materials, supplies, and equipment (n = 4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes testing scores (n = 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plans (n = 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides funding for materials, extra supplies (n = 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans professional development (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types drafts/paperwork (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules appointments/planning periods (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observes other schools (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets substitute teachers (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sits on committees (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets with teachers (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes schools decisions (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives instruction (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists with registration (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists with licensing rules and expectations (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bold indicates common instructional leadership services and tasks. Source: Interviews with teacher.
Furthermore, many teachers had the opinion that district curriculum leaders and principals performed overlapping instructional leadership services and tasks in their districts. However, when teachers were asked to tell about those instructional leadership services and tasks, frequently they referred to the common desires shared by their administrators for high student achievement through standard-based teaching.

One Alpha district teacher reported overlapping instructional leadership services and tasks. That teacher said, “I see [the district curriculum leader and principal] coming together and talking about what issues need to be addressed in each grade. [The] [c]urriculum director brings in resources in the content areas and the principals would back her.” The teacher added that the overlapping instructional leadership was with, “the content areas, the indicators, [and] what is important for the students at each grade level.”

When the Beta district teacher was asked whether there were any overlapping instructional leadership services or tasks between the district curriculum leader and principals in her district she shared the following thought. She stated,

I would say that they [the district curriculum leader and the principal] both are letting us know what is going on within our school district… our principal also makes sure that we’re using our state standards by having us put them in our lesson plans and posting them outside our doors. So, I think that they both are making sure we’re integrating the important things that we need to have.

Then a Gamma district teacher told about overlapping instructional leadership services or tasks. The teacher simply stated, “Well, they’re both looking at our standards and they’re both looking at our benchmarks, and test results through all five grades.” Again, this same sentiment seemed to be shared by another teacher from the Delta district. The teacher responded to my question by saying,
[w]ell, they [district curriculum leaders and principals] are both after the same goal. We [teachers] have to do what they tell us to do. Whatever the state says she [the district curriculum leader] has to make sure that we are doing it and he [the principal] has to make sure we are following through. Although some teachers understood district curriculum leaders and principals to have overlapping instructional leadership services and tasks, some teachers also reasoned that the instructional leadership between the two administrators were unique. There were a variety of instructional leadership services and tasks that teachers considered unique for each administrative group (district curriculum leaders and principals).

For instance, often teachers reasoned that the instruction leadership of district curriculum leaders was for the entire district. District curriculum leaders were generally perceived as the leading administrator for focusing teachers on content standards, state expectations, and ensuring district-wide curriculum alignment. Teachers recognized district curriculum leaders for providing curriculum materials.

In contrast, teachers perceived the instructional leadership of principals for serving their own building and staff. Principals were perceived to be accessible and interactive with the teaching staff. Teachers noticed principals as disciplinarians and facilitators of implementation.

Conclusion

This chapter presented a comprehensive review of the findings regarding the instructional leadership responsibilities, services, and tasks of district curriculum leaders in relations to the instructional leadership responsibilities, services, and tasks of principals. Both district curriculum leaders and principals in this study provided instructional leadership for all teachers regardless to the teacher’s years of experience.
or teaching status. Instructional leadership was for helping all teachers to understand and to effectively use the district’s curricular program for increased student outcomes.

All district curriculum leaders had implementation and program management responsibilities for instructional leadership that were rendered to the entire district. To adhere to implementation responsibilities, district curriculum leaders provided teachers with various professional development programs. Generally, professional development opportunities of district curriculum leaders were formal events. District curriculum leaders used differing structures and models for delivering professional developments to teachers. In addition, instructional leadership for district curriculum leaders generally centered around curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

All principals in this study had implementation and program management responsibilities to fulfill for instructional leadership. In addition, most principals also had another instructional leadership responsibility that seemed indirectly related to implementation responsibilities. For implementation responsibilities, principals attempted to help teachers within their buildings “operationalize” the written curriculum of the district. Principals provided professional development opportunities that were both formal and informal events. Generally principals were accessible for answering curricular or instructional questions.

Furthermore, program management responsibilities were a second category of instructional leadership for principals. Principals frequently established various committees to assists with building level decisions. Principals also monitored implementation. In addition, principals delivered instructional materials, and planned meetings. The program management responsibilities of principals were dualistic. That
is, principals planned or organized instructional programs at both the building and
district levels. Sometimes principals also served on district planning committees and
assisted district curriculum leaders with organizing district-wide in-services.

Another instructional leadership responsibility for principals was categorized as
other. Principals in this study had a wide range of other instructional leadership tasks to
fulfill. Other instructional leadership tasks were for the day-to-day operation of the
school. To encourage building environments that were conducive to learning, most
principals generally attempted to meet the needs of teachers, students, and parents
affiliated with their schools. Other instructional leadership tasks often included
establishing good public relationships, establishing high standards of student conduct,
and enforcing discipline.

