ABSTRACT

ASSESSING KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDINGS, SKILLS, AND TRAITS: A DISCREPENCY ANALYSIS OF THOSE WHO PREPARE AND HIRE SECONDARY PRINCIPALS IN OHIO

By Thomas L. Goodney

A purported discrepancy exists in Ohio between what knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits are most important for preparing secondary principals compared to those valued in selecting and hiring secondary administrators. The purpose of this study was to determine the areas and the degree of discrepancy, if any, in perceptions among educational leadership faculty and superintendents in the value and utility of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISLLC) and Ohio Standards for Principals (OSP) as well as the specific knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits contained in them.

The design of this primarily quantitative study used simple descriptive statistics and basic tests to identify significant statistical variances between educational leadership faculty and superintendents and assistant superintendents. Additionally, this study uses limited qualitative data gathered from a one-time facilitated discussion that further illustrate and support the findings. As expected, some statistical analyses of knowledge, understandings, traits, and/or skills revealed distinct differences in the perceptions of superintendents and educational leadership professors. However, comparison of means of the two groups generally showed more agreement than variation, a finding that surprised participants in a facilitated discussion among a small group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and educational leadership faculty. Other findings yielded statistically significant correlations between rankings of certain ISLLC and OSP standards and specific demographics of educational faculty. In effect, adjunct professors and full professors seem to differ on the importance of preparing secondary principals in
relationship to developing, articulating, and implementing a shared vision, in addition to engaging parents and community members in the educational process.

Clearly this new line of inquiry exposes the inherent discrepancies among the realities of standards, accountability, and structures that define the parameters of the secondary principalship as seen by superintendents and assistant superintendents and by theories of leadership, teaching, and learning that frame the scope of principal preparation programs. Further, this study raises new and important questions for future investigation that could serve to bridge the gap and better prepare secondary principals for what is expected of them in the field.
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INTRODUCTION

This study examines the discrepancies in how educational leadership faculty, who prepare high school principals, and superintendents, who hire high school principals, perceive the value and utilization of Leadership Standards. A survey was developed and used to collect the perceptions of faculty in Ohio’s 21 principal preparation programs and members of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators (Ohio superintendents) who are directly responsible for hiring high school principals in their school districts.

CHAPTER 1

CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

In the foreword to Better Leaders for America’s Schools: A Manifesto (Meyer & Feistritzer, 2003), Chester Finn, president of the Thomas Fordham Foundation argues, “For America to have the great schools it needs, those schools must have great leaders - and so must their school systems” (p. 5). It is from this premise, some may argue, that school district superintendents and members of the professorate in educational leadership share a common purpose. Newman, King, and Youngs (2000) point out “that school capacity is the crucial variable affecting instructional quality and corresponding student achievement. And at the heart of school capacity are principals focused on the development of teachers’ knowledge and skills, professional community, program coherence, and technical resources” (p. 2). In short, principals are the frontline officers in education who must bring crucial strengths to their positions (Meyer & Feistritzer, 2003, p. 29).

In two separate Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) studies, Waters and Grubb (2004) and Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) highlight a number of relevant findings that were discovered, but four are especially relevant here. Each one supports the general notion that there is a direct relationship between leadership and student achievement. They state that:

1. Principal leadership is significantly correlated with student achievement. The average effect size, expressed as a correlation, is .25. This means that a one standard deviation improvement in principal leadership is associated with a 10 percentile difference in student achievement.
2. Twenty-one specific leadership responsibilities and 66 associated practices have statistically significant relationships with student achievement.

3. Just as leaders can have a positive impact on student achievement, they also can have a marginal or, worse, a negative impact on achievement. This finding is referred to as the “differential impact” of leadership on student achievement.

4. Changes with varying implications for stakeholders are positively associated with some responsibilities and negatively associated with others. (pp. 2-3)

Fullan (2002, May) concurs with the McREL study findings when he argues that, “Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement” (p. 16).

Further concurrence is offered by Leithwood & Riehl (2003, January), who claim that school leadership has a significant effect on student learning. Their review of relevant school leadership research concludes that leadership has significant albeit indirect influence on student learning that surpasses the effects of a quality curriculum and teacher instruction. Complicating this leadership challenge is the fact that the educational environment is more complex today. The authors cite, “…curriculum standards, achievement benchmarks, programmatic requirements, and other policy directives from many sources which generate complicated and unpredictable requirements for schools” (p. 1). Similarly, Leithwood, Lewis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) contend that successful contemporary principal leadership is challenged by two primary forces. The first is the complex education public policy environment that exists in the United States with its multilayered accountability structures. The second is centered on serving a burgeoning diverse student population.

If one accepts the important role that principals play in building school capacity to carry out its primary educational mission, further inquiry is required of the core knowledge, understandings, traits, and skills emphasized in university-based principal preparation programs that produce the next generation of high school principals. Equally important is an examination of what knowledge, understandings, traits, and skills superintendents consider as important when selecting aspiring high school principals to
lead their schools. It is this nexus around core knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits within principal preparation programs and criteria for selection to the principalship that forms the basis for this study.

When one first encounters this nexus and begins to examine the “why should I care?” question, a cursory examination of the nature of contemporary versus traditional principalship roles and responsibilities is all that is required to grasp the importance of understanding the alignment or misalignment of preparation standards and wise selection criteria. Meyer and Feistrizer (2003) provide a brief but instructive analysis of the altered state of the principalship in the United States when they point out that:

The principal’s job has changed profoundly in the decades since the familiar certification regimen was put in place. At that time, its main tasks were supervising teachers, managing the building, and dealing with parents. If the school was tidy and orderly, the staff content, the parents quiescent, and the downtown bureaucracy untroubled, the principal was assumed to be doing his or her job. Today, however, while all of those old responsibilities endure, the principal’s main task has evolved into something very different: to develop a vision of learning; to build a school culture and instructional programs conducive to learning for all pupils; to manage staff, students and parents with needs and problems that did not exist or were largely ignored in the past; and, above all, to produce excellent academic results as gauged by external measures such as state proficiency tests keyed to statewide academic standards (p. 17).

The arts of visioning and culture building are sorely needed skill sets that have produced and supported a consulting and publishing industry in business management and educational leadership for decades. The acumen with which a principal juggles these two dynamics amidst the daily challenges of managing a school - digesting and interpreting the external forces that put pressure on teachers and students - is often the crucial difference in perceived or actual school success or failure. Simply put, the redefinition of the roles school principals have placed upon them has put a burden on university preparation programs and on school superintendents to ensure that they are preparing and selecting candidates who can successfully tackle the challenges of leadership in schools today.
Similarly, Hessel and Holloway (2002) suggest that “School principals and other school leaders are confronted with the daunting task of providing structure and coherence to the school’s instructional mission while simultaneously responding to the sometimes intense pressure from parents, the community, and even the district’s own central administration” (p. 2). Commenting on the adopted Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards formulated by the Council of State School Officers (CCSSO), the authors posit that the core proposition behind any set of school-based leadership standards is the continuous improvement of student learning. This critical aspect of a principal’s role demands that, “All of the other multiple tasks and activities are in the service of that core responsibility” (p. 2).

Despite differing opinions within colleges of education and certainly throughout the school superintendency on how to approach principal preparation, it can be agreed that to positively move the proverbial needle on student achievement in an underperforming school or to successfully push for advanced levels of accomplishment in an excellent school requires a skilled and committed principal. Troubling, though, are assertions that suggest that current leadership preparation programs, as well as superintendent-based recruitment and selection decisions, are less than exemplary and likely at odds with one another in several respects. In their official report to the Program on Education Policy and Governance (Harvard University) released by the Education Schools Project, Hess and Kelley (2005) analyzed whether principal preparation programs are producing graduates with the knowledge and skills necessary to provide leadership in today’s increasingly complex schools. The evidence presented in this report suggests that preparation has not kept pace with the changes in the larger world of schooling, leaving graduates of principal preparation programs ill-equipped for the challenges and opportunities posed by an era of accountability (p. 35). In a critical response to the conclusions drawn by Hess and Kelley (2005) and Levine (2005), Young, Crow, Orr, Ogawa, and Creighton (2005), who were writing on behalf of the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA), provide a degree of concurrence when they state, “…programs must be rigorously evaluated, and weak programs must either be strengthened or closed” (p. 1), “There is no question that there are too many programs in educational leadership that provide inadequate preparation” (p. 6).
Currently in Ohio, high school reform efforts are found in the urban core, growing suburban areas, and in small rural communities. With the recently enacted Ohio CORE legislation, many high schools are reassessing their academic programming in an effort to meet the new standard of college readiness. As a result, the principals who lead these high schools are tasked with reexamining a wide range of variables such as reviewing overall teaching strategies and techniques, ensuring access to curriculum, assessing learning conditions, creating a new vision for their high schools, and providing connections to the larger community amid the ever present reality of available resources being in short supply.

Ohio high school principals are called to lead the development of or implement break-the-mold models that not only raise academic rigor and overall student performance, but models that lead efforts to improve instructional quality in their schools while simultaneously enhancing the efficiency of operations and organizational flexibility. Important to note is that these same performance expectations exist for the veteran or rookie high school principal without exception. With the added pressure of high-stakes national and state accountability structures, all high school principals find themselves in a highly visible and at times a very controversial position when it comes to the casualties of such a system. Graduation tests, graduate completion rates, school Adequate Yearly Progress under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and attendance rate are only a handful of areas where the high school principal is at the epicenter of a community accountability vortex where the results, if negative, produce potentially disastrous results for the entire school district in terms of funding and, even worse, public confidence.

Van Meter and Price (2007) assert that “across Ohio, there is a strong and growing desire for schools to do a better job - for all students to graduate from high school with the knowledge and skills they will need to be successful in the college classroom, careers, and citizenship” (p. 14). In the context of this study, the coin of the realm is “all students.” Never in the history of U.S. education, specifically the history of the American high school, have we aspired to do what we are presently undertaking. As Van Meter and Price point out:

This is not a simple challenge - particularly not when academic standards are being raised and the expectations of what every student should know and be able
to do are being widely debated, when parents and communities are voicing deep concerns about the performance of their schools, when the demands on teachers and school leaders are becoming more intense, when new accountability measures are being developed and applied, when pressures are mounting to train the knowledge workers who will fill the high-skill, high-wage jobs that will be used to measure Ohio’s future prosperity, and when school districts are being squeezed by tightened revenue streams and rising costs of operations (p. 14).

It is this premise, in which the preparation of and subsequent actions and decisions made in the recruitment and hiring of secondary principals, that is under analysis in this study. For reference, the Ohio Department of Education, Center for the Teaching Profession currently lists 22 institutions of higher education in Ohio that prepare principals. That number is actually 21 as Baldwin Wallace College is not accepting applicants for its leadership program at this time. The 22 educational administration programs are:

1. University of Akron
2. Antioch McGregor
3. Ashland University
4. Baldwin-Wallace College
5. Bowling Green State University
6. University of Cincinnati
7. Cleveland State University
8. University of Dayton
9. University of Findlay
10. Franciscan University of Steubenville
11. John Carroll University
12. Kent State University
13. Malone College
14. Miami University
15. Muskingum College
16. The Ohio State University
17. Ohio University
18. University of Toledo
19. Ursuline College
20. Wright State University
21. Xavier University
22. Youngstown State University

Eight of the 22 programs in Ohio (indicated by italics) have undergone a review by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), a specialized professional organization (SPA) that is part of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). The ELCC trains reviewers to conduct rigorous evaluations of
educational leadership programs as part of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) process and determines which programs are deserving of National Recognition status.

Recruitment and Selection

Criticism of the recruitment and selection decision process is levied by Hess (2003, January), who argues that we have “retain(ed) a system of recruitment, retention, and induction that does not recruit the leaders we need, does not prepare them for their positions, and does not reward them on par with their responsibilities” (p. 1). Additionally, Hess points out that in a national survey of superintendents fewer than “40 percent were happy with their principals’ ability to make tough decisions, delegate responsibility to staff, involve teachers in developing policies and priorities, or spend money efficiently” (p. 1). Baker (2001) found that previous experience and communication skills were the critical factors leading to the selection decisions of superintendents and that selection processes vary widely and involve directly or indirectly any number of school or district constituents. Citing that the ISLLC standards that guide the majority of principal preparation programs contain 182 indicators, Baker found that the superintendents who were surveyed typically considered roughly 25% (n=48) in their principal selection process stating, “It does not appear that the Standards strongly influence principal selection and decisions made by superintendents to select one individual over another” (p. 124).

Concerns over preparation and selection and hiring processes notwithstanding, there is additional evidence to suggest that the highest levels of leadership within the schools are not entirely pleased with the current state of the principalship. Hess (2003) points out that more than 60% of superintendents who responded to the survey indicated that when filling a principal position, they have to take what they can get. Lack of superintendent confidence in their hiring decisions of principals requires its own study perhaps, but for the purposes of this discussion, it reveals an indication of dissatisfaction from within the profession and that something is amiss.

Statement of the Problem

In light of a clear lack of consensus on what knowledge, understandings, skills and traits should be considered as most important in both principal preparation programs
and in the selection and hiring process, it is important to examine any discrepancies of opinion that may exist between those who are doing the preparation (professors of educational administration) and those who are doing the selecting and hiring (superintendents).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the areas and degree of discrepancy, if any, between the perception of the value and utility of the ISLLC Standards and the recently adopted Ohio Standards for Principals, as well as the specific knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits contained in them among those who prepare high school principals and those who hire them.

Research Questions

1. What knowledge, understandings, skills and traits, are considered most important by Ohio college or university educational leadership faculty in secondary principal preparation programs?
2. What knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits are considered most important by Ohio superintendents in the selection process when hiring a secondary principal?
3. Which leadership standards (ISLLC or OSP) are considered most important by Ohio college or university educational leadership faculty?
4. Which leadership standards (ISLLC or OSP) are considered most important by Ohio superintendents?

