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ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of sustained reflection on the leadership practice of a novice principal participating in an Administrative Leadership Academy. Mentoring and portfolio writing provided the means for such reflection. The researcher was a participant observer and the primary data gathering instrument. Data, consisting of interviews, observations, and document analysis, were gathered at Academy functions, as well as on-site at the school. Literature on expert problem solving and adult learning theory established the framework for conducting data analysis.

The study found that the use of self-reflection, reflection with others, and written reflection moved the novice principal in the direction of expert school administrator. With respect to problem interpretation, obtaining problem relevant information, and the use of self-reflection and collaboration, the novice principal took on characteristics befitting an expert as opposed to novice problem-solver. Such growth allowed the early career principal to better address the barriers to student learning within the school setting.

This study has implications for policy recommendation surrounding the licensure requirements for school principals. With standards-based accountability driving educational reform, State Department of Education officials continue to seek out new ways to improve the performance of school leaders. Conclusions from this study support
the inclusion of sustained reflection as a component of the professional development licensure requirement for early career principals. With respect to this study, mentoring and portfolio writing provide the vehicle for such reflection.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The current wave of educational reform centers on the need for improved educational outcomes for all children. Federal and state agencies, research institutions, and educational associations, all endeavor to determine which reform/restructuring efforts will have the greatest impact on student achievement. While there are many factors that play into the equation for academic success, one factor is persistent: successful schools have strong leaders (Brown & Irby, 2001; Daresh, 2001; Eddins, 1998). Principals are responsible for setting the tone and creating a climate conducive to teaching and learning. Because principals play such a pivotal role in the success of the school, it becomes evident that the preparation and continuous professional development of quality school leaders should be a key factor within educational reform efforts.

Professional development is of great concern for policy makers and educators (David, 2000). Indeed, inadequate training is sited as one of the reasons for administrator shortages in our nation’s schools. The field of educational leadership faces many challenges in the 21st century, among them ineffective and inappropriate preparation and professional development (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002).
Recognizing the need to elevate the quality of educational leadership, the Council of Chief State School Officials (CCSSO) created the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). Through its development of *Standards for School Leaders*, ISSLC provides a shared vision for effective school leadership based on continuous standards-based professional development (Collaborative Professional Development Process For School Leaders, 2000).

The *Standards for School Leaders* address areas of needed improvement in conjunction with personal and professional goals, a school/school district continuous improvement plan and the ISLLC standards. The framework for the standards is designed around knowledge, disposition, and performance indicators (see Appendix A for the complete standards). Student success is paramount throughout all six standards as each begins with the phrase: “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by….” The following six statements complete each phrase:

1) facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

2) advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

3) ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4) collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

5) acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6) understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (p. 2-3).

The ISLLC standards “provide a clear organized set of curriculum content and performance standards that [can] be used to drive the preparation, professional development and licensure of principals” (Jackson & Kelley, 2002). Murphy (2002) refers to three concepts “that provide the new anchor for the profession of educational leadership”: school improvement, democratic community, and social justice (p. 117). These concepts are highly visible in the ISLLC standards for school leaders.

With the CCSSO providing the foundation, states sought to develop standards-based professional development programs for school leaders. An Administrative Leadership Academy in a large Midwestern state was one such program, created to address the needs of professional growth and development of novice principals. The Academy set out to address two critical concerns within the field of educational administration: the growing shortage of school principals and the need for higher quality professional development among school administrators. By providing meaningful professional development, the Academy sought to prepare quality principals who will remain in their positions for longer periods of time.

Responding to this Midwestern State Department of Education’s call for proposals to support entry year principals, the Academy created an Entry Year Program (EYP) in 1997.¹ The organizational structure of the program consisted of a statewide director and five regional coordinators. Within each region, numerous others took on

¹ Throughout this document, any reference to the Administrative Leadership Academy, the Academy, the Entry Year Program, or EYP will mean the Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program.
leadership roles and responsibilities with respect to professional development activities. State and regional level coordinators collaborated to develop sound objectives for meeting program goals with implementation of objectives varying across regions. The following five goals guided the EYP: to nurture reflective leadership and learning practices, to support the continuous development of leadership skills for beginning administrators by pairing them with veteran principals, to introduce principals to the state’s new Administrator Competencies (derived from the ISLLC standards), to discover more meaningful ways of assessing leadership performance and development, and to create a more collaborative leadership development network among the department of education, universities, professional development centers, professional associations, local school districts, and various other communities of practice. The creation of an administrative professional growth portfolio provided one means for Academy participants to enhance reflective leadership and learning practices. Collaboration and networking with Academy coordinators, mentors, and other novice principals provided assistance throughout the reflective process.

Although originally conceived as a two-year pilot program in 1997, the EYP continued to provide professional development to two additional cohorts of principals. Extending the EYP supported the efforts of the state department of education as it continued to develop policy around the teacher education and administrative licensure standards. The language within those standards stipulated that to obtain a professional licensure, a principal would successfully complete an entry year program of mentoring. The beginning administrator would also demonstrate competency across each of the
following areas: facilitating the vision; school culture and instructional program; managing the organization; collaboration and community engagement; ethics and integrity; and understanding publics. Although the debate continues as to how best to assess proficiency, creation of a portfolio was written into policy as a means for the performance-based assessment of the entry year program.