This study confirmed the notion that both district curriculum leaders and
principals shared instructional leadership responsibilities for ensuring program
implementation and guiding the development of teachers. However, those
administrators’ instructional leadership were often influenced by many forces both
within and beyond their control. District curriculum leaders and principals provided
instructional leadership to fulfill the many needs of the state department of education,
local boards of education, and individual schools (Doll, 1992). Although district
curriculum leaders and principals worked within the larger organizational structure (of
the State), many of these participating administrators did attempt to create additional
internal structures for empowering and strengthening local organizational connections
among teachers and the community (English & Steffy, 2005).
Implications

Instructional leadership, which refers to administrative services that assist teachers with growth and development of instructional skills, strategies, and knowledge, currently seems to be in a precarious state. Researchers and the popular press encourage district curriculum leaders and principals to serve as the instructional leaders for schools and school districts. However, careful examination of their instructional leadership responsibilities, services, and tasks tells us a different story about how administrators work and function. Findings from this study suggested three implications that affect instructional leadership practice. These implications include (a) time management, (b) ambiguity of instructional leadership tasks, and (c) conflict with philosophical beliefs and reforms. The ideas are interrelated and overlapped in their implications for schools and those who lead them.

Time Management

District curriculum leaders and principals do share instructional leadership responsibilities for supporting teachers. However, both groups of administrators had many internal and external demands for which they were responsible for satisfying. The job of the district curriculum leader was to fulfill district directives and follow federal and state policies.

Frequently, district curriculum leaders designed and aligned local curriculum documents to state standards. To design curriculum documents, district curriculum leaders usually reflected on current curricular trends, curricular problems, and performed data analysis. They organized meetings, wrote curriculum, gained curriculum approval, and distributed various curriculum documents throughout their
districts. Furthermore, they frequently wrote grants to secure additional funds for financial support of various projects. Such duties appeared to have taken up much time, leaving little time for direct instructional support.

A teacher expressed frustration as she explained her view of instructional leadership. She said that some district curriculum leaders seem to say, “Here it [the curriculum] is. Have fun... Do the best you can with it.” Implied in these comments is the notion of inadequate time to address instructional leadership tasks.

In spite of those comments, all of the participating district curriculum leaders perceived and spoke of being actively involved in instructional leadership. All of them spoke of providing professional development for teachers as a fundamental part of their positions. However, according to some teachers not much time was provided for leadership of instruction throughout the workday. Data suggests that such lack of time for instructional leadership might possibly be because of fiscal pressures that schools might be experiencing. Many school districts are hiring fewer and fewer district curriculum leaders than in the past (Oliva & Pawas, 2004). Therefore, individuals hired for the position of district curriculum leader were likely to have increased workloads to accomplish.

Along with an increased workload, the role of the district curriculum leader may have shifted. In this study, the number of district curriculum leaders that were employed by school districts was limited. Rural and suburban school districts hired one (or two) district curriculum leaders for their entire districts. The number of district curriculum leaders serving the urban school district was approximately one for each content area offered throughout the curriculum.
Most frequently, the job of the district curriculum leader was narrow in scope of content to be covered and broad in range for the individuals they were expected to serve. That is, the job of the district curriculum leader generally focused on curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Yet, the range of the job was district-wide. Their services were to be provided to the entire district including other administrators. As such, the efforts of district curriculum leaders’ providing direct assistance to individual teachers were often too difficult to achieve; thus, rarely provided. One administrator confided in me and gave an illustration to validate this point. The building administrator said,

[a]gain, the district curriculum and instructional person will bring you out materials, but again I think they [district curriculum leaders] are a little unfamiliar with that person [the teacher]. They’ll [district curriculum leaders] come in, they’ll sit in, and they’ll watch your class to give you some helpful hints, but again they are sitting in for a brief period as opposed to the principal seeing you everyday.

This statement seems to suggest that the task of instructional leadership through direct assistance to teachers in the classroom was often left up to principals. However, principals also seemed to have some difficulty providing direct assistance. Principals were to follow federal and state policy guidelines for running their buildings. Plus, they had district directives to achieve. Principals often attempted to meet building level demands regarding their personnel and members of the school community. On a daily basis, they generally assisted parents, cared for their school facilities, helped with student behavior issues, and assisted school personnel.

The tasks of upholding building level demands seemed to comprise a considerable amount of time throughout a principal’s workday. A teacher shared with
me her perception of the difference between instructional leadership of district curriculum leaders and principals. The teacher said,

> even though they’re [the instructional leadership of district curriculum leaders and principals] similar in some areas, they do differ where the principal has other priorities such as staff meetings. Concentration is on staff and students or discipline issues or parent issues, where as a curriculum coordinator would have some of those, but not as much as a principal would. Their [district curriculum leaders’] focus is on really getting that content out there for the teachers to know and to learn and to use.