Significance of the Study

Ample research exists that examines principal preparation program development, reform, and best practices. Numerous states have aligned principal preparation program accreditation to widely accepted standards such as the ISLLC Standards or they adapt their own standards such as the OSP. Numerous scholars have attempted to show the positive effects of hiring a good principal whose knowledge and skills translate to increased student achievement, a positive school culture, and overall school success. Some studies have attempted to determine from superintendents what they find lacking in preparation programs and what they look for when hiring a principal, but very little research exists on examining agreement or disagreement on a core set of accepted
knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits that principals should possess as a result of completing a principal preparation program.

This study adds to the literature on principal preparation and selection criteria used by superintendents of principals and more specifically adds to a body of literature that seeks to examine the relationship between K-12 and higher education by attempting to determine what discrepancies, if any, exist between what professors of educational administration consider as the most important knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits in the preparation of aspiring principals and what superintendents consider as most important when recruiting, selecting, and eventually hiring a principal.

The study may aid educational administration faculty in their ongoing critical examination of their principal preparation programs in terms of their eventual impact on providing potential candidates who possess skill sets that resonate with superintendents and boards of education, respectively. The study may aid superintendents in rethinking their recruitment and selection criteria as well as the core knowledge and skills they can expect from applicants who have recently completed a preparation program. The study also may inform state department of education officials and other education public policy officials who seek further clarity on the important issue of principal preparation.

Lastly, a significant contribution from this study is the design, development, and test of a survey instrument that uses ISLLC Standard elements and those from the Ohio Standards for Principals. One criticism of the ISLLC Standards is that they are not empirically tested. This study not only provides an empirical test of the ISLLC Standards and the core knowledge and understandings contained in them, but it also provides an empirical test between two sets of leadership standards.

Delimitations of the Study

This study had several delimitations. It was delimited to professors of educational leadership and school superintendents in Ohio. Furthermore, by using only active Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA) members, the superintendent survey was not sent to current superintendents who do not hold a membership in that organization. While an attempt was made to include adjunct faculty in principal preparation programs, the survey was not sent to those faculty who either were not listed
on a university-sponsored department Web page or did not have available e-mail addresses with the department secretary.

Another delimitation of the study was the use of ISLLC Standards and OSP. Other leadership standards or frameworks could have been selected as a basis for the survey instrument, such as McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework, but ISLLC Standards are connected to current principal preparation program accreditation criteria as required by NCATE. The newly adopted OSP are the result of a larger public policy agenda in Ohio around standardization. The use of each set of standards was delimited because not all elements of the standard framework were incorporated into either the conceptual design of the study or the survey instrument itself.

The emphasis on high school principal preparation and selection was a delimitation of the study. A decision was made to limit the scope of the study based primarily on the radically changing nature of the high school principalship and what is expected of high schools today and in the future. It is recognized that most principal preparation programs do not segregate or provide specialized instruction to aspiring high school principals.

Definitions

1. **AASA** stands for American Association of School Administrators.
2. **BASA** stands for Buckeye Association of School Administrators.
3. **CASA** stands for the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration.
4. **CCSSO** stands for the Council of Chief State School Officers.
5. **ELCC** stands for the Educational Leadership Constituent Council.
6. **ICSL** stands for the Interstate Consortium on School Leadership.
7. **ISLLC** stands for the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium.
8. **Leadership Standard** is a term used to describe a desired standard of the requisite knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits of a good school or district leader.
9. **McREL** stands for the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
10. **NAESP** stands for the National Association of Elementary School Principals.
11. **NASB** stands for the National Association of School Boards.
12. **NASSP** stands for the National Association of Secondary School Principals.
13. **NCATE** stands for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
14. NPBEA stands for the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
15. ODE stands for the Ohio Department of Education.
16. OSP stands for the Ohio Standards for Principals.
17. SELI stands for the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.
18. SPA stands for a specialized education organization.
19. UCEA stands for the University Council for Educational Administration.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented and organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and organization of the study. Chapter 2 provides a review of the relevant literature as an informational basis for the study as well as suggesting the use of Murphy, Elliott, Goldring, and Porter’s Learning Centered Leadership Framework as a useful conceptual framework by which the reader can situate the study’s purpose, findings, and subsequent implications. Chapter 3 contains the research methodology, sample, instruments (tests and measures), general procedures, and the methods for reporting the data. Chapter 4 reports the findings of the study and includes a restatement of the research questions in relation to the data reported. Chapter 5 contains a final summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations, and implications for current practice and future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW
Leadership Standards

Historical Perspective

The earliest recorded attempts to create standards for administrator preparation and licensure was fueled by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) founded in 1954 (Hoyle, 2005, p. 23). In 1955, the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA) was created after a relationship was forged between the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the Kellogg Foundation. Its inaugural project was to develop standards for the preparation of school leaders. An eventual outcome of the project not only produced the intended preparation standards, but it also produced recommendations for school administrator professional development, school board procedures for selecting administrators, and suggestions for research in the field. In the process, American Association of School Administrator’s CASA evolved as the driving force in creating benchmarks for improving selection, preparation, and development of leaders for educational institutions (Hoyle, 2005).

Subsequently titled Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators, the standards were submitted for review in 1982 to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of School Boards (NASB), as well as other experts in the education field and policy makers. Several revisions to the guidelines occurred as a result of the official review process, and from 1983-1995 they served as the standard by which administrator preparation programs were reviewed by NCATE (Hoyle, 2005).

Designed to be all-inclusive guidelines/standards based on skills that would be required for all school administrators (for example, superintendents, central office administrators, principals, and assistant principals), the guidelines were written as required to include desired competencies with associated skills. The original guidelines were:
1. Category 1 - Designing, implementing, and evaluating a school climate improvement program that utilizes mutual staff and student efforts to formulate and attain goals.

2. Category 2 - Understanding political theory and applying political skills in building local, state, and national support for education.

3. Category 3 - Developing a systematic school curriculum that assures both the extensive enrichment activities and the mastery of fundamental as well as progressively more complex skills required in advanced problem solving, and creative and technological skills.

4. Category 4 - Planning and implementing an instructional management system that includes learning objectives, curriculum design, and instructional strategies and techniques that facilitate high levels of achievement.

5. Category 5 - Developing staff development and evaluation systems to enhance effectiveness of educational personnel.

6. Category 6 - Allocating human, material and financial resources to efficiently and accountably assure successful student learning.

7. Category 7 - Conducting research and utilizing research findings in decisions to improve long-range planning, school operations, and student learning.

Each of these competencies contained between five to seven skills and/or research rationale that became the foundation for other standards developed since 1983 (Hoyle, 2005).

During its 12-year run (1983-1995), the CASA guidelines came under increased scrutiny and subsequent calls for revision ensued. As a result, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) with financial support from the Danforth Foundation tasked a large group of representatives from the many school administration professional associations to develop a new common set of NCATE guidelines/standards for educational leaders (Hoyle, 2005). Published in 1995, the NPBEA developed Guidelines for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership for Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors. As drafted, the NPBEA standards included sub-elements, indicators of success, and examples of how to create solid practices for candidate performance activities at building and district-level
leadership. Additionally, the NPBEA standards included a seventh standard for an internship experience for the candidate that sought to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice developed in Standards 1-6 through a substantial, sustained, standards-based work in a real setting, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel (NPBEA, 2002, p. 16).

Approved standard language in 2002 read, “Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success for all students by” (p. 2) and included:

1. Standard 1.0 – Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning supported by the school community.

2. Standard 2.0 – Promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

3. Standard 3.0 – Managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient and effective learning environment.

4. Standard 4.0 – Collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

5. Standard 5.0 – Acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.

6. Standard 6.0 – Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

7. Standard 7.0 – Internship.

The internship provided significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and to practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit (NPBEA, 2002).

ISLLC Standard Development

Closely adhering to original or revised standards from AASA, NASSP, and NAESP, the NPBEA guidelines were highly instructive in the development of the six
original ISLLC Standards. Created by the ISLLC in 1996, the new standards (termed ISLLC Standards) were published by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) in response to the growing need for a clear structure of leadership criteria in the face of increasing challenges and complexities for school administrators. Originally designated as the lead agency for this project by the NPBEA and intended to apply to nearly all formal leadership positions in education, not solely the principalship, the ISLLC standards attempt to represent a formal emphasis on matters of learning and teaching and on the creation of powerful learning environments without sacrificing a needed emphasis on management and skill sets such as measuring academic growth and stewardship (Murphy & Shipman, 2002, pp. 4-5).

Motivated by the absence of one set of common standards in the field of educational administration, the ISLLC team chose a standards approach with associated knowledge, dispositions, and performances to guide the development of the ISLLC Standards with the hope that the standards would serve broader improvement efforts on three fronts: licensure, program approval, and candidate assessment (Murphy & Shipman, 2002). As adopted by the full consortium on November 2, 1996, the standards read, “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success for all students by” (p31):

1. **Standard 1.0** – Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
2. **Standard 2.0** – Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
3. **Standard 3.0** – Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
4. **Standard 4.0** – Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
5. **Standard 5.0** – Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6. **Standard 6.0** – Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (Hessel & Holloway, 2002).
Currently, 46 states have leadership standards for administrator certification and preparation programs, and 41 states report that they have officially adopted the ISLLC Standards or confirmed alignment of state standards with ISLLC (Sanders & Simpson, 2005). In October, 2005, the Interstate Consortium On School Leadership (ICSL) convened for the purposes of discussing the current wording of the ISLLC Standards in response to numerous states, which requested that ISLLC reflect the numerous political and social policy changes that have occurred since the standards were originally published in 1996. In concert with NPBEA, a national process is underway to update the standards with input from ICSL members. Critical areas for discussion and likely revision include the standards’ central focus being on teaching and learning for success for all children and adults in schools, on increased administrator accountability, on greater requirements for community engagement, on cultural competencies, on how to frame performance expectations in a differentiated licensure framework, and on leadership dispositions (Sanders & Simpson, 2005).

McREL Balanced Leadership Framework

In recent years, research efforts have been engaged in an attempt to produce leadership standards or frameworks that are based upon contemporary school leadership challenges and that are empirically tested. Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) identified 21 leadership responsibilities significantly associated with student achievement as part of a Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) meta-analysis, which began in 1998. Termed the Balanced Leadership Framework, these standards for leaders are argued to stand apart from any previous advice for school leaders, largely because they were developed from a far more comprehensive analysis of research on school leadership and student achievement (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003, p. 2). The authors also contend that because the balanced leadership framework is grounded in evidence, it moves beyond abstraction to concrete responsibilities, practices, knowledge, strategies, tools, and resources that principals and others need to be effective leaders (Waters, et al., 2003, p. 2).

Waters and Grubb (2004) compared the ISLLC Standards and the Balanced Leadership Framework and found that the McREL conclusions add value to the use of
ISLLC Standards by policymakers and others in three key ways: (a) increased utility, (b) guidance based upon quantitative research, and (c) the identification of leadership practices that should take primacy (p. 3). With regard to utility, the 21 leadership responsibilities and 66 practices in the Balanced Leadership Framework are relatively simple to digest when compared to the 184 indicators emanating from the six ISLLC Standards. However, there are numerous instances where the two sets of standards share common language and reference. The suggestion that the quantitative results of the Balanced Leadership Framework provide ISLLC Standard acceptance mainly points to McREL filling the void left by ISLLC Standards, which are failing in numerous instances to communicate the critical connection between the standard and improved student learning. The McREL findings clarify what key points should take primacy in the ISLLC Standards and offer guidance to policymakers, senior education officials, and practitioners about what to do (pp. 3-4). The Balanced Leadership Framework is organized into work responsibilities and the extent to which a principal/leader meets the responsibility within the context of identified associated practices. The responsibilities include affirmation, change agent, communication, contingent rewards, culture, curriculum, instruction, assessment, discipline, flexibility, focus, ideals/beliefs, input, intellectual stimulation, knowledge of curriculum, monitors/evaluates, optimizer, order, outreach, relationships, resources, situational awareness, and visibility (pp. 15-18).

Ohio Standards for Principals

The Ohio State Board of Education adopted by resolution a final draft of the OSP at its meeting October 11, 2005. Closely aligned with ISLLC and NPBEA Standards for school leaders and programs in educational leadership, these five standards were developed for use as a guide for principals as they continually reflect and improve upon their effectiveness as leaders throughout all the stages of their careers (Ohio Standards for Principals, final draft, 2005, p. 1). It is also believed that these standards may assist principal preparation programs in developing course content and general training program requirements, in focusing district goals and objectives for principals, in planning and guiding professional development for principals, and in leading to improved coaching and mentoring programs for principals. Even though the OSP are intended to drive conversation and are not to be thought of as an evaluation tool, these five standards
still may potentially guide the mandate included in Ohio Senate Bill 2 to develop evaluation guidelines for school leaders (Ohio Standards for Principals, final draft, 2005, p. 1).

In terms of structure, the standards are organized into general statements that reflect standard, narrative summaries, elements, and indicators. Furthermore the standards are written to show performance at three levels: proficient, accomplished, and distinguished, all of which indicate the essential knowledge and building blocks to allow school administrators to advance in their expertise. The standards are further delineated into three distinct organizers: goals and achievement, conditions, and collaboration and communication. The standards are:

1. Standard 1 – Principals help create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress toward achieving their goals.
2. Standard 2 – Principals support the implementation of high-quality; standards based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students.
3. Standard 3 – Principals allocate resources and manage school operations in order to ensure a safe and productive learning environment.
4. Standard 4 – Principals establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote student learning and achievement of all students.
5. Standard 5 – Principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support student learning, achievement, and well-being (Ohio Standards for Principals, final draft, p. 7).

Opposing Views of Leadership Standards

A long history of tension within the field of educational administration around leadership standards has crystallized in recent years into two basic views. One argument suggests that historically, leadership criteria or standards were, at best, ambiguous and, at worst, contradictory, impossible, or variant to common values (Reeves, 2004). Primarily concerned with the standards themselves but also with the lack of concrete performance criteria, Reeves argues that these standards are poorly defined and confounded by too much educational jargon, are severely lacking in the establishment of clear performance criteria, and are unrealistic in what areas a school leader actually has authority over (p. 4).
That said, Reeves does contend that ISLLC is a step in the right direction, stating, “Almost all of these represent an advance over previous evaluation systems and are certainly better than the utter absence of systematic leadership evaluation” (p. 4).