District curriculum leaders and principals are the official instructional leaders of schools. However, instructional leadership often meant planning for various reforms. Many times district curriculum leaders and principals seemed to be functioning more as managers of school and district events rather than instructional leaders of teachers. Many district curriculum leaders and principals regularly spend time planning, organizing, structuring, and chairing meetings with teachers. With current reforms the focus of meetings often are on curriculum alignment or standards based planning. Standards do seem to help prevent fragmentation of the curriculum. Also, standards are important to ensure that lessons are focused on the appropriate content and skills. However, such planning seemingly is geared more towards managerial duties as opposed to instructional leadership that involves working alongside teachers and coaching their instructional development.

**Ambiguity of Instructional Leadership Tasks**

District curriculum leaders usually assisted teachers with curriculum alignment to state standards and planning for standards based teaching through a few instructional leadership programs. Such professional development usually included in-services, grade level meetings, and workshops. In addition, some district curriculum leaders did
establish networks and professional learning communities where teachers among one another collaborated to reflect, discuss, and share instructional practice. Such structures did seem to help support teaching and enhance curriculum implementation by allowing teachers to share best practices they perceived to be effective in their classrooms.

However, less frequently offered by district curriculum leaders were other informal instructional leadership services to assistance teachers. Rarely did district curriculum leaders in this study consult with teachers individually or model lessons in classrooms. Those forms of instructional leadership was seldom mentioned by administrators as provisions offered to teachers. Yet, one participating teacher suggested a need for such practice. The teacher stated that there is an importance in, 
“[m]odeling… Showing them [teachers] exactly how to do it or giving them ideas of how to… fix the problem.”

The teacher apparently desired a more intimate learning structure for understanding and implementing the curriculum. Large group discussions may be beneficial for some teachers. But professional development that is differentiated may be more effective in reaching the needs of others. Some teachers may need to see modeling done in classrooms with children for understanding. Furthermore, another teacher informed me that district curriculum leaders should consider following-up on teachers. The teacher explained,

You can learn a new… [innovation] in a two or three hour workshop… They [district curriculum leaders] need to then go back and… check-up on us [teachers] again. You don’t just throw something new and expect that it’s going to happen.
That comment suggested that sometimes during professional development sessions teachers may assume that they understanding an innovation. Later teachers may discover that they do not fully understand the innovation and may have difficulty with proper implementation. As such, administrative consultations and follow-up are essential for proper implementation.

Although the job descriptions indicated that the responsibility of instructional leadership was to be shared by both district curriculum leaders and principals, often principals seemed to function more directly and actively in aiding the instructional development of teachers within classrooms than district curriculum leaders. Administrators and teachers shared similar opinions regarding the interactions generally held between teachers and district instructional leaders. For example, when a district curriculum leader spoke about herself she said,

I would say my services are more indirect than direct because I do professional development…So, from that standpoint as far as helping a teacher get settled into their classroom and giving them day to day support that would not be my role. Although I would be glad to offer it at anytime. My role would be at a little higher level in helping them gain the knowledge and skills they need to be comfortable… and adequate teachers.

A principal also gave a statement about how district curriculum leaders and principals assists with the instructional needs of teachers. The principal stated,

I’m there, right there with the teacher… whereas the district coordinator is dealing with so many people and they are only coming out if they [teachers] need help so it [instructional leadership] is ultimately my responsibility.

Then two teachers gave commentaries. The first teacher compared the instructional leadership of district curriculum leaders and principals. The teacher said,

[they’re [principals] the doing part of the two, if that makes sense… I think that the curriculum coordinator is more of an office job. They’re [district
curriculum leaders] there to order the textbooks. They’re there to see that [district curriculums] are set and doable where the principal in the building is the hands-on person.

Here the teacher indicated that principals appear to be more directly involved in instructional leadership than district curriculum leaders. Another participating teacher attempted to describe the instructional leadership of district curriculum leaders but had difficulty. The teacher said,

I don’t know a whole lot to be honest with you…I guess they set up the [district curriculum] for us. I think. Are they the ones who do that…I don’t know. They get the materials we need to teach with… I don’t know what else they do.

Again this teacher suggested that district curriculum leaders were removed from classrooms and had little interaction with teachers. Currently, the instructional leadership of district curriculum leaders appears to be unfamiliar to many teachers. As district curriculum leaders are seemingly attending to more managerial tasks associated with federal, state, and district requirements for instructional leadership principals seem to be taking on more instructional leadership responsibility for providing direct assistance to teachers in their buildings.

For this study, jobs of principals were generally described as broad in scope concerning responsibility and narrow in range for individuals they were expected to serve. Along with instructional leadership, a principal’s job included many diverse tasks. Yet, the job range was narrow in comparison to the job range of district curriculum leaders.

The nature of the principal’s job often made instructional leadership difficult. Most principals had “full plates” of requirements to accomplish. They were to meet the needs of their districts, parents, and teachers. Often they had many interruptions
throughout their workday. One principal described some distinctions between district curriculum leaders’ and principals’ daily duties. The principal said,

[t]heir [district curriculum leaders] instructional leadership is just as important as the building principal’s in my opinion…Now the curriculum coordinator obviously their focus is not going to be on management of the school. Their focus is not going to be on student discipline. Their focus is not going to be on all the different range of events and activities that are going on at the building level.

However, because principals were the immediate supervisors of teachers in their buildings, the obligation of providing direct assistance or follow-up for improved teaching and effective learning generally rested on them.

A study by Adams and Copland (2005) suggested that with the demands that are placed on today’s schools principals and district curriculum leaders need knowledge, skills, and strategies that will support school leadership goals. The authors suggested a new approach for state licensing of administrators. The new licensure framework would focus on individual, learning, and organizational requirements. Such an approach would help develop and orient school administrators towards leadership. According to the authors, such an approach would “align licensing requirements with the job states expect” administrators to fulfill (p. 43). Besides time management and ambiguity of instructional leadership tasks another implication was conflict with philosophical beliefs and reforms.

Conflict with Philosophical Beliefs and Reforms

Frequently, the impact of State imposed reforms on instructional leadership reinforced “top-down” organizational structures and linear relationships that work independently of one another for achieving school goals (English & Steffy, 2005).
Such decisions often influenced the content, planning, and delivery of classroom instruction.

Instructional leaders were accountable to their local and State boards of education for improving achievement in their districts. As levels of direction increased from State departments of education, administrative discretion was often reduced (Oliva & Pawas, 2004). Consequently, the range of teaching was also frequently narrowed (Glickman, 2002; Marsh & Willis, 1995; Snyder et al., 1989). Teachers had little to no latitude for helping to make instructional decisions. Some educators have pointed out that when the curriculum was tightly narrowed, the thinking skills of students’ were not being developed. Yet, school management was often tightened for more coherence among the instructional experiences of students (Sergiovanni, 1995). Although some instructional leaders may have had philosophical values that were opposed to the constraints that were placed on the curriculum, instruction, and learning through various reforms, they were committed to fulfilling established policies that were set within their districts (Oliva & Pawas, 2004; Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993). However, some of those instructional leaders did try to help teachers to work within the set guidelines for curriculum and instruction as established by state and local standards (Oliva & Pawas, 2004).

Recommendations for Future Research

Findings from this study brought about several suggestions for future research. The following recommendations were offered for consideration.

1. This study focused on the perceived instructional leadership services and tasks of instructional leaders to untenured teachers and was triangulated with untenured
teacher reports. Rather than centering on perceptions, a future study could be conducted to observe the actual instructional leadership services and tasks instructional leaders provide to untenured teachers.

2. The findings from this study suggested that some instructional leaders provided professional development through various formats. However, research could be conducted to identify effective models of professional development that addresses both the practical/technical needs of teachers along with organizational needs for improved teaching and increased student learning outcomes on tests.

3. Goldman (1966) and Educational Research Service (1982) suggested that principals have often focused on the daily fiscal, disciplinary, and facility operation of a school. As such, a research study could be constructed to investigate the actual amount of time principals currently spend in providing direct instructional leadership services to teachers in support of classroom instruction and in comparison to other responsibilities that must be fulfilled.

4. With the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) National education policy (U.S. Dept. of Ed., 2005; Danielson, 2002; and Williams-Boyd, 2002), a research study could be designed to compare how district curriculum leaders and principals assist teachers with preparing students for mastering State examinations. Such a study could also describe the quality of education in regards to the range of teaching and the content provided to students.

5. The job titles for district curriculum leadership were very broad. A study could focus on the instructional leadership responsibilities, tasks, and services of those administrators (i.e. directors, coordinators, instructional specialist, etc). Such a study
could identify whether there is any overlapping among their instructional leadership responsibilities, tasks, and services.

6. A future study could look at principals who transitioned to district curriculum leadership positions and individuals who went directly to district curriculum leadership positions. Such a study could compare background experiences and how those experiences may have influenced their perceptions of instructional leadership.

7. A goal for this study was to look at teachers who were in most need of instructional leadership services and tasks. However, some teachers (n = 8) had over 5 years of teaching experience. A future study could focus on teachers with less teaching experience. Such a study could look at teachers with 1-3 years of teaching experience and teachers with more years of experience. Those groups could be compared to identify the instructional needs most required by each group of teachers.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

CASE STUDY PROTOCOL

Overview of the Study

This qualitative case study explores and describes the specific responsibilities, services, and tasks district curriculum coordinators and principals within a mid-western state report they provide to untenured classroom teachers. This study seeks to uncover overlapping functions, conflicting service or neglected services. The roles and tasks of the district curriculum leaders will be compared and contrasted to those services provided by principals.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do district curriculum leaders and principals describe their instructional leadership responsibilities for supporting untenured teachers?
2. According to district curriculum leaders and principals, how are their instructional leadership responsibilities overlapping or unique?
3. How are the instructional leadership responsibilities reported by district curriculum leaders and principals corroborated by untenured teacher reports?