A similar argument has arisen against contemporary leadership standards and their perceived lack of use in practical situations. This argument says that because no specific essential skills or knowledge required for effective leadership has been specifically identified, the use of standards in preparation program design, licensure assessment, and program review is troubling. Hess and Kelley (2005a) point out that ISLLC standard assertions, such as administrators should “promote student success” by doing things like “facilitating a vision for learning,” “collaborating with community members,” and “influencing the larger political, legal, and cultural context,” are accepted by those who embrace ISLLC’s constructivist agenda (p. 14). Of ISSLC, Hess (2003, January) further contends that, “The Standards endorse a doctrinaire philosophy of educational leadership motivated by a particular vision of social justice and democratic community and dismissive of conventional management theory” (p. 13).

In stark contrast, Murphy (2003, September) provides a wholly different perspective when he states,

The ISSLC Standards are an empirically-based set of values that go a long way in redefining the field of school administration. They privilege the core technology of business (i.e. learning and teaching) as well as the knowledge about how to develop schools where all youngsters learn well (i.e. school improvement). They acknowledge the critical nature of the political, managerial, and organizational dimensions of the profession, for sure. But, in a break from the past, they link these elements, or put these dynamics, in the service of education – learning, teaching and school improvement (p. 6).

Furthermore, Murphy points out that ISLLC was never designed to be a comprehensive accounting of every performance indicator in the field of educational leadership, rather it was the intention of the Consortium “to illuminate the knowledge that should occupy center stage in school administration and to show how other aspects of the profession can promote more effective student learning and more productive schools” (p. 26).
Superintendent Selection of Principals

Scant research exists on the issue of superintendent selection of principals, let alone secondary school principals. However, one study by Glass and Bearman (2003, March) is especially instructive as it looks at the selection criteria used in the hiring process and reviews whether the criteria correspond to ISLLC preparation and licensure standards. Of note from the study were findings on selection criteria, which showed a discrepancy between what contemporary education literature states and what responding superintendents valued. The authors cited education literature that states that the most important skill set for a principal is instructional leadership - including using student assessment data for diagnosis, observing teachers, and suggesting strategies for improvement - whereas responding superintendents felt that effective communication and managing student discipline were just as important. In general, non-instructional criteria were rated by responding superintendents as higher in importance than instructional criteria when making selection decisions (p. 1).

At the time of the Glass and Bearman (2003) study, 32 states were using ISLLC standards as the basis for principal licensing. According to AASA, that number has grown to as many as 46 states, but it now stands at 44 (AASA Bulletin, March 20, 2006). At present, the ISLLC Standards are under review and revision by the CCSSO, which was appointed as lead agency by the NPBEA. The findings of the Glass and Bearman study may have, in part, led to the reexamination of the standards when it was revealed that only three of the six ISLLC Standards were found by responding superintendents to be very important in selecting a secondary principal. This suggests an obvious discrepancy between ISLLC-driven principal preparation and licensing programs and the reality of the criteria used by superintendents to select secondary principals (Glass and Bearman, 2003, p. 2). Based on the responses of superintendents in this study, the authors suggest that the use of identical ISLLC Standards to prepare all principals (elementary, middle, and high school) could be a part of the reexamination process.

Worth mentioning is the data that the Glass and Bearman (2003) study offer respective to who ultimately makes secondary principal selection decisions and the criteria used to arrive at those decisions. The authors point to data that suggest that size of a school district is a determining factor in who sets the criteria, conducts the
interviews, and makes the final selection decision. In districts fewer than 3,000 students, the superintendent is typically the person responsible for the determining selection criteria, directing the search process, and establishing proposed contract terms. In districts larger than 3,000 students, these criteria, processes, and decisions are usually left to others in the central office contingent upon superintendent approval.

Baker (2001) examined several factors that superintendents use when selecting principals. Included in her analysis was an exploration of the congruence between the ideals advocated in the national movement in the preparation of principals (ISLLC) and those employed by superintendents in making their choices (p. 14). Experience and communications skills were cited as critically important to superintendents in their selection decisions. In addition, candidates who demonstrated abilities to deal with diverse populations, possessed a strong sense of justice and fair play, and showed the ability to solve problems effectively were viewed as favorable to superintendents. Approximately 25% (48 of 182) of ISLLC Standard indicators (knowledge, understandings, and dispositions) were mentioned by superintendents as playing a role in their selection decisions indicating that the standards themselves do not appear to strongly influence principal selection decisions in general or the selection of one candidate over another.

Less instructive on the issue of secondary principal selection decisions by superintendents is a study by Winter, McCabe, and Newton (1998) that examined the selection decisions of teachers when participating in the principal selection process. Premised around the local school council approach to selecting a principal, the study revealed that teachers preferred candidates with whom they shared a dominant work value. Moreover, of relevance in comparison and contrast to the Glass and Bearman findings, Winter et al. found the elementary and middle school teachers preferred candidates more oriented toward instructional leadership, whereas high school teachers preferred candidates oriented toward management. These findings suggest that elementary and middle school teachers rank a principal candidate’s dominant work values, at least those that are more in line with the instructional leadership criteria category of the ISLLC Standards, as more important, which is in contrast with the responses provided by the superintendents in the Glass and Bearman study. Conversely,
the Winter et al. (1998) findings suggest that high school teachers rank a secondary principal candidate’s dominant work values, at least those that are more in line with leadership standard criteria that are of the non-instructional leadership criteria, as more important, which is somewhat in agreement with the responses given by the superintendents in the Glass and Bearman study.

In another study that examined teacher-based principal selection decisions rather than superintendent-based decisions, Winter and Jaeger (2002) found that when the decision came down to prioritizing between job experience and personal characteristics such as communication, management, and instructional leadership, teachers rated the most experienced candidates higher than the least experienced candidates, but they failed to rate the medium experienced candidates higher than the least experienced candidates or the most experienced candidates higher than the medium experienced candidates. This suggests that at least in some instances, teachers may place increased value on personal characteristics rather than experience level.

Embedded within a larger discussion of improving principal performance is the value of assessing decision making abilities. Calabrese and Zapeda (1999) offer an analysis of the importance of decision making in the preparation, selection, and evaluation of principals. Of relevance in the superintendent selection of principals conversation is the assertion that the screening and eventual selection process can be greatly enhanced through the identification of the quality of the decisions made by prospective or practicing principals (p. 9). It is also suggested that decision making should be emphasized in both the principal preparation programs and the standards or criteria that the programs are based upon.

Principal Preparation

Recent Calls for Reform

Several studies in 2005 focused on the question, “What gets taught in principal preparation programs?” Numerous studies conducted by Hess & Kelley for the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research were in direct response to numerous key findings from a 2003 report by Public Agenda, which in part stated that “today’s school superintendents want their principals to display prowess in everything from accountability to instructional leadership and teacher quality, but principals themselves
don’t think they are equipped for these duties” (Hess & Kelley, 2005, p. 1). In their official report to the Program on Education Policy and Governance (Harvard University), released by the Education Schools Project, Hess and Kelley (2005) analyzed whether principal preparation programs are producing graduates with the knowledge and skills necessary to provide leadership in today’s increasingly complex schools. The evidence presented in this report suggests that preparation has not kept pace with the changes in the larger world of schooling, leaving graduates of principal preparation programs ill-equipped for the challenges and opportunities posed by an era of accountability (p. 35). Outlining a preferred agenda of complete deregulation of the profession, the authors voiced concerns about the limited training in the use of data, research, technology, and hiring or termination of personnel, as well as scant exposure to management scholarship or inquiry into educational productivity or governance (p. 36).

Other Hess and Kelley studies (May, 2005a; May, 2005b; July, 2005) have directly focused on an analysis of courses, syllabi, and textbooks used to deliver the standards of the principal preparation program. In each instance, the authors concluded that there was little attention paid to managing with accountability, using data, or making tough personnel decisions. Amid other findings that confirmed or confounded the authors’ suspicions prior to conducting the research existed a concise belief statement describing what should be taught in principal preparation programs as “significant attention to accountability, managing with data, and utilizing research; to hiring, recruiting, evaluating, and terminating personnel; to overseeing an effective instructional program; and to exposing candidates to diverse views regarding educational and organizational management” (2005a, p. 4).

Similarly themed studies and reports contend that in contrast to concerns voiced regarding a shortage of school administrators who are willing and able to lead schools, the reality is that supply is not the problem. The problem is that preparation programs have not trained prospective candidates with the skills necessary to lead in accountability systems through the effective use of technology grounded in day-to-day realities of schools (Hess & Kelley, 2005b; Meyer & Feistritzer, 2003). This conservative and alternative view, or as some refer to it as the “radical reform agenda” view, of school leader preparation has found common ground with conventional administration
preparation program proponents such as Kowalski (2004), who rejects a more radical reform agenda but accepts that “substantial reforms in administrator preparation, program accreditation, and state licensing standards” (p. 93) are necessary.

Predictable with the recent and widely articulated calls from outside the higher education community for the reform of school leader preparation, a reluctance to change by some people and programs in educational administration is expected (McCarthy et al. 1988 and Murphy, 1991). Bjork and Ginsberg (1995) suggest a theoretical explanation for the reluctance to reform by some current university preparation programs. Premised loosely on Kuhn’s (1970) paradigm continuum, the authors suggest that real reform will not occur until there is, in essence, a crisis within the field to cause the system to undergo any real paradigm shift. Cuban’s (1988) research on first and second order change is also offered by the authors as a way to explain the reluctance by some to make substantive changes in their preparation programs. The authors suggest that until there is widespread dissatisfaction with the present arrangements in preparation programs, no second order changes will occur.

Concurring and Opposing Views

Shortly after the aforementioned Hess and Kelley reports, and Art Levine’s (2005) *Educating School Leaders* was published in several professional journals and appeared in mainstream media outlets in the spring of 2005, a joint response was submitted by a group of leaders representing the University Council for Educational Administration, the American Educational Research Association, and the National Council for Professors of Educational Administration. *An Educative Look at Educating School Leaders* by Young, Crow, Orr, Ogawa, and Creighton (2005) was directed toward the conclusions offered in the American Enterprise Institute and Levine reports.

Young et al. (2005) agreed with Levine that high standards for schools of education and leadership preparation are required along with a review of the financial practices that strengthen them. Additionally, they agreed that all programs should be rigorously evaluated and that weak programs should be strengthened or closed. However, primary disagreement was voiced through disappointment and even regret at Levine’s and others’ failure to validate aggressive and complex changes already underway, such as the integration of ISLLC Standards with NCATE and the Educational
Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Program Standards for evaluating leadership preparation programs for national accreditation (pp. 1-2). In their paper, *An Educative Look at Educating School Leaders*, Young et al. (2005) questioned the research validity of Levine’s and others’ work and suggested an alternative road map for reform of leadership programs by providing eight recommendations to further strengthen current preparation programs.

Others in the field of educational administration have taken on Levine’s assertions as well. Achilles (2005), for example, suggests that Levine and others who make similar reform recommendations provide no new ideas, except empirically untested ones. Specifically in response to Levine, Achilles suggests that he “employs a selective and weak review, offering a model for future ideological treatises that may further demonize education” (p. 3). General themes of criticism of Levine, Hess and Kelley from the higher education community revolve around those provided by Young et al. (2005) and Achilles (2005).

*Advancements in Program Redesign*

Research evidence exists that suggests progress has been made in developing effective principal preparation programs (Davis & Jazzar, 2005; Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005). In their research, Davis and Jazzar examined 14 principal preparation programs and found seven consistent instructional and learning actions, or habits, they believe established a framework for providing future educational leaders with opportunities to connect their knowledge to reality through carefully designed experiences. Labeled as seven habits of effective principal preparation programs, the framework includes: curriculum and instruction, clinical learning internships, mentors, collaborative experiences, authentic assessments, research-based decision-making, and turnkey transitions. All seven components are suggested as behaviors that when applied by principals into their leadership and management routines, they are more likely to experience success (p. 21).

The Stanford Educational Leadership Institute’s *School Leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals* (2005) similarly examined exemplary programs in an effort to identify common practices among them. Of particular importance in this analysis were findings relative to program content, methods of delivery, and overall
program structure. The study found that exemplary programs are aligned with licensing standards, are research based, and provide a coherent curriculum that offers field-based internships, problem-based learning, and program mentors who are delivered in close collaboration with the university and local school districts. This study confirms conclusions offered by Valentine (2001), who suggested that graduates of programs that have a clear conceptual foundation, are cohort based, and contain robust internship and mentor components scored higher on the ISLLC performance assessment test, received higher performance evaluations by supervisors, and were perceived by teachers as being effective managers of their schools.

One resource, which offered a broader review of preparation programs in universities in states that fall within the Southern Regional Education Board titled *Schools Can’t Wait: Accelerating the Redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs* (2005) resulted in four general conclusions. The first conclusion centered on state policies and associated strategies that have produced some change but have generally failed to produce programming that ensures content mastery around the knowledge and skills necessary to effectively lead schools today. Citing a lack of urgency in redesigning principal program content, process, and outcomes based upon the current needs of schools, the report suggested that a renewed commitment toward immediate change emerge from state, university, and local school district leadership. The report cited “deploy entrenched” barriers to change that exist within universities, which should communicate to state and local school district officials that other approaches are required. A final conclusion is that the issue is not whether principal programs need to change, but how the redesign efforts will unfold within the context of larger education reform initiatives in a given state. Issued as a call to action, the *Schools Can’t Wait* report (a) encouraged policy makers to take bold steps at motivating universities to collaborate with local school districts, (b) state agencies to align their practice in support of universities and school districts in the redesign process, (c) university presidents to recognize that quality principals contribute to quality local schools that enhance the economic and social conditions of their regions, and (d) departments of educational leadership to reject the status quo and devise programming based on requisite knowledge and skills for effective principals.
Practitioner Viewpoint

Principals

The recent of current principal practitioner is conspicuously absent from most of the contemporary and widely cited research on leadership preparation redesign, effectiveness, and emphasis areas. Several studies surveying principal practitioners point to several areas of concern as well as optimism about principal preparation from practitioners (Brent & Haller, 1998; Petzko, 2004; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, & Gundlach, 2003; and Vick, 2004). In a handful of studies, practicing administrators report ambivalence or in some cases general dissatisfaction of their preparation programs, often relating greater dissatisfaction relative to their length of service as an administrator (Maher, 1987; Schnur 1989; and Goldman & Kempner, 1988). Surveyed principals recommended that preparation programs provide continued or additional emphasis in the areas of interpersonal relationships, conflict resolution, business and financial administration, cultural sensitivity, staff supervision and evaluation, teaching through the use of scenarios, using experience administrators as instructors, and discussing research in the context of practice (Petzko, 2004; Portin et al., 2003; and Vick, 2004). Principals also suggest that programs deemphasize or improve program delivery in the areas of internship/hands-on experiences and in content areas such as foundations, research methods, and school board relations, in addition to providing faculty with administrative experience (Petzko, 2004; Vick, 2004).

Superintendents

A few studies have sought the perspectives of superintendents on the issue of principal preparation generally within the context of larger questions about school leadership, as well as how they perceive their own principals within the context of their preparedness for the jobs the presently hold (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001; Farkas, Johnson, & Duffett, 2003; Hardin, 1998). Superintendents surveyed in these studies reported that they were generally disappointed with the preparation of their principals to deal with leadership challenges such as holding staff accountable for the achievement of students and evaluation and supervision of teachers in general. Additionally, superintendents recommended that preparation programs provide greater
focus on courses that train principals in the areas of school law, supervision of instruction, curriculum, and personnel administration.

A Useful Conceptual Framework

Murphy, Elliott, Goldring, & Porter (2006) provide a framework that can assist researchers and school leadership practitioners in better understanding the nexus between factors that are at the center of principal leadership, such as previous experience, knowledge, personal characteristics, and values/beliefs and contemporary leadership, and principal preparation program standards, as well as recruitment and selection criteria used by superintendents. The Learning Centered Leadership Framework is premised on the general notion that leadership matters, that in difficult times it matters even more, that at times of transition in organizations it is the major controllable factor in explaining performance, and that instructionally focused and change-oriented leadership are effective frames for education in general and for school leadership specifically (Murphy et al., pp. 2-3). Furthermore, the framework situates the impact of leadership behaviors that are shaped by experience, knowledge, personal characteristics and values/beliefs in terms of valued outcomes as indirect. That is, impact is mediated by factors such as school operations and classroom activities and is influenced by other factors that, in turn, influence the outcomes (e.g. student achievement) (p.5). The framework provides a clearer conceptual understanding of the use in this study of the ISLLC knowledge and understandings and the OSP traits and skills applied in obtaining perceptions from educational leadership faculty and school superintendents about what they think is most important in the preparation and eventual selection of secondary principals.

More specifically, the framework relies significantly on the previous experiences and knowledge of a principal. For example, experience as a core academic subject high school teacher with departmental leadership responsibilities will likely lead to behaviors as a principal that will differ greatly from those exhibited by a principal who has considerable experience as a teacher of an elective area with no associated understanding of core academic subject state content standards or assessment programs. The emphasis on previous experiences in the framework is especially relevant when compared to the 43 ISLLC Standard knowledge and understandings. Several of the desired areas of knowledge and understanding for principals contained in ISLLC may result from
previous experience as a core content high school teacher rather than as an outcome of completing a university principal preparation program that is aligned to ISLLC Standards.

The framework also relies heavily on the personal characteristics and values/beliefs of a principal. For example, a prospective candidate being considered by a superintendent for a high school principalship who demonstrates high personal expectations, for him or herself, who shows a record of a commitment to ethical conduct, or who exudes personal and professional advocacy for all students will likely develop behaviors as a principal that will lead to high expectations for setting, monitoring, and achieving challenging and specific goals of staff and students, an emphasis on ethical and professional conduct in the school, and a climate in the school that is student centered. However, a candidate who articulates a belief set that appears to devalue collaboration of all stakeholders in key decision making processes is less likely to develop behaviors as a principal that promote a collaborative learning culture that shares leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members. The emphasis on personal characteristics and values/beliefs in the framework (see Figure 1) is especially relevant when compared to the 22 traits and skills contained in the recently adopted OSP. Several of the desired traits and skills for principals contained in these standards may well result from previous personal and professional experiences, but they are of particular importance when considering on what bases a principal preparation program should be structured.
The framework functions by observing outcomes of leadership by using a tripartite or three part perspective. Initially, precursors must be assessed including experience, knowledge, personal characteristics, and values/beliefs. Next, these factors interact to create leadership behaviors that produce outcomes directly and indirectly within the school that are contextually based. Murphy et al. (2006) state that “the model acknowledges that context plays a significant role in the exercise of learning-centered leadership” (p. 6). Lastly, this nexus of leadership behaviors rooted in particular school, district, or state policy-level contexts influences outcomes that are generally positive such as increased student achievement and increased graduation rates, college attendance, and post graduate success.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter details the methods used in this study. It includes a discussion of the research design, context for the study, participant selection, instrument development, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

The design of this quantitative study used a simple descriptive approach. Such an approach seeks to describe the characteristics of a sample at one point in time through a one-shot survey (Mertens, 1998, p. 108). Additionally, this study employed a mixed methodology, as it gathered anecdotal data from subjects in the form of reactions and commentary to the survey data results through a one-time facilitated conversation. In sum, the intent of the study was to gain insight into and compare the perceptions of educational leadership faculty and school superintendents relative to the knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits deemed most important in the graduate-level preparation and subsequent selection and hiring of secondary level principals.

Context for the Study

At the heart of this analysis exists the notion that superintendents, who hire secondary principals, and educational leadership faculty, who provide the pre-service preparation to prospective secondary principals differ significantly in what knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits are most important and need to be emphasized for a candidate to be successful in the role of high school principal. Several informal conversations with individuals from each field revealed a level frustration about what should and should not be stressed in preparation programs as well as in recruiting and hiring methodology.

The purpose of this study was to analyze discrepancies, if any, that may exist between what leadership standards are valued in Ohio’s 21 university principal preparation programs by its program faculty and by Ohio superintendents when hiring secondary school principals. A secondary purpose was to determine the degree to which the knowledge, understandings, traits and skills articulated in the ISLLC Standards and the new OSP are valued or utilized in the preparation or selection process of secondary principals.
Participants

The participants in the study included two distinct cohorts. The first were educational leadership faculty from the 21 Ohio colleges and universities who presently offer principal licensure programs, and the second were school superintendents from Ohio who also hold membership in BASA.

I obtained e-mail addresses of the educational leadership faculty by accessing the college or university department Web site or in some instances calling the department directly and requesting contact information. A total sample of 133 college or university educational leadership faculty were selected to receive the survey through a Listserve created using the following criteria. First, educational leadership faculty who were listed on the departmental Web site as teaching courses in the principal licensure program were selected. Second, adjunct faculty who were provided by a departmental contact who stated that they regularly taught courses in the principal preparation program were selected. Finally, other faculty were selected based on whether they were listed as full-time faculty in a program where no specific information was provided by the departmental Web site or by a departmental contact of what specific courses the faculty taught in any of the graduate or licensure programs at the institution.

Participants included active BASA active members who are mainly superintendents and assistant superintendents. Current active BASA superintendent membership produced a total sample of 636. This number included superintendents of city, exempted village, local, joint vocational school, and educational service center districts. A disaggregation of district type was unavailable. The survey was sent through the e-mail address they provided on the BASA Listserve. The rationale used to select only active superintendent BASA members and not include any interim superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, directors, or treasurers is that typically the superintendent is the person in a district doing the lead recruiting and hiring of a secondary principal. While other central office administrators may be involved in the process, the superintendent typically sets the search criteria, profile for the ideal candidate, conducts the interviews, and selects the candidate for hire.

As an active BASA member, this researcher was able to request and obtain access to the active superintendent member Listserve from the executive director. The director
agreed to include a personal message to BASA superintendents supporting the research and encouraging members to respond to the survey.

Instrument Development

The primary instrument used in the study was a survey. Mertens (1998) contends, “Surveys are good because they allow collection of data from a larger number of people than is generally possible when using a quasi-experimental or experimental design” (p. 105). For this study, a survey was used so it could be sent to two different sample groups for the purpose of assessing whether there were any discrepancies between their responses.

The survey was constructed using selected elements from two prominently used leadership standards for preparing and licensing secondary principals: the ISLLC and the recently adopted OSP as well as the standards themselves. Specifically, the knowledge and understandings from the ISLLC Standards were selected for one group of responses, whereas the traits and skills from the OSP were used for another set of responses. The six ISLLC Standards and the five OSP constituted the final set of standards-related responses.

Superintendent’s Version of the Survey

The first six questions of the superintendent’s version of the survey instructed the participants to “rank order the following areas of knowledge and/or understanding from the most important (1) to least important (6) when selecting and hiring a secondary principal. You may use only one rank per item.” Additionally, this version prompted the participants to respond to the statement, “When selecting a secondary principal, a candidate must have a knowledge and understanding of…” Each question included six areas of knowledge or understanding from the ISLLC Standards - one from each standard for the participants to consider when rank ordering from most to least important. For example, the first question includes the first area of knowledge or understanding taken from each of the six ISLLC Standards.
The question reads:

1. Rank order the following areas of knowledge and/or understanding from the most important (1) to the least important (6) when selecting and hiring a secondary principal. You may use only one rank per item.

When hiring a secondary principal, a candidate must have a knowledge and understanding of:

1.1 learning goals in a pluralistic society.
1.2 student growth and development.
1.3 theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development.
1.4 emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community.
1.5 the purpose of education and the role of leadership in a modern society.
1.6 principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools.

The ISLLC Standards have varying numbers of knowledge and understandings ranging from five to 11 totaling 43 elements. A total of six knowledge and understanding elements were included in each question to match the number of ISLLC Standards so the means from each knowledge and understanding questions could be compared with the mean from the ISLLC Standard question. It also was concluded that keeping a consistent number of ranking possibilities would make it easier for participants to analyze results.

ISLLC Standards 4 and 5 contained only five elements. Therefore, in the sixth group of knowledge and understandings, the first knowledge or understanding element was used again. As a result, item 1.4 is the same as item 6.4, and item 1.5 is the same as item 6.5. ISLLC Standard 2 has 11 elements, and Standards 3 and 6 have eight respectively. As a result of selecting only six elements in each standard, nine total elements were not included in the survey. The decision to include certain elements of knowledge or understandings from Standards 2, 3, and 6 over others was arbitrary. No knowledge or understanding was used twice from Standards 1-3 and 6 in the survey.
Questions 7-11 of the survey instructed the participants to “rank order the following skills and/or traits from the most important (1) to least important (5) when selecting and hiring a secondary principal. You may use only one rank per item.” Participants were asked to respond to the statement, “When selecting a secondary principal, a candidate must demonstrate the following skills and/or traits of effective principals…” Each question included five areas related to skills and/or traits from the OSP, one from each standard for the participants to consider when rank ordering from most to least important. For example, the first question in this section of the survey included the first skill and/or trait taken from each of the OSP. The question reads:

7. Rank order the following skills and/or traits from the most important (1) to the least important (5) when selecting and hiring a secondary principal. You may use only one rank per item.

When selecting and hiring a secondary principal, a candidate must demonstrate the following skills and/or traits of effective principals:

7.1 Facilitates the articulation and realization of a shared vision of continuous school improvement.

7.2 Ensures that the instructional content taught is aligned with the Ohio Academic Content Standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district.

7.3 Establishes and maintains a safe school environment.

7.4 Promotes a collaborative learning culture.

7.5 Uses community resources to improve student learning.

The OSP have varying numbers of skills and/or traits ranging from three to six, totaling 22 elements. A total of five skills and traits were included in each question to match the number of OSP so that the means from each skills and traits questions could be compared with the mean from the OSP question. It was also concluded that keeping a consistent number of ranking possibilities would make it easier for participants as well as for analyzing the results.
OSP 1, 4, and 5 contain less than five traits and/or skills with Standards 1 and 5 containing four, and Standard 4 containing three. Therefore, in the fourth and fifth groups of traits and skills, the first (or second) skill and/or trait area was used again. As a result, item 7.1 is the same as item 11.1, item 7.5 is the same as item 11.5, item 7.4 is the same as item 10.4, and item 8.4 is the same as item 11.4. OSP 2 has six areas, and as a result the sixth area was left out of the survey. In all 21 of the possible 22 skills and/or traits were represented in the survey.

Questions 12 and 13 of the survey instructed the participants to “assign the following standards for school leaders a rank from most important (1) to least important (6). You may use only one rank per item.”
Question 12 includes the six ISLLC Standards and reads:

12. Assign the following standards for school leaders a rank from the most important (1) to the least important (6). You may use only one rank per item.

12.1 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

12.2 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

12.3 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

12.4 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

12.5 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

12.6 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.
Question 13 includes the five Ohio Standards for Principals and reads,

13. Assign the following standards for school leaders a rank from the most
important (1) to the least important (5). You may use only one rank per item.

13.1 A school administrator helps create a shared vision and clear goals for their
schools and ensures continuous progress toward achieving their goals.
13.2 A school administrator supports the implementation of high-quality,
standards based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for
all students.
13.3 A school administrator allocates resources and manages school operations in
order to ensure a safe and productive learning environment.
13.4 A school administrator establishes and sustains collaborative learning and
shared leadership to promote learning and achievement of all students.
13.5 A school administrator engages parents and community members in the
educational process and creates an environment where community resources
support student learning, achievement, and well-being.

Questions 14-18 of the survey asked participants to provide relevant demographic
information including gender (optional), current position (superintendent, assistant
superintendent, former superintendent, retired superintendent, other), years of service in
their current position (0-3 years, 4-7 years, 8-12 years, 12 or more), district enrollment
(1,000 or less, 1,001-2,500, 2,501-5,000, 5,001-10,000, 10,001 or larger), and type of
district (city, community, exempted village, private, other). The decision to use these
five demographic gathering questions was based upon a desire to keep the survey brief
but instructive. The dynamic of gender, actual position held, length of service in current
position, and size and type of district were considered to be the most compelling with
regard to other factors involved in the recruitment and eventual selection of a secondary
principal by a superintendent.