Procedures

1. Design Study
   a. Select topic (Instructional Leadership)
   b. State a claim about the topic based on a preliminary investigation (see Chapter I)
c. Gather literature on the topic to form a theoretical frame (Incorporate leadership theory, philosophical values, learning theory, curriculum theory, instructional leadership, professional development components and curriculum practice)

d. Construct the research questions

2. Establish the research design
   a. Determine the research design based on the research questions and literature review (descriptive)
      a. Construct interview questions connected to literature review
      b. Construct possible code list

3. Conduct study and collect data
   a. Send letters of request for voluntary participation
   b. Schedule interviews by telephone
   c. Conduct on-site direct interviews
   d. Tape record interviews
   e. Transcribe and read interviews
   e. Send each participant a transcribed interview to review for accuracy (see Appendix)

4. Conduct data analysis
   a. Establish coding categories
   b. Code transcripts
   c. Identify broad themes, sub-themes established by the literature review
   d. Identify patterns between the interview transcripts and the literature review

5. Prepare the case study report
   a. Write the report
   b. Write the conclusion
APPENDIX B

MEMBER CHECK

Street
City, State Zip
Date

School Name
Attention:
Street
City, State Zip

Dear Participant:

Thank you again for your participation this past spring, 2005 in my research study at the University of Akron. Enclosed in this letter is a hard copy of your interview and a self-addressed stamped envelope for your reply. Please take a few minutes to read your transcripts for accuracy and print any corrects that need to be made in red ink. You do not have to return the transcripts if there are no corrections.

I will need to receive your reply by Oct. 11, 2005. You may telephone Dawn McCombs at 330/807-6380 (c) or email dmccombs56@hotmail.com to answer any questions. Your assistance is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dawn K. McCombs
APPENDIX C

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

March 29, 2005

Dawn K. McCombs
870 W. Thornton Ext.
Akron, Ohio 44307

Ms. McCombs:

The University of Akron’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) completed a review of the protocol entitled “District Curriculum Leaders’ Involvement in Instructional Leadership: Perspectives of Untenured Teachers and School Administrators”.

The IRB application number assigned to this project is 20050318.

The protocol qualified for Expedited Review and was approved on March 25, 2005. The protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for expedited review:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation or quality assurance methodologies

This approval is valid until March 25, 2006 or until modifications are proposed to the project protocol, whichever may occur first. In either instance, an Application for Continuing Review must be completed and submitted to the IRB.

Enclosed is the informed consent document, which the IRB has approved for your use in this research. A copy of this form is to be submitted with any application for continuation of this project.

Please note that within one month of the expiration date of this approval, the IRB will forward an annual review reminder notice to you by email, as a courtesy. Nevertheless, it is your responsibility as principal investigator to remember the renewal date of your protocol’s review. Please submit your continuation application at least two weeks prior to the renewal date, to insure the IRB has sufficient time to complete the review.

Please retain this letter for your files. If the research is being conducted for a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, you must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Sharon McWhorter, Associate Director]

Cc: Susan G. Clark, Department Chair
    Duane M. Covitig, Advisor
    Phil Allen, IRB Chair
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF REQUEST

Street
City, State
Date

Board of Education
Attention:
Street
City, State

Dear :

My name is Dawn McCombs. I am doctoral student at The University of Akron in Educational Foundations and Leadership, concurrent with serving as a public school educator. My proposed dissertation is to study the delivery of instructional support services to untenured teachers. This letter is to ask your permission to conduct a study in your school district for data collection and completion of my dissertation.

The primary research questions guiding this study are:

b. What instructional roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks do district curriculum leaders provide to untenured teachers?

c. What instructional roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks do principals provide to untenured teachers?

d. How did the instructional roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks fulfilled and or performed by district curriculum leaders and principals compare?

e. What instructional roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks did untenured teachers report receiving from curriculum leaders?

f. What instructional roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks do untenured teachers report receiving from principals?

g. How do the roles, services, responsibilities, tasks reported by untenured teachers compare with those reported by curriculum leaders and principals?
To explore and describe the instructional roles, approaches, tasks, and services principals and curriculum coordinators provide in servicing untenured teachers, a qualitative case study method has been chosen. The purpose of this study is to provide detailed analysis and interpretations of current instructional support services. Sets of participants are required. Each set needs to consist of one curriculum coordinator, two principals, and 2-3 untenured teachers per principal.