Question 19 of the survey asked participants to respond to the question, “What
leadership standards should be stressed in college or university principal preparation
programs?” This open-ended question was asked to obtain opinions from participants for the purposes of comparing them to their responses, to the other survey questions, and to the responses of the other survey group.

*Educational Leadership Faculty Version of the Survey*

The survey for the faculty in colleges or universities with principal preparation programs in Ohio was constructed exactly as the survey for superintendents with the only difference being in the way individual questions were asked. For example, principal preparation program faculty were instructed in Questions 1-6 of the survey to respond to the prompt, “When preparing a secondary principal, a candidate must have a knowledge and understanding of…” Similarly, in Questions 7-11 they were instructed to respond to the prompt, “When preparing a secondary principal, a candidate must demonstrate the following skills and/or traits of effective principals.” Questions 12-13 required faculty to rank order the leadership standards. Demographic questions for faculty included one additional item. Questions 14-19 included gender (optional), current position (full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, department chair, adjunct instructor/former K-12 administrator, adjunct instructor/current K-12 administrator, other), length in current position, college or university enrollment, whether the institution is public or private, and the college or university principal preparation program for which they teach. The dynamic of gender, position held, length of service in current position, and size, type, and name of college or university were anticipated to be the most compelling with regard to other factors involved in the preparation of a prospective secondary principal by collegiate faculty.

Question 20 of the survey asked participants to respond to the question, “What leadership standards should be stressed in the selection and hiring process of secondary principals by superintendents?” This open-ended question was asked to obtain opinions from participants for the purposes of comparing them to responses, to the other survey questions, and to the responses of the other survey cohort. The items used in the survey instrument are not considered to be interpretive items because they are extracted directly from the ISLLC Standards and OSP.
Data Collection

Data was gathered during the first half of 2007 in an effort to capture any programmatic emphasis changes with university preparation programs and in advance of the typical recruitment and hiring season for administrators. The survey sought opinion data from educational leadership professors and superintendents regarding what knowledge, understandings, traits, and skills are valued in the preparation and eventual selection process of secondary principals. The areas of knowledge and understanding were taken directly from current ISLLC Standards, whereas the traits and skills were taken from the recently adopted OSP. Each respondent was then asked to rank from most important to least important in the performance of their respective preparation or selection duties which standards were considered most important. The participants were directed to force rank the items in an effort to create statistical variation among survey items rather than allowing respondents to score all items as most important, for example. Lastly, a small number of demographic items and an open-ended question were asked to gather additional information about the sample.

Procedures

The study was conducted by sending the electronic surveys to each sample using a Listserve that was accessed or created for each group in early 2007. Three specific requests to participate were sent for each sample approximately one month apart in early 2007 in an effort to get additional respondents. The following e-mail messages to superintendents and educational leadership faculty were included in the original notification and request to participate in the study. The e-mail sent by Dr. Jerry Klenke, Executive Director, BASA, to superintendents on my behalf read:

BASA routinely supports research that will contribute to the body of knowledge useful for practicing school district leaders. BASA member Tom Goodney is currently conducting research on the knowledge, understanding, skills and traits superintendents value when interviewing and hiring secondary principals. To contribute to this research, please go to the following link: (http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=559552416063). Tom will make the results of his research available to BASA members at their request. Your assistance is appreciated.
Miami University doctoral candidate Tom Goodney is currently conducting research on the knowledge, understanding, skills and traits that educational leadership instructors value when preparing future secondary principals. To contribute to this important research that takes approximately ten minutes to complete, please go to the following link: (http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=845212435863). Tom will make the results of his research available to any Ohio college or university educational leadership instructor at their request. Your assistance is appreciated.

For those superintendents electing to participate in the study by completing the survey, the following instructions were provided:

You are invited to participate in a study that is designed to collect your beliefs about what knowledge, understanding, skills, and traits you value when hiring secondary principals. This survey is being distributed to Ohio superintendents. Your participation is voluntary and you may discontinue participation at any time or refuse to answer specific questions. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to respondents. A primary benefit of participating in the study is the opportunity to contribute to the larger conversation between educational leadership faculty and school superintendents around what is valued in the preparation and eventual selection of secondary principals.

Your responses will be completely anonymous and results of this survey will not be used to identify any individual survey participants. All completed survey data will be kept by the researcher. Results will be available for participants who request a copy. Results will be used as part of the researcher's doctoral dissertation data. The survey takes approximately ten minutes to complete.
Should you have any questions about the procedures used in this study, please contact Tom Goodney at tom.goodney@fcesc.org or 614.445.3750 or Dr. Ellen Bueschel, dissertation advisor at bueschme@muohio.edu or 513.529.6839. Research subjects may also contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship at Miami University at humansubjects@muohio.edu or at 513.529.3734.

When completing the survey, please consider each statement and, based on the scale provided below, select the response that best represents your opinion.

Similarly, those educational leadership professors electing to participate were provided the following instructions:

You are invited to participate in a study that is designed to collect your beliefs about what knowledge, understanding, skills, and traits you value when preparing future secondary principals in the principal preparation seminars you teach. This survey is being distributed to Ohio college and university educational leadership/principal preparation faculty.

Your participation is voluntary and you may discontinue participation at any time or refuse to answer specific questions. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to respondents. A primary benefit of participating in the study is the opportunity to contribute to the larger conversation between educational leadership faculty and school superintendents around what is valued in the preparation and eventual selection of secondary principals.

Your responses will be completely anonymous and results of this survey will not be used to identify any individual survey participants. All completed survey data will be kept by the researcher. Results will be available for participants who request a copy. Results will be used as part of the researcher's doctoral dissertation data. The survey takes approximately ten minutes to complete.
Should you have any questions about the procedures used in this study, please contact Tom Goodney at tom.goodney@fcesc.org or 614.445.3750 or Dr. Ellen Bueschel, dissertation advisor at bueschme@muohio.edu or 513.529.6839. Research subjects may also contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship at Miami University at humansubjects@muohio.edu or at 513.529.3734.

When completing the survey, please consider each statement and, based on the scale provided below, select the response that best represents your opinion.

Data Analysis

Data for the study was collected by utilizing an on-line survey design and collection service as well as through a facilitated discussion of a small group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and educational leadership faculty. The survey data was collected using Surveymonkey (www.surveymonkey.com), which allows a researcher to design, collect, and conduct an initial analysis of data in real time by using the service’s standard tools or by exporting all data to Excel or SPSS for more sophisticated statistical analyses. The facilitated discussion data was collected using a scribe and a tape recorder.

For this study, all survey data was exported to Excel and then into SPSS. The statistical tests applied to the survey data were a t-test for paired samples, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and a correlation analysis using simple bi-variate correlations and partial correlations controlling for district size and superintendent experience. In Chapter 4, the results of these tests are primarily represented through the use of tables. The raw frequencies and comparison of means between the two sample groups are also shared in tables.

The initial statistical test is a t-test for paired samples providing two means that represent two sets of scores, which are paired from the sample groups. Additionally, an analysis of variance test was computed. The analysis of variance was used to compare the means of two or more independent samples, and test whether the differences between the means were statistically significant (Ravid, 2000, p. 203). In this study, the means
from the superintendent and professor group samples were compared to determine whether the differences were statistically significant. A correlation analysis also was completed to determine the strength or degree of correlation between the two sample groups.

Summary

The type of research conducted in this study is a quantitative analysis of survey data collected from school superintendents in Ohio and educational leadership faculty in Ohio colleges and universities, as well as results from a facilitated discussion of the survey data collected with recognized experts in the field of school administration and education policy in Ohio. Participants were current and former school superintendents and educational leadership faculty in Ohio. The primary instrument used in data collection was a survey constructed using elements of ISSLC and OSP. Survey data was collected in early 2007 followed by a facilitated discussion on May 24, 2007. The statistical tests used included a t-test of paired samples, ANOVA, and a correlation analysis.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter reports the results from the analysis of the data collected for the current study. Population and sample demographics are described followed by descriptive statistics, comparison of means using one-way ANOVA, tests of reliability of the scales, as well as bi-variate correlations between demographics and variables. This chapter also documents the responses of current and former superintendents, assistant superintendents, and current educational leadership faculty during a facilitated discussion regarding findings of the study.

Population and Sample of Study

Public School Superintendents

Participants included active BASA members who are mainly current and retired superintendents and assistant superintendents. Current active BASA superintendent membership produced a total sample of 636. This number included superintendents of city, exempted village, local, joint vocational school, and educational service center districts. A disaggregation of the population by district type was unavailable. The survey was sent through the BASA member Listserve. The rationale used to select active superintendent BASA members and eliminate members who are directors, principals, or treasurers was that typically the superintendent or assistant superintendent is the person in a district doing the lead recruiting and hiring of a secondary principal. While other central office administrators may be involved in the process, the superintendent usually sets the search criteria, establishes the profile for the ideal candidate, conducts the interviews, and selects the candidate for hire. This study acknowledges that some superintendents in the sample may have delegated completion of the questionnaire to an assistant or deputy superintendent or executive director of human resources. However, the study also assumes that such an assignment would be made in accordance with a subordinate’s expertise relating to preparation, recruitment, and selection of high school principals.
As an active BASA member, this researcher was able to request and obtain access to the active superintendent member Listserve from the executive director. Additionally, the executive director included a personal message to BASA superintendents supporting the research and encouraging members to respond to the survey.

Position and Gender

Of those participating in the study, 79 superintendents completed and submitted the data collection instrument as requested. Table 4.1 denotes 66 of the respondents (84.6%) were active superintendents, five of the respondents (6.4%) were assistant superintendents, two of the respondents indicated they were former superintendents, and four others indicated they were retired superintendents. One respondent indicated to have a position other than the options provided. A total of 62 respondents (81.6%) indicated they were male, while 14 (18.4%) indicated they were female. Three did not respond to that question.
### Table 4.1

**Gender of Superintendent Sample by Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Superintendent</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Superintendent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Superintendent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographically, the sample drew on superintendents from districts representing a broad selection of student enrollment. Student enrollment was hypothesized to be an important control variable as district size might influence superintendent perceptions of necessary selection criteria for a high school principal. In districts with fewer than 1,000 students, the high school principal would generally have less administrative and managerial support. Conversely, in a district of more than 10,000 students, high school principals are more likely to have assistant or vice principals, deans of students, as well as central office support staff and specialists to assist them in the administration and management of their building. As a result, the role of the principal can vary greatly based upon the size of the district and the expertise or designated responsibility of supporting staff members, therefore a superintendent may prioritize certain knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits differently.

Of the respondents, 19.2% were from districts with enrollment up to 1,000; 46.8% were from districts with enrollment between 1,001-2,500; 22.8% were from districts with enrollment between 2,501-5,000; 6.4% were from districts with enrollment between 5,001-10,000; and 3.8% were from districts with enrollment larger than 10,000. As evidenced in Table 4.2 below, the percent of superintendent respondents in the sample closely represented the distribution of superintendents by enrollment statewide.
Table 4.2  
*Distribution of Sample by Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
<th>State (Ohio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 2,500</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,501 – 5,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – larger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*District Types*

This sample included superintendents from different types of districts ranging from city school districts (27.3%), community school districts (1.3%), exempted village (7.8%), and local school districts (54.5%). Seven respondents (9.1%) indicated Other as their district type, suggesting that they may have been from educational service centers, joint vocational school districts, or independent schools.
Table 4.3
Demographics of Sample by Position and District Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Community School</th>
<th>Exempted Village</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Superintendent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Superintendent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Leadership Faculty

Other participants in the study included educational leadership faculty from the 21 Ohio colleges and universities who presently offer principal licensure programs. E-mail addresses of program faculty were obtained by accessing the department Web site or in some instances calling the department directly and requesting contact information. A total sample of 133 college or university faculty were selected to receive the survey through a Listserv created using the following criteria. First, faculty selected were listed on the departmental Website as teaching courses in the principal licensure program. Second, adjunct faculty selected were provided by a departmental contact who stated that they regularly taught courses in the principal preparation program. Finally, other faculty selected were listed as full-time faculty in a program where no specific information was provided by the departmental Web site or by a departmental contact of what specific courses the faculty taught in any of the graduate or licensure programs at the institution.

Position and Gender

Of those invited to participate, 32 educational leadership faculty completed and submitted the data collection instrument required of the study. As shown in Table 4.4, 20% of the respondents identified themselves as full professors, 10% as associate professors, and 40% as assistant professors. Of the remaining participants, 13.3%
identified themselves as adjunct instructors who were former K-12 administrators; 3.3% were adjunct instructors who are current K-12 administrators; and 13.3% selected other suggesting they were lecturers or adjunct instructors who may not serve in a K-12 district. Twenty-two respondents indicated they were male, and seven responded they were female.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Educational Leadership Faculty Sample by Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct, Former K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct, Current K-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student Enrollment*

Demographically, the sample drew on principal preparation programs representing a broad selection of enrollment. Of the respondents, 12 were from colleges or universities with enrollment of less than 10,000 students as evidence in Table 4.5 below. A majority of the higher education faculty (58.4%) indicated their university enrollment was greater than 10,000.
Table 4.5

*Distribution of Sample by Enrollment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 – 2,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,501 – 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 – 10,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - larger</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Length of Service*

Additionally, the educational leadership faculty sample included a range of length of service from full professor to adjunct faculty and lecturers who are either former or current K-12 administrators. Length of service may be an important control variable relating to the prioritization of specific knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits in the preparation of high school principals by professors. For example, a more experienced professor may be more likely to have participated in the development of the preparation program’s core principles, individual courses, and key learning experiences for students who are aligned to past and current leadership standards and may be more familiar with the depth of the literature.