The Institutional Review Board for the protection of human participants has approved this study. Anonymity and confidentiality of the participants will be protected throughout both the data collection and ensuing publication(s) within the limits of the law. Each participant, school building, school district, county, and city will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous within the limits of the law through pseudonyms. All participants must hold a valid administrative or teaching certificate or license. Participants must also agree to be directly interviewed and possibly telephone interviewed if needed. Participation is voluntary. Participants may withdraw from this study at any time or refrain from answering any or all questions without any penalty.

Your participation in this study is needed and much appreciated. Please consider allowing this study to be conducted in your school district. You may telephone Dawn McCombs at 330/807-6380 (c) or 330/434-9577 (h) or email dmccombs56@hotmail.com to answer any questions you may have about this study. You may also contact Dr. Duane Covrig at 330/972-6950 or email d covrig@uakron.edu. Any questions regarding IRB approval may be directed to the Institutional Review Board (Attention: Sharon McWhorter), Office of Research Services, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44325-2102, Telephone: 330/972-7666. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dawn K. McCombs
APPENDIX E

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

Please read the following information:

Subject’s Name: Untenured Teachers, Principals, and Curriculum Coordinators

Title of Research Project: District Curriculum Leaders Involvement in Instructional Leadership: Perspectives of Untenured Teachers and School Administrators

Description and Explanation of Procedure: Untenured teachers and administrators will be directly interviewed and audio taped. In addition, these participants will complete a brief biographic and demographic questionnaire.

Risks and discomforts: None

Potential Benefits: Better instructional support for untenured teachers and role clarity for administrators

The nature, purpose, procedures, and risks for participating in this research has been fully described above. To answer any questions, Dawn McCombs can be reached at 330/807-6380 (c) or 330/434-9577 (h) or email dmccombs56@hotmail.com. You may also contact Dr. Duane Covrig at 330/972-6950 or email d covrig@uakron.edu. The procedures for this research study have been approved by The University of Akron’s Institutional Review Board for Protection of Human Subjects and will be followed within the limits of the law. I have provided details regarding elements of informed consent.

Researcher’s Name Dawn K. McCombs

Researcher’s Signature _____________________________________________________________

Date __________________________________________________________________________

Please read and sign this consent form:

I read and understand the research procedure. I give permission for my participation in this study. I know that the researcher, Dawn McCombs, will be available to answer any questions I may have. If my questions have not been adequately answered I may request to speak with either the researcher or the University of Akron’s Institutional Review Board for protection of Human Subjects (Attention: Sharon McWhorter, Office of Research Services, 330/972-7666) at any time. I understand that I may withdraw this consent and stop participation in this project at any time without penalty. I also understand that procedures approved for this project by The University of Akron’s Institutional Review Board for the protection of Human Subjects, including those to maintain confidentiality and records will be followed within the limits of the law.

Subjects Signature ______________________________________________________________

Print Name _______________________________________________________________________

Date __________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX F

BIOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1) Job Position: ☐ Curriculum Coordinator ☐ Principal ☐ Teacher

2) Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male

3) Age: ☐ 20 – 29 ☐ 30 – 39 ☐ 40 – 49 ☐ 50 – 59 ☐ 60 – 69 ☐ 70+

4) Which ethnic or racial group do you place yourself?
   a) ☐ African American/Black
   b) ☐ Asian American/Pacific Islander
   c) ☐ Latin American/Mexican
   d) ☐ Native American/American Indian
   e) ☐ European American/White
   f) ☐ Other ____________________________

5) What is the highest degree you obtained?
   a) ☐ BS
   b) ☐ BS + 15
   c) ☐ BS + 30
   d) ☐ MS
   e) ☐ MS + 15
   f) ☐ MS + 30
   g) ☐ PhD
   h) ☐ EdD
6) Number of years of experience in education (as a teacher or principal or curriculum coordinator):
   a) □ 0
   b) □ 1 – 5 yrs.
   c) □ 6 – 10 yrs.
   d) □ 11 – 15 yrs.
   e) □ 16 – 20 yrs.
   f) □ 21 - 25 yrs.
   g) □ 26 – 30 yrs.
   h) □ 31 – 35 yrs.
   i) □ 36 – 40 yrs.
   j) □ 40 +

7) Number of years in current position (as a teacher or principal or curriculum coordinator):
   a) □ 0
   b) □ 1 – 5 yrs.
   c) □ 6 – 10 yrs.
   d) □ 11 – 15 yrs.
   e) □ 16 – 20 yrs.
   f) □ 21 - 25 yrs.
   g) □ 26 – 30 yrs.
   h) □ 31 – 35 yrs.
   i) □ 36 – 40 yrs.
   j) □ 40 +