As shown in Table 4.6, 10 of the educational leadership faculty responding to the survey indicated they have held their position 0-3 years, 11 indicated 4-7 years, three selected 8-12 years, and six indicate their length of service to be 12 or more years.
Table 4.6

Demographics of Sample by Position and Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>0-3 yrs</th>
<th>4-7 yrs</th>
<th>8-12 yrs</th>
<th>12 or more</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct, Former K-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct, Current K-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examination of the Variables

This section examines the descriptive statistics, the comparison of means for each variable including ANOVA, and the bi-variate correlations between demographics and variables for superintendents and professors as they relate to the following research questions presented in Chapter 1:

1. What knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits are considered most important by Ohio college or university educational leadership faculty in secondary principal preparation programs?
2. What knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits are considered most important by Ohio superintendents in the selection process when hiring a secondary principal?
3. Which leadership standards (ISLLC or OSP) are considered most important by Ohio college or university educational leadership faculty?
4. Which leadership standards (ISLLC or OSP) are considered most important by Ohio superintendents?

*ISLLC Standards*

ISLLC Standards attempt to represent a formal emphasis on matters of learning and teaching and the creation of powerful learning environments without sacrificing a needed emphasis on management and skill sets such as measuring academic growth and stewardship (Murphy & Shipman, 2002, pp. 4-5).
The ISLLC Standards include 43 associated knowledge, dispositions, and performances (termed understandings for this study) among the six standards, 36 of which were utilized in this study. The Standards read, “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success for all students by” (Hessel & Holloway, 2002, p. 7):

1. Standard 1.0 – Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
2. Standard 2.0 – Advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
3. Standard 3.0 – Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
4. Standard 4.0 – Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
5. Standard 5.0 – Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6. Standard 6.0 – Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context.

Each question of the survey included a group of six knowledge or understandings from the ISLLC Standards - one from each standard. Participants rank ordered items in each group from most important 1 to least important 6. Means of the items in each group as perceived by superintendents and educational leadership faculty are shown in Table 4.7. Also shown in Table 4.7 are results from ANOVA tests (F column) comparing the means of the two groups of respondents.

Knowledge and Understandings

Note that ISLLC knowledge and understanding 1.2, “student growth and development,” reveals moderately significant variance in means of the superintendent responses to those of educational leadership faculty. The mean rank of superintendents for item 1.2 was 2.46 compared to the mean rank of educational leadership faculty, 3.74 (F=3.739, sig.=.056). Four of the ISLLC knowledge and understandings in group three show significant variance between mean ranks of superintendents and mean ranks of
educational leadership faculty. Item 3.1, “systems theory,” was ranked much higher by educational leadership faculty than superintendents, 2.9 and 4.1 respectively (F = 12.001, sig. .001). ISLLC knowledge and understanding 3.3, “principles and issues relating to school safety and security,” was ranked significantly more important by superintendents than educational leadership faculty in relation to other knowledge and understandings in that group (2.9 and 3.8, respectively, F=7.321, sig.=.008). Other knowledge and understandings that vary significantly include 3.4, “community resources” (F=5.287, sig. = .024), and 3.6, “political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact school” (F=3.939, sig.=.050). In group four, items 4.2, “measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies,” was ranked significantly more important by superintendents than educational leadership faculty (F=8.106, sig.=.005). Item 4.6, “models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling,” was ranked significantly more important by educational leadership faculty than by superintendents (F=6.096, sig.=.015). The final statistically significant measure of variation between superintendent and professor means is item 6.4, “emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community,” ranked significantly more important by superintendents than educational leadership faculty (F=4.502, sig=.036).
Table 4.7

*Comparison of ISLLC Means, Rank, ANOVA by Cohort*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC1.1</td>
<td>3.3200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4828</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC1.2</td>
<td>2.4658</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2069</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.739</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC1.3</td>
<td>3.4865</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.447</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC1.4</td>
<td>3.3467</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC1.5</td>
<td>3.3684</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC1.6</td>
<td>4.7051</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7241</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC2.1</td>
<td>3.7027</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4483</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC2.2</td>
<td>2.4533</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC2.3</td>
<td>3.0267</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3571</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC2.4</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5172</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC2.5</td>
<td>3.5132</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2581</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC2.6</td>
<td>4.6282</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3333</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC3.1</td>
<td>4.1447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9032</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.116</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC3.2</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.807</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC3.3</td>
<td>2.9868</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8387</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.321</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC3.4</td>
<td>3.8493</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4667</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.287</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC3.5</td>
<td>3.7763</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7241</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC3.6</td>
<td>4.0897</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3548</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.939</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC4.1</td>
<td>2.8800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC4.2</td>
<td>2.4533</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3448</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.106</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC4.3</td>
<td>4.3553</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0345</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC4.4</td>
<td>3.8933</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8966</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC4.5</td>
<td>3.0909</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6552</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC4.6</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.096</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Supt Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Prof Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC5.1</td>
<td>1.8182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC5.2</td>
<td>3.2667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8929</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.401</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC5.3</td>
<td>3.6974</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9643</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC5.4</td>
<td>3.5395</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6786</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC5.5</td>
<td>4.7105</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5172</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC5.6</td>
<td>3.8077</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1034</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC6.1</td>
<td>2.2078</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4643</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC6.2</td>
<td>3.0658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8929</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC6.3</td>
<td>3.4868</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0714</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC6.4</td>
<td>3.7200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3793</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.502</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC6.5</td>
<td>4.2078</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0714</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC6.6</td>
<td>4.1429</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9643</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standards**

Statistically significant differences between the mean rankings of superintendents to the ISLLC Standards 12.1 through 12.6 compared to the mean rankings of the responses of the educational leadership faculty are shown in Table 4.8. Overall, superintendents perceived ISLCC Standard 12.2, “advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth” as most important with mean ranking of 2.58, only slightly more important than ISLLC Standard 12.1, “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school and community” (mean=2.65). Respondents of the superintendent questionnaire ranked ISLLC Standard 12.6, “understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context,” as least important with a mean ranking 5.07. Standards 12.3, 12.5, and 12.4 ranked third, fourth, and fifth, respectively.
Similarly, educational leadership faculty also perceived ISLLC Standard 12.2 as most important with a slightly lower mean ranking of 2.39. ISLLC Standard 12.1 ranked second with a mean ranking of 2.71. Similar to the superintendent group, respondents on the educational leadership faculty survey ranked ISLLC Standard 12.6 least important but not quite as strongly with a mean of 4.62. Standards 12.5, 12.3, and 12.4 ranked third, fourth, and fifth, respectively.

As shown in Table 4.8, rankings of means for the ISLLC Standards for superintendents and educational leadership faculty were the same on 4 out of 6 items. The two groups differed on 12.3 and 12.4 as third and fourth most important. ANOVA tests indicate no statistically significant differences in the means of the ISLLC Standards between the two groups.
Table 4.8
Comparison of ISLLC Standards Means, Rank, ANOVA by Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school and community</td>
<td>2.6533</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth</td>
<td>2.5844</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment</td>
<td>3.2987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8462</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources</td>
<td>3.9342</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0714</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner</td>
<td>3.4474</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1481</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context</td>
<td>5.0779</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6207</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio Standards for Principals

The five OSP were developed for use as a guide for principals because they continually reflect and improve upon their effectiveness as leaders throughout all the stages of their careers (Ohio Standards for Principals, final draft, 2005, p. 1), as well as informing principal preparation programs in how to develop course content and general training program requirements, how to focus district goals and objectives for principals, how to plan and guide professional development for principals, and how to lead to improved coaching and mentoring programs for principals.

In terms of structure, the standards are organized into the standards themselves, narrative summaries, elements, and indicators. Furthermore, the standards are written to show performance at three levels: proficient, accomplished, and distinguished, all of which indicate the essential knowledge and building blocks to allow school administrators to advance in their expertise. The standards are further delineated into three distinct organizers: goals and achievement, conditions, and collaboration and communication. The standards are:

1. Standard 1 – Principals help create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress toward achieving their goals.
2. Standard 2 – Principals support the implementation of high-quality; standards based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students.
3. Standard 3 – Principals allocate resources and manage school operations in order to ensure a safe and productive learning environment.
4. Standard 4 – Principals establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote student learning and achievement of all students.
5. Standard 5 – Principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create and environment where community resources support student learning, achievement and well being (Ohio Standards for Principals, final draft, 2005, p. 7).

Traits and Skills

The survey includes 25 leadership indicators clustered into five groups of five items, one each from the five distinct domains of the OSP. Means of respondent rankings
of the five skills and/or traits in each group, ranging from most important 1 to least important 5 as perceived by superintendents and educational leadership faculty, are shown in Table 4.9 along with ANOVA (F column) comparing the means of the two groups of respondents. Note in the first group that OSP 7.1, “facilitates the articulation and realization of a shared vision of continuous school improvement,” was ranked significantly more important by educational leadership faculty than superintendents (F=7.653, sig.=.007). Conversely, OSP 7.2, “ensures that the instructional content taught is aligned with Ohio academic content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district,” was ranked significantly more important by superintendents than educational leadership faculty (F=7.257, sig.=.008). OSP 8.4, “shares leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members,” shows strong statistically significance variance between superintendent and professor means (F=7.304, sig.=.008) with educational leadership faculty ranking it most important of the group while superintendents ranked it third most important. ANOVA tests for OSP 10.2, “understands, encourages, and facilitates the effective use of data by staff,” yield moderately significant variance between the two groups of respondents (F=4.422, sig.=.038).

Table 4.9

Comparison of OSP Items Means, Rank, ANOVA by Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSP7.1</td>
<td>2.6711</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8966</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.653</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP7.2</td>
<td>2.2237</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9310</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.257</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP7.3</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP7.4</td>
<td>3.1299</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP7.5</td>
<td>4.2078</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSP8.1</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5517</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP8.2</td>
<td>2.3117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7931</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP8.3</td>
<td>2.6104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5517</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP8.4</td>
<td>3.1184</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.304</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP8.5</td>
<td>3.5325</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6897</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Supt Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Prof Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP9.1</td>
<td>2.3506</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5862</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP9.2</td>
<td>3.5974</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6897</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP9.3</td>
<td>3.3158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9310</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP9.4</td>
<td>2.5395</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3793</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP9.5</td>
<td>3.2208</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP10.1</td>
<td>2.3766</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6552</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP10.2</td>
<td>2.7273</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2667</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.422</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP10.3</td>
<td>2.6364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP10.4</td>
<td>3.1818</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8621</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP10.5</td>
<td>4.0658</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5862</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.515</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP11.1</td>
<td>2.5333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP11.2</td>
<td>2.8400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1034</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP11.3</td>
<td>2.5132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP11.4</td>
<td>3.0526</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6207</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP11.5</td>
<td>4.1053</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0333</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standards**

Means for the OSP items 13.1 through 13.5 in Table 4.10 revealed statistically significant variance between the mean rankings of superintendents compared to the mean rankings of educational leadership faculty on two items. Overall, superintendents perceived OSP 13.2, “principals support the implementation of high-quality, standards-based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students,” as second most important with an average rank of 2.35 compared to educational leadership faculty mean ranking of 2.86, third most important (F=4.008, sig.=.048). Also, the mean ranking for superintendents on OSP 13.4, “principals establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote student learning and achievement of all students,” is 3.25, third most important, while the mean ranking for the same item by professors is second most important at 2.58 (F=6.083, sig.=.015). Superintendents ranked OSP 13.1,
“principals help create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress toward achieving their goals,” as most important with a mean ranking of 2.29 and OSP 13.5, “principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support student learning, achievement, and well-being,” as least important with a mean of 3.74. Similarly, educational leadership faculty rank OSP 13.1 and OSP 13.5 most and least important with means of 2.1 and 4.0, respectively.
Table 4.10

Comparison of OSP Standards Means, Rank, ANOVA by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>OSP Standard</th>
<th>Supt Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Prof Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Principals help create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress toward achieving their goals.</td>
<td>2.2987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>Principals support the implementation of high-quality, standards-based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students.</td>
<td>2.3506</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8621</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.008</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Principals allocate resources and manage school operations in order to ensure a safe and productive learning environment.</td>
<td>3.2949</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3448</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Principals establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote student learning and achievement of all students.</td>
<td>3.2564</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5862</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.083</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support learning and achievement.</td>
<td>3.7436</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reliability of the Scales**

Forced rankings result in ipsativity, which is high levels of interdependence present in a set of data, thus limiting the usefulness of conventional reliability tests (Baron, 1995). Consequently, Cronbach’s alphas are not presented here as evidence of reliability of the scales. Rather, reliability of the metrics are asserted substantively as survey items are verbatim from ISLLC Standards and OSP and supported statistically by comparing the means of the individual indicators to the means of the standards.

Accordingly, means for all of the ISLLC indicators ending in .1, .2, .3, etc. were calculated to create new variables ISLLC x.1, ISLLC x.2, ISLLC x.3, etc., as shown in Table 4.11. These clusters of knowledge and understandings for each standard were then compared to the means of the ISLLC Standards. Given that the items within each cluster were taken directly from the standards, the means of the clusters should reflect the means of the standard. As evidenced in Table 4.11, a comparison of the means of superintendent responses on the knowledge, skills, and understanding clusters (i.e. x.1, x.2, etc.) shows similar means and rankings to those of the ISLLC Standards.

### Table 4.11

**Superintendent Means and Ranks of Knowledge and Understandings Clusters and ISLLC Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.1</td>
<td>2.6533</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ISLLCx.1</td>
<td>2.9948</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.2</td>
<td>2.5844</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ISLLCx.2</td>
<td>2.5959</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.3</td>
<td>3.2987</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ISLLCx.3</td>
<td>3.4722</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.4</td>
<td>3.9342</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ISLLCx.4</td>
<td>3.6087</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.5</td>
<td>3.4474</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ISLLCx.5</td>
<td>3.7372</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.6</td>
<td>5.0779</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ISLLCx.6</td>
<td>4.2526</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the means of responses of the educational leadership faculty on the knowledge and understanding clusters (i.e. ISLLC x.1, ISLLC x.2, etc.) compared to the means of their responses for the ISLLC Standards (Table 4.11) show nearly identical
alignment between the means of 12.1 and x.1, but more discrepant means exist between the other standards and clusters.

Table 4.12

*Educational Leadership Faculty Means and Ranks of Knowledge and Understandings Clusters and ISLLC Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.1</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ISLLCx.1</td>
<td>2.7930</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.2</td>
<td>2.3929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ISLLCx.2</td>
<td>2.9256</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.3</td>
<td>3.8462</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ISLLCx.3</td>
<td>3.5065</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.4</td>
<td>4.0714</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ISLLCx.4</td>
<td>3.8430</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.5</td>
<td>3.1481</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ISLLCx.5</td>
<td>3.6677</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC12.6</td>
<td>4.6207</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ISLLCx.6</td>
<td>3.8882</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Simple Correlations*

Simple bi-variate correlations shown in Table 4.13 demonstrate statistically significant relationships between educational leadership faculty demographics and characteristics of the institutions in which they teach. For example, faculty position (i.e. full professor, assistant professor, associate professor, director, adjunct professor or lecturer), is strongly and negatively correlated to length of service (r = -.48, p < .01). Given the coding of the variables as shown in Table 4.13, the closer educational leadership faculty are to being full professors (full professor=1), the longer the length of service of that individual (12+ yrs=4.0). Length of service also shows a significant and negative correlation (r = -.37, p < .05) to the enrollment of the university where the longer the length of service (12+ yrs = 4.0), the smaller the enrollment (0-1000 students = 1). Length of service and enrollment of the sample reveal statistically significant correlations to whether the institution is public or private. The shorter the length of service, the more likely that educational leadership faculty is to be at a public institution (r = .408, p < .05). Further, the higher the enrollment, the more likely the institution is to be public rather than private (r = -.756, p < .05).
**Table 4.13**  
*Bi-Variate Correlations: Professor Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1000 = 1</td>
<td>Public = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1001-2500</td>
<td>Private = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1000 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1001-2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2501-5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5001-1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct = 5-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10,001 = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3 yrs = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1000 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 yrs = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1001-2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11 yrs = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2501-5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12+ yrs = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1000 = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1000 = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2500 = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1001-2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501-5000 = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2501-5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-10000 = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5001-10000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10,001 = 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10,001 = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender: 1.000  
Position: 1.000  
Length of Service: 1.000  
Enrollment: 1.000  
Institution: 1.000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  

Superintendent demographics and district characteristics were not significantly correlated with each other. Further, superintendent demographics and district...
characteristics were not significantly correlated with any of the ISLLC Standards, as shown in Table 4.14, or the OSP, as shown in Table 4.15.
Table 4.14

*Bi-Variate Correlations for Superintendent Demographics and ISLLC Standards*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ISLLC 12.1</th>
<th>ISLLC 12.2</th>
<th>ISLLC 12.3</th>
<th>ISLLC 12.4</th>
<th>ISLLC 12.5</th>
<th>ISLLC 12.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Type</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.15

*Bi-Variate Correlations for Superintendent Demographics and OSP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OSP 13.1</th>
<th>OSP 13.2</th>
<th>OSP 13.3</th>
<th>OSP 13.4</th>
<th>OSP 13.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Type</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Educational leadership faculty position and length of service are significantly correlated with ISLLC Standard 12.1, “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by
the school community” as shown in Table 4.16. The closer the faculty were to full professor status (full professor = 1.0, adjunct ≥5.0), the less important ISLLC Standard 12.1 was ranked, where most important is coded 1.0 and least important is 6.0 (r = -.528, p<.01). ISLLC standard 12.4 was moderately correlated to position as well (r = .379, p<.05). The shorter the length of service of educational leadership faculty where 0-3 years equals 1.0, the more important ISLLC Standard 12.1 was ranked against the other standards (r = .618, p<.01) as shown in Table 4.16.
Table 4.16
Bi-Variate Correlations: ISLLC Standards and Educational Leadership Faculty Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female = 1</td>
<td>Male = 2</td>
<td>Full Prof = 1</td>
<td>0-1,000 = 1</td>
<td>Public = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc Prof = 2</td>
<td>1,001-2,500 = 2</td>
<td>Private = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asst Prof = 3</td>
<td>2,501-5,000 = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dir = 4</td>
<td>5,001-10,000 = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjunct = 5-7</td>
<td>&gt;10,001 = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 12.1</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.528**</td>
<td>.618**</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 12.2</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 12.3</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 12.4</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.379*</td>
<td>-.366</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 12.5</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC 12.6</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 4.17 shows that only educational leadership length of service is significantly correlated with any of the OSP. Length of service is negatively correlated with OSP 13.5, “principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support student learning, achievement, and well-being.” In effect, the longer the length of service of the educational leadership faculty, the less important OSP 13.5 was ranked (r = -.422, p<.05).
Table 4.17

**Bi-Variate Correlations: ISLLC and OSP Standards and Professor Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>-.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td><strong>.422</strong></td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>-.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Facilitated Discussion**

A small group of eight superintendents, assistant superintendents, and educational leadership faculty participated in a facilitated discussion on May 24, 2007, responding to survey results and key findings of the study. The facilitator of the discussion has been a superintendent and presently serves as adjunct faculty in educational leadership in a principal preparation program. He also possesses a Ph.D. in Research and Evaluation and has conducted or assisted with numerous academic studies involving quantitative and qualitative research methods.

**ISLLC Standards: Knowledge and Understandings**

Participants were first asked to comment on the general finding that mean rankings of ISLLC Standards by superintendents and educational leadership faculty revealed no statistically significant variance between the two groups. The group asserted
universal surprise, noting that their expectations were that superintendents and educational leadership faculty would prioritize standards for principals very differently, with superintendents more focused on practical management standards and with educational leadership faculty more focused on theoretically-based standards. However, when examining specific knowledge and understandings of the six ISLLC Standards, discussion group participants found statistically significant variances more consistent with their predictions as evidenced by item 3.1, “systems theory.” Although superintendents in general ranked knowledge and understandings from the first standard most or second most important, participants were not surprised to find that superintendents ranked knowledge of “systems theory” least important relative to other items.

*OSP Standards: Traits and Skills*

Facilitated discussion participants also remarked about the statistically significant difference between superintendent and educational leadership faculty in ranking OSP 2, “principals support the implementation of standards-based instruction,” pointing out that school personnel, superintendents, and assistant superintendents recognize standards-based education as a reality of their landscape, defining school and district performance ratings, influencing graduation rates, and impacting limited district resources. On the other hand, educational leadership faculty are not directly affected by standards-based education or the federal and state mandates that govern standards for K-12 educators, and these faculty may be exposed to the issue of standards in schools only when introduced in class by students in principal preparation programs. Consequently, the educational leadership faculty’s sense of importance around standards is predictably lower than that of the superintendents. Similarly, participants in the facilitated discussion found statistically significant variance between superintendents and educational leadership faculty on OSP standard 4, “establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership…,” consistent with expectations, noting that shared leadership and collaborative learning are theoretical constructs prominent in recent academic literature and purported to enhance teaching and learning. On the other hand, as pointed out by group discussion participants, superintendents likely recognize real barriers to
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collaborative learning and shared leadership inherent in the practice of leading a secondary school and ranked the item accordingly.

Conclusions

Statistical analyses of knowledge and understandings from ISLLC Standards and traits and skills from the OSP seem to reveal distinct differences in perceptions between superintendents and professors. However, one-way ANOVA results and comparison of means shows more agreement than variation. Important to recall is that items are ranked relatively, so while some may rank an item lower than another, the ranking is strictly in relation to the other items in the group, not to the overall set of knowledge and understandings (ISLLC) and traits and/or skills (OSP).

Simple bi-variate correlations between variables and demographics of the respondents yielded a limited number of strong and statistically significant findings among educational leadership faculty and ISLLC Standards and the OSP. In effect, as respondents move through the faculty length of service process from adjunct professor positions toward the category of full professor, the more likely they were to rank ISLLC Standard 1, “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school and community,” and OSP 5, “principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support student learning, achievement, and well-being,” as less important than other ISLLC Standards and OSP in a forced ranking questionnaire.

Subsequently, a facilitated discussion among a small group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and educational leadership faculty responding to key findings of the study expressed universal surprise that mean rankings of ISLLC Standards by superintendents and educational leadership faculty revealed no statistically significant variance between the two groups. However, participants did identify differences in OSP that were more consistent with their expectations based on the inherent disconnect between the realities of standards, accountability, and structures that define the parameters of the secondary principalship and the theories of leadership, teaching, and learning that frame the scope of principal preparation programs.
While this study has revealed interesting relationships among the perceptions of ISLLC Standards and OSP by superintendents, assistant superintendents, and educational leadership faculty regarding the preparation, recruitment, and selection of secondary principals, the findings must be considered in the context of a new line of inquiry. To substantiate the results shown here, further examination would require more rigorous methods of data collection and a significantly greater sample size than included here. These issues as well as specific results will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter contains a final summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations, and implications for current practice and future research. Specifically, it provides a summary discussion of results described in Chapter 4, presents conclusions of the study, provides recommendations for further inquiry, and suggests implications for current practice and future research in the areas of principal preparation, recruitment, and selection as it relates to ISLLC Standards and OSP.

Summary of Findings

**Knowledge and Understandings**

There were eight ISLLC Standard knowledge and understanding elements whose mean differences between superintendents and educational leadership faculty were shown to be statistically significant (see Table 4.7, bold-faced significance values). The strongest statistical differences were ISLLC Standard knowledge and understandings elements 3.1 “systems theory,” 3.3 “principles and issues relating to school safety,” and 4.2 “measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies.” Educational leadership faculty ranked “systems theory” second most important, whereas superintendents ranked it least important. Superintendents ranked “principles and issues relating to school safety” second most important, whereas educational leadership faculty ranked it next to least important. Superintendents ranked “measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies” most important, whereas educational leadership faculty ranked it third most important.

Other ISLLC Standard knowledge and understandings elements with statistically significant difference values of note included: 1.2 “student growth and development,” 3.4 “community resources,” 3.6 “the political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools,” 4.6 “models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied the larger political, social, cultural and economic contexts of schooling,” and 6.4 “emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community.” Superintendents ranked “student growth and development,” “community resources,” and “emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community” more important than educational leadership faculty. Conversely,
educational leadership faculty ranked “the political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools” and “models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling” more important than superintendents.

**ISLLC Standards**

There were no ISLLC Standards whose mean differences between superintendents and educational leadership faculty were shown to be statistically significant (see Table 4.8). The strongest statistically significant mean difference was with ISLLC Standard 3 “ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment,” with superintendents ranking it as more important than the educational leadership faculty. Superintendents and educational leadership faculty ranked four of the six ISLLC Standards the same. Each ranked Standard 2 “advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to learning and staff professional growth,” as most important and Standard 6 “understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context,” as least important.

**Traits and Skills**

There were four OSP traits and skills whose mean differences between superintendents and educational leadership faculty were shown to be statistically significant (see Table 4.9, bold-faced significance values). The strongest statistical differences were OSP traits and skills 7.1, “facilitates the articulation and realization of a shared vision of continuous school improvement,” 7.2 “ensures that the instructional content taught is aligned with the Ohio academic content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district,” and 8.4 “shares leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.” OSP trait and skill 10.2, “understands, encourages, and facilitates the effective use of data by staff,” also had a statistically significant difference worth reporting.

Educational leadership faculty ranked “facilitates the articulation and realization of a shared vision of continuous school improvement” most important, whereas superintendents ranked it slightly lower at second most important. Superintendents ranked “ensures that the instructional content taught is aligned with the Ohio academic
content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district” most important, whereas educational leadership faculty ranked it third most important. Educational leadership faculty ranked “shares leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members” most important, whereas superintendents ranked it third most important. Superintendents ranked “understands, encourages, and facilitates the effective use of data by staff” third most important, whereas educational leadership faculty ranked it fourth most important.

Ohio Standards for Principals

There were two OSP whose mean differences between superintendents and educational leadership faculty were shown to be statistically significant (see Table 4.10, bold-faced significance values). The strongest statistically different mean difference was with OSP 4 “principals establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote student learning and achievement of all students,” with educational leadership professors ranking it as more important than superintendents. OSP 2 “principals support the implementation of high-quality, standards-based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students,” also revealed a statistically significant difference and had superintendents ranking it as more important than the educational leadership professors.

Educational Leadership Professor Demographics

Simple bi-variate correlations relating to educational leadership faculty demographics and the characteristics of the institutions in which they teach (see Table 4.13, bold-faced significance values) revealed two strong relationships of note. The first relationship reveals that the longer the length of service at the college or university, the more likely that the individual was to be a full professor. The second relationship reveals that educational leadership professors who had a short length of service with their institution were more likely to be at institutions with larger enrollments (10,000 or more).

Demographics and ISLLC Standards

Educational leadership faculty positions and lengths of service were significantly correlated with ISLLC Standard 1 “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community,” with more experienced faculty ranking Standard 1 less
important. Conversely, less experienced faculty ranked Standard 1 more important (see Table 4.16, bold-faced significance values).

Demographics and Ohio Standards for Principals

Educational leadership faculty length of service is the only demographic that is significantly correlated to any of the OSP. OSP 5, “principals engage parents and community resources, support student learning, achievement and well-being,” is negatively correlated with the faculty member’s length of service revealing that the longer the length of service of the faculty member, the less important OSP 5 was ranked. The shorter the faculty member’s length of service, the more important OSP 5 was ranked (see Table 4.17, bold-faced significance value).

Superintendent Demographics

Simple bi-variate correlations relating to superintendent demographics and the characteristics of the districts within which they work did not reveal any statistically significant relationships. Superintendent demographics and district characteristics were not significantly correlated with any ISLLC Standard or OSP (see Tables 4.14 and 4.15).

Conclusions

From the outset, this study was guided by four research questions. They were:

1. What knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits are considered most important by Ohio college or university educational leadership faculty in secondary principal preparation programs?
2. What knowledge, understandings, skills, and traits are considered most important by Ohio superintendents in the selection process when hiring a secondary principal?
3. Which leadership standards (ISLLC or OSP) are considered most important by Ohio college or university educational leadership faculty?
4. Which leadership standards (ISLLC or OSP) are considered most important by Ohio superintendents?