8) Tenured Status: □ yes □ no

9) Write the total number of school buildings in your district _______________

10) The district’s community type:
    a) □ Rural
    b) □ Suburban
    c) □ Small Town
    d) □ Urban

11) Write the total number of students enrolled in your district: _______________

12) Check the number of student enrolled in your building:
    □ <200 □ 201-400 □ 401-600 □ 601-800 □ 801-1000 □ 1001-1200 □ >1200
13) The number of building levels in your district:
   a) Elementary Schools_________________
   b) Middle or Junior Highs________________
   c) High Schools______________________

14) Write your school’s zip code:____________

15) Number of students in school on Free or Reduced Lunch: ______________

16) Number of students in the district on Free or Reduced Lunch: ______________

17) Write the board of education/superintendent’s zip code:______________
APPENDIX G

START LIST OF POSSIBLE CODES

1. Implementation
   A. Direct Staff Assistance
      Obtains teacher release time for observing other teachers
      Arranges inter-system visitations to observe promising practice
      Provides in-classroom assistance with teaching innovations or materials
      Assists teachers in organizing and managing their classroom, (including group
         students, setting up centers and advising on program and materials)
      Assists teachers in long term planning
      Helps new and less experience teachers plan daily lessons
      Directly assists individual teachers (in-class) with classroom instructional
         change (e.g. adding learning centers, increasing the use of manipulatives)
      Directly assists teachers (in-class) with the delivery of the lesson
      Directly assists teachers (in-class) with improving communication with students
         (providing more feed back, becoming a better listener, etc.)
      Directly assists individual teachers (in-class) with teacher resource books
      Directly assists individual teachers (in-class) with general education
         information (e.g., about teaching methods, current educational trends,
         research, discipline, etc.)
      Directly assists individual teachers (in-class) with implementing a project
         adopted by the school system
      Directly assists individual teachers (in-class) with using new materials (e.g.,
         textbooks, kits, test, etc.)
      Directly assists individual teachers (in-class) with locating supplemental
         instructional materials for use
Demonstrates specific teaching procedures upon request
Consults with individual teachers on instructional problems upon request
Assist in locating or providing resource persons for individual classrooms

Individualized Training

B. In-service and Professional Development Activities

Make teachers aware of new and worthwhile professional literature
Orients teachers with new instructional program
Plans and organizes orientation programs for new teachers
Interprets school board philosophy to the teaching staff
Serves as a resource person
Plans and organizes in-service presentations by outside consultants
Conducts workshops
Conducts staff meetings
Meets with staff groups on instructional problems
Helps teachers develop better teaching methods
Helps teachers develop evaluative techniques
Assists teachers in developing effective disciplinary techniques
Assists teachers in the interpretation of materials
Recommends teachers for attendance at worthwhile conferences, workshops, or seminars
Helps teachers with professional problems
Provides teaching demonstrations
Assists teachers with classroom organization and arrangement
Provides teachers with information or suggestions about enrichment or remedial activities
Facilitates collegial planning
Assists with staff training
Assists with reflective inquiry
Provides teachers with collegial support
C. Management of Programs

Conducts teacher observations followed by a conference
Plans presentations by educational sales representatives
Plans and organizes a program of standardized testing for the district
Writes competency criteria/test
Interprets the results of assessment data
Gathers, analyzes, and interprets data
Assists in evaluation of student progress
Conducts or directs research
Coordinates instructional programs
Coordinates building or district activities
Assists in the evaluation and appraisal of school programs
Assists in planning intervention and remediation
Writes grant proposals
Administers the budget for instructional materials
Formulates policies
Determines educational goals
Develops federally funded programs
Develops/writes new curriculum guides/graded courses of study
Selects new curricular programs
Arranges for the use of test data for curriculum revision
Interprets the curriculum & instructional program to local organizations through public appearances
Serves as a working member on a district curriculum committee
Proposes curriculum change
Secures lay participation in curriculum development
Suggests ideas for curriculum evaluation
Conducts research locally for curriculum revision and the improvement of instruction
Develops curriculum
Collects and disseminates current curriculum materials
Coordinates curriculum improvement efforts
Assists in the development of curriculum guides and other publications
Approve requisitions for instructional materials
Assists with textbook selection committees
Makes final selection on text and instructional materials for school use
Organizes instruction

D. Management of Personnel
Evaluates teachers for the purpose of retention
Recommends employment termination of teachers
Participates in the selection of teachers
Evaluates methods of instruction used by teachers
Assigns teachers to grade level areas
Interviews teacher candidates and make recommendations for employment
Holds individual teacher conferences
Conducts clinical Supervision (pre-conference, observation, follow-up conference)
Conducts teacher observations
Develops standards of teaching effectiveness
Establishes teaching standards of practice