This section of the chapter will provide several conclusions that were drawn from the findings of the study within the context of these research questions. Because the knowledge and understanding elements are aligned with ISLLC Standards, and the skills and traits elements are aligned with OSP, each set of elements was assessed separately.
Knowledge and Understandings

The three knowledge and understanding elements of the ISLLC Standards that produced the strongest statistically significant differences were somewhat consistent with the literature. It was reasonable to posit that educational leadership faculty would rank “systems theory” as more important than superintendents, because faculty tend to place appreciably more value on theories, as well as theoretical frameworks, especially when approaching leadership preparation practice. The researcher’s own experience in educational leadership graduate programs as well as conversations with current superintendents and adjunct instructors in educational leadership programs contributed to this speculation. Recalling Farkas et al. (2001, 2003), it was also reasonable to conclude that superintendents would rank both “principles and issues relating to school safety” and “measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies” as more important than the educational leadership faculty. Each element is closely aligned to the daily activities of secondary principal leadership and therefore is more likely to be valued by superintendents in a hiring decision than by educational leadership faculty in a preparation program.

Of the eight knowledge and understanding elements whose mean differences were statistically significant, five were ranked higher by superintendents and three were ranked higher by educational leadership faculty. Out of the 36 total knowledge and understanding elements, two each in ISLLC Standard 2 “student growth and development” and “measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies” and Standard 4 “community resources” and “emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community” were both statistically significant, and all four were ranked higher by superintendents. Drawing from Hess (2003) and Hess and Kelley (2005a, May, 2005b, May, and 2005, July), these findings were somewhat surprising because it was reasonable to speculate that educational leadership faculty would rank “student growth and development,” “community resources,” and “emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community” as more important than superintendents primarily because these areas of knowledge are closely aligned with child development theories and community engagement frameworks that are often emphasized in leadership preparation programs. Although somewhat surprising, the fact that superintendents ranked these four
elements of knowledge and understanding higher than educational leadership professors suggests that those who suppose that superintendents generally do not place high value in such areas should reexamine the basis for their conclusions.

Skills and Traits

The four skills and traits elements of the OSP that produced statistically significant or moderate differences were generally consistent with recommendations made by Fry et al. (2005). This leads one to posit that educational leadership faculty would rank “facilitates the articulation and realization of a shared vision for continuous school improvement” and “shares leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members” more important than superintendents because faculty tend to place significant emphasis in principal preparation programs on building shared vision amongst all stakeholders and in shared or distributed leadership frameworks. While superintendents may deem these elements important to their work at the district level, the importance of these elements in relation to other skills or traits tends not to be cast onto the high school principal role in a district. Recalling Hardin (1998), it was also reasonable to speculate that superintendents would rank “ensures that the instructional content taught is aligned with Ohio academic content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district” and “understands, encourages, and facilitates the effective use of data by staff” higher than educational leadership faculty because superintendents tend to focus more on the close connection between curricular alignment and the use of student achievement data to make instructional decisions, as these skills and traits contribute directly to how the school is assessed in Ohio’s accountability system.

Research Question 3 asked, “Which leadership standards (ISLLC or OSP) are considered most important by Ohio college or university educational leadership faculty?” Research Question 4 asked the same question but to Ohio superintendents. Each set of standards (6 ISLLC and 5 OSP) were assessed separately in the analysis of the data.

ISLLC Standards

Somewhat surprising was the lack of any strong statistical differences between the rankings by superintendents and by educational leadership faculty of ISLLC Standards. In four of the six standards, the rankings were the same. The ISLLC Standard revealing the most statistically significant, albeit moderate difference, was “ensuring management
of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.” Superintendents ranked this standard as third most important, whereas educational leadership professors ranked it fourth. The moderate difference suggests that, as expected, superintendents rank it as more important than professors because superintendents tend to place emphasis on their high schools being well-run, safe, and efficient places of learning. Educational leadership professors tend to want less emphasis placed on this area over others such as acting with integrity and in an ethical manner, advocating a nurturing school culture, and the development of a shared vision that is shared by the larger community.

One possible explanation for the lack of significant statistical differences between the superintendent and educational leadership professor rankings is that Ohio is an ISLLC state. As a result, the respondents are likely to have both conceptual and practical understandings of the standards gained from academic, inservice, or professional development and on-the-job experiences. Another possible explanation is that the superintendents who responded to the survey may be more likely to have attended principal and superintendent licensure programs, as well as doctoral programs, whose faculty stress the ISLLC Standards.

Ohio Standards for Principals

The two standards that produced statistically significant differences between superintendents and educational leadership faculty were consistent with expectations. Out of five standards, superintendents ranked “principals support the implementation of high-quality, standards-based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students” second most important, while professors ranked it third. It is reasonable to assume that superintendents who are hiring a high school principal would place a greater level of importance on instructional practices that are aligned with state academic content standards than their educational leadership faculty counterparts because superintendents are focused on student achievement levels on both the Ohio Graduation Test as well as college entrance exams.

Educational leadership professors ranked “principals establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote student learning and achievement for all students” as second most important of the five OSP whereas superintendents
ranked it third. As mentioned before, it is reasonable to assume that the professors would rank any standard or element that pertains to models of collaboration or forms of shared or distributed leadership as more important than superintendents because many of the models of public engagement and shared leadership are common areas of research and inquiry for professors. More surprising was that superintendents ranked this standard as more important to them than “principals allocate resources and manage school operations in order to ensure a safe and productive learning environment.” At the outset of the study, it was predicted that this standard would be ranked at or near the top by superintendents.

Looking at the overall rankings of the OSP, superintendents and educational leadership faculty gave identical rankings to three of the five standards. Worth noting is that they both ranked “principals help create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress toward achieving their goals” as most important and “principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support student learning, achievement, and well-being” as least important. This was not an expected result, as it was reasonable to assume there would be differences between the two groups as to what they considered to be the most and/or least important standards. Results from this study should cause those who assume that superintendents and educational leadership professors differ on the importance of these standards to reexamine the basis for their conclusions.

Recommendations for Further Inquiry

In response to the statistical findings and feedback solicited from the facilitated discussion group of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and educational leadership faculty it is recommended that further inquiry be conducted into this study’s most surprising finding that no statistically significant discrepancies exist between superintendents and educational leadership faculty, on the question of which ISLLC Standards are considered most important. It begs the obvious question of why is this fact not widely known, understood, or communicated in the field of educational leadership? Why do perceived discrepancies exist? In that there was universal surprise with the facilitated discussion group participants on this question, it was recommended by the
attendees that additional studies be conducted to investigate this question further, as it is
of great importance to the field of secondary principal preparation and to the decision
methodology of recruiting and selecting secondary principals by superintendents.
Furthermore, with the ISLLC Standards presently undergoing review and revision,
evidence from this and subsequent similarly purposed studies may prove as valuable
contributions to the deliberation process.

A second area for additional inquiry pertains to the facilitated discussion group’s
contention that superintendents recognize real barriers to collaborative learning and
shared or distributed leadership approaches in a secondary school setting. Premised on
the statistically significant variance between the superintendents and educational
leadership professors on OSP 4, “principals establish and sustain collaborative learning
and shared leadership to promote student learning and achievement of all students”
discussion group participants called for the need to look more closely at what real barriers
superintendents and high school principals might offer as reasons why they ranked this
standard lower in importance than their professor colleagues.

Related to the general area of inquiry aforementioned, it is recommended that
further study be conducted that attempts to ascertain the basis for a suspected disconnect
between the realities of standards, accountability, and structures that define the daily
leadership parameters of the secondary principalship and current theories of leadership,
teaching, and learning, which often frame the scope of principal preparation programs.
Participants in the facilitated discussion, as well as the researcher, still suspect that there
are widely disparate notions of the value of emphasizing aspects such as Ohio’s
accountability system, curriculum and assessment, and supervision of instruction in
preparation programs or in making hiring decisions of secondary principals.

Implications for Current Practice

This study provides some empirical and anecdotal data on the question of whether
superintendents and educational leadership faculty view the necessary knowledge,
understandings, skills, and traits for serving as a high school principal differently. In
many key respects, the study suggests that some discrepancies exist but not to the degree
that one might expect. A key implication from this study is that superintendents and
educational leadership faculty generally agree that future high school principals should
have the knowledge, the key understandings, and the necessary skills and traits necessary
to lead in the creation and facilitation of a shared vision for student success in their
schools, as well as success in the advocacy and oversight of a school culture that
marshals an instructional program conducive for student learning and professional growth
for its teachers.

Overall, results from the study, specifically the results reported in Tables 4.11 and
4.12 begin to establish a basis for some empirical credibility of the ISLLC Standards and
the knowledge and understanding elements associated with them. Individuals closely
involved in the ISLLC Standards writing and review committee have suggested that some
researchers and opponents criticize the ISLLC Standards and their associated knowledge
and understandings elements because they have not been rigorously empirically tested.
Tables 4.8, 4.11, and 4.12 demonstrate the nearly identical mean rankings of the ISLLC
Standards and the individual knowledge and understanding elements associated with each
standard by superintendents and educational leadership faculty.

These are valuable findings for educational leadership professors, specifically in
principal preparation programs and for superintendents. More specifically, these findings
are valuable to their professional association BASA, who is always looking for relevant
professional development programming for their members, and for the Ohio Department
of Education who is charged with overseeing the implementation of the OSP through its
relationships with licensure programs and the professional associations for principals
(OAESA and OASSA).

Keeping in mind that each of these findings is in relation to the force ranking
method applied in the survey tool, an equally compelling finding of the study, which has
implications for current practice in principal preparation programs and for
superintendents, is that both cohorts ranked two leadership standards - one from ISLLC
and one from OSP - as least important, yet both standards receive a good deal of attention
in preparation programs. The first relates to understanding and influencing the larger
political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of schooling at the secondary level,
and the second pertains to engaging parents and community members in the larger
educational process and the creation of an environment where community resources
support student learning, achievement, and well-being. Perhaps each group felt that
given the other ISLLC Standards, asserting that a high school principal focus on influencing the larger economic or political context of schooling was not as important as, say, facilitating the vision of the school and ensuring management of the organization. Similarly, it would seem that each cohort felt that compared to the other OSP, prioritizing that principals engage parents of high school students in the educational process ahead of supporting the implementation of standards-based instruction and assessment was not wise.

As college and university preparation programs prepare for their program reviews, BASA and its professional development committee suggest programming for next year and beyond. As the field of educational leadership engages the question of leadership standards, it would be beneficial for each cohort to ponder the leadership standards and elements that professors and superintendents ranked as least important to them, especially the instances where it was the same item. The suggestion is not that the standards and elements be ignored, but that they are reexamined for their utility in relation to the preparation of and subsequent hiring practices of the high school principal.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders

**Standard 1**
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

**Standard 2**
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

**Standard 3**
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

**Standard 4**
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

**Standard 5**
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

**Standard 6**
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.
APPENDIX B

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders
Knowledge and Understandings Elements

The administrator will have a knowledge and understanding of:

**Standard 1**
- learning goals in a pluralistic society.
- the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans.
- systems theory.
- information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies.
- effective communication.
- effective consensus-building and negotiation skills.

**Standard 2**
- student growth and development.
- applied learning theories.
- applied motivational theories.
- curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement.
- principles of effective instruction.
- measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies.
- diversity and its meaning for educational programs.
- adult learning and professional development models.
- the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals.
- the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth.
- school cultures.

**Standard 3**
- theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development.
- operational procedures at the school and district level.
- principles and issues relating to school safety and security.
- human resources management and development.
- principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management.
- principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space.
- legal issues impacting school operations.
- current technologies that support management functions.
Standard 4

- emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community.
- the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community.
- community resources.
- community relations and marketing strategies and processes.
- successful models of school, family, business, community, government and higher education partnerships.

Standard 5

- the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society.
- various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics.
- the values of the diverse school community.
- professional codes of ethics.
- the philosophy and history of education.

Standard 6

- principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools.
- the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation.
- the law as related to education and schooling.
- the political, social, cultural and economic systems and processes that impact schools.
- models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural and economic contexts of schooling.
- global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning.
- the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system.
- the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society.
APPENDIX C

Ohio Standards for Principals

**Standard 1**
Principals help create a shared vision and clear goals for their schools and ensure continuous progress toward achieving their goals.

**Standard 2**
Principals support the implementation of high-quality standards-based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students.

**Standard 3**
Principals allocate resources and manage school operations in order to ensure a safe and productive learning environment.

**Standard 4**
Principals establish and sustain collaborative learning and shared leadership to promote learning and achievement of all students.

**Standard 5**
Principals engage parents and community members in the educational process and create an environment where community resources support student learning, achievement and well being.
APPENDIX D

Ohio Standards for Principals

Traits and Skills

Standard 1

• Principals facilitate the articulation and realization of a shared vision of continuous school improvement.
• Principals anticipate, monitor and respond to educational developments that affect school issues and environment.
• Principals lead the change process for continuous improvement.
• Principals initiate and support team work at setting, monitoring and achieving challenging and specific goals that reflect high expectations for all students and staff.

Standard 2

• Principals ensure that the instructional content that is taught is aligned with the Ohio academic content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district.
• Principals ensure instructional practices are effective and meet the needs of all students.
• Principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted and students with disabilities.
• Principals know, understand and share relevant research.
• Principals understand, encourage, and facilitate the effective use of data by staff.
• Principals support staff as they plan and implement research-based professional development.

Standard 3

• Principals establish and maintain a safe school environment.
• Principals create a nurturing learning environment that addresses the physical and mental health needs of all.
• Principals allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.
• Principals institute procedures and practices to support staff and students and establish an environment that is conducive to learning.
• Principals understand, uphold and model professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.
Standard 4

- Principals promote a collaborative learning culture.
- Principals share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.
- Principals develop and sustain leadership.

Standard 5

- Principals use community resources to improve student learning.
- Principals involve parents and community members in improving student learning.
- Principals connect the school with the community.
- Principals establish expectations for the use of culturally-responsive practices, which value and acknowledge diversity.