E. Human Relations
Engages in public relations
Works with community groups
Works with citizens and lay groups
Strives to build a good working rapport between self and the professional staff
Helps new teachers become familiar with central office services and personnel
Serves as a communication link with the central office
Helps teachers understand the community
2. Decision Making

A. Instructional Philosophy
   Perennialism
   Essentialism
   Progressivism
   Reconstructionism

B. Learning Psychology
   Field Theories
   Association Theories

C. Surveys

D. Observations

E. Request
### APPENDIX H

### CODING KEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Categories</th>
<th>District Curriculum Leader Codes</th>
<th>Principal Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>DCLR</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>DCLT</td>
<td>PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>DCLS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Categories</th>
<th>Teachers Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Curriculum Leaders’ Tasks</td>
<td>TDCLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ Tasks</td>
<td>TPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Curriculum Leaders’ Services</td>
<td>TDCLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ Services</td>
<td>TPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Curriculum Leaders and Principals’ Overlap</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Curriculum Leaders and Principals’ Uniqueness</td>
<td>TU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR DISTRICT CURRICULUM LEADERS

1. What instructional leadership roles do you provide to untenured teachers as a district curriculum coordinator?

2. What instructional leadership services do you provide to untenured teachers as a district curriculum coordinator?

3. What responsibilities do you have for providing instructional support to untenured teachers as a district curriculum coordinator?

4. Tell me the instructional leadership tasks you provide to untenured teachers as a district curriculum coordinator.

5. What are the most important roles, services, responsibilities, or tasks you provide to untenured teachers as a district curriculum coordinator?

6. What roles, services, responsibilities or tasks related to untenured teachers take up most of your time as a district curriculum coordinator?

7. Explain how your instructional leadership tasks as a district curriculum coordinator differs from the instructional leadership of principals.

8. Describe how your instructional leadership roles as a district curriculum coordinator differs from the instructional leadership role of a principal.

9. Tell me how the instructional leadership responsibilities of the district curriculum coordinator and principal differ.
10. Explain how your instructional leadership services differ from that of the principal.

11. Explain how your instructional leadership tasks as a district curriculum coordinator are similar to the instructional leadership of a principal.

12. Describe how your instructional leadership roles as a district curriculum coordinator are similar to the instructional leadership role of a principal.

13. Tell me how the instructional leadership responsibilities of the district curriculum coordinator and principal overlap.

14. Explain how your instructional leadership services are similar to that of the principal.
APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS

• What instructional leadership roles do you provide to untenured teachers as a principal?
• What instructional leadership services do you provide to untenured teachers as a principal?
• What responsibilities do you have for providing instructional support to untenured teachers as a principal?
• Tell me the instructional leadership tasks you provide to untenured teachers as a principal.
• What are the most important roles, services, responsibilities, or tasks you provide to untenured teachers as a principal?
• What roles, services, responsibilities or tasks related to untenured teachers take up most of your time as a principal?
• Explain how your instructional leadership tasks as a principal differs from the instructional leadership of a district curriculum coordinator.
• Describe how your instructional leadership roles as a principal differs from the instructional leadership role of a district curriculum coordinator.
• Tell me how the instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal and district curriculum coordinator differ.
• Explain how your instructional leadership services differ from that of the district curriculum coordinator.

• Explain how your instructional leadership tasks as a principal are similar to the instructional leadership of a district curriculum coordinator.

• Describe how your instructional leadership roles as a principal are similar to the instructional leadership role of a district curriculum coordinator.

• Tell me how the instructional leadership responsibilities of the principal and district curriculum coordinator overlap.

• Explain how your instructional leadership services are similar to that of the district curriculum coordinator.
APPENDIX K

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR DISTRICT TEACHERS

- What instructional roles do district curriculum coordinators provide you?
- What instructional roles do principals provide you?
- How do the instructional roles of curriculum coordinators and principals differ?
- How do the instructional roles of curriculum coordinators and principals overlap or are similar?
- What instructional services do district curriculum coordinators provide you?
- What instructional services do principals provide you?
- How do the instructional services of curriculum coordinators and principals differ?
- How do the instructional services of curriculum coordinators and principals overlap or are similar?
- What instructional responsibilities do district curriculum coordinators provide you?
- What instructional responsibilities do principals provide you?
- How do the instructional responsibilities of curriculum coordinators and principals differ?
- How do the instructional responsibilities of curriculum coordinators and principals overlap or are similar?
- What instructional tasks do district curriculum coordinators provide you?
- What instructional tasks do principals provide you?
• How do the instructional tasks of curriculum coordinators and principals differ?

• How do the instructional tasks of curriculum coordinators and principals overlap or are similar?

• What roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks do curriculum coordinators provide that you think is most important?

• What roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks do principals provide that you think is most important?

• What roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks do curriculum coordinators provide that take up most of their time with you?

• What roles, services, responsibilities, and tasks do principals provide that take up most of their time with you?
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