As with any program, it is important to evaluate and assess the effectiveness of the EYP. Specifically, the following research questions attempted to assist policy makers in determining the best strategies for continued support of newly licensed principals:

1. To what extent and in what ways do EYP principals gain understanding of the ISLLC standards in the context of their role as instructional leaders?
2. To what degree do they perceive ongoing reflection (within their mentor/protégé groups and by means of portfolio writing) as a tool of principal practice?
3. In what ways are they applying the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of the ISLLC standards, as well as the corresponding reflective skills, within their schools?
4. What is the evidence of impact on the organization?

To better understand the concerns surrounding these and other emerging questions, a two-year, in-depth case study was conducted from September of 2001 through June of 2003. A research team comprised of two faculty members and three graduate research assistants conducted this evaluative study. The five team members conducted three case studies of mentor/protégé pairs from three different regions of the state. Representation across the pairs included elementary, middle/junior high, and high school levels, as well as rural, suburban/small urban, and large urban school districts.
This dissertation study focused on the mentor/protégé pair from a middle/junior high school in a small urban/suburban district. Collaboration on the research design and analysis of data resulted in a comparative case analysis across three regions of the Administrative Leadership Academy.

The focus of this case study aligned closely with the questions previously presented for evaluating overall program effectiveness. The researcher assessed the degree to which ongoing reflection (through mentoring and portfolio writing) served as a tool for the development of administrative leadership practice; observed the ways in which the novice principal applied Academy-supported knowledge and skills in the school setting; and determined the impact such application had on the organization.

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical frame for this case study was literature-based, as well as grounded in the data. As is the nature with qualitative studies, theory continued to emerge throughout data collection and analysis.

Peterson’s (2002) provides a list of recommended features included within quality professional development programs for school leaders. Many of these features were found within the structural framework of the Administrative Leadership Academy, the first being long term commitment. Novice principals signed on for a two year commitment. Most mentors participated in the Academy as novice principals, developed their own portfolios, and returned to the Academy as mentor participants.

Other features of quality professional development programs for educational leaders include the use of portfolios, the opportunity for job embedded experiences, and a focus on student learning. Each component of the Academy’s administrative
professional growth portfolio focused specifically on real problems related to student learning. Participants identified barriers to student learning within their school environment and developed plans of action for addressing the concerns. By engaging in problem-based learning, the academy participants gained mastery of problem finding and problem solving skills (Jackson & Kelley, 2002).

Problem solving skills do not develop in isolation. Hence, mentoring and feedback represent two other key features of quality professional development for school leaders. Interaction with mentors, both on the school site and at Academy regional meetings, afforded novice principals numerous opportunities for networking and collaboration. The feedback that novice principals received from their more experienced colleagues served to enhance and improve their own problem solving skills. Fullen (2001) acknowledges that situation specific and social problem solving provides the greatest payoff to learning.

A final characteristic evident across most successful professional development programs for school leaders is engagement in reflective writing (Peterson, 2002). Improving reflective practice through mentoring relationships and portfolio writing represented a primary goal of the Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program. The responsibilities shouldered by school leaders are monumental and usually carried out in isolation from colleagues, with only minimal contact and little or no time to reflect. The mentoring process fosters reflective practice and serves as a “time out” for novice principal learning (Southworth, 1995).

Experts and novices differ in their problem-solving processes, particularly with respect to interpreting problems, obtaining problem-relevant information, setting goals
for problem solving, applying principles and values, handling constraints, developing
solutions, and maintaining productive affect (Barnett, 1995; Leithwood & Steinbach,
1995). Problem solvers, according to Daresh (2001), perform the following sequence of
events: seek information about the problem, define the problem, propose alternative
strategies, select the strategies that will be implemented, design an implementation/action
plan, implement the plan, and assess the plan. The components of the reflective process
complement the desired problem solving skills: identify the problem to be resolved,
respond to the problem by evaluating the similarities as well as the unique features of this
particular problem versus previous situations, frame and reframe the problem, anticipate
the consequences for a variety of solutions, and determine the desiredness of the
anticipated consequences (Barnett, 1995).

Reflective practice and mentoring relationships are major constructs within
Leithwood and Steinbach’s (1995) research on expert problem solving. Their data
suggests that “experienced principals perceive a much higher proportion of their
problems to be nonroutine” and that solving nonroutine problems requires reflection (p.
28). The act of self-reflection contributes to experiential learning. In addition,
relationship with others was crucial for experts, who engaged in “high levels of
consultation in working out a solution process” (p. 61). Thus, by guiding the protégé
through numerous reflective processes, the Academy mentors were modeling expert
thinking/expert problem solving and supporting the protégé’s journey to becoming an
expert thinker.

While relationships with mentors provide one opportunity for reflection, writing
the portfolio truly elevates the reflection process. The act of externalizing (writing)
thoughts presents the greatest opportunity for scrutiny. When novice principals put their thoughts, ideas, and plans into a written document, it is easier to determine overlooked possibilities (Lofland, 1971).

Components of the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP not only coincided with Peterson’s (2002) list of characteristics for quality professional development for school leaders, they also converged with the current research on adult learning theory. Daresh (2001) sums up years of research identifying characteristics of effective adult learners. He suggests that “adults learn best” when the learning activities are viewed as realistic and have personal relevance, when the learning relates to personal or professional goals, when the learner receives accurate feedback, when the experience is successful, and when the motivation to learn comes from within the learner.

While numerous perspectives have made their mark on adult learning theory across time, transformative learning theory best reflects approaches applied within the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP. According to Daloz (1999), four conditions are necessary for transformative learning to occur. These same four conditions were present within the framework of the Academy: the presence of the other, mentoring, reflective discourse, and the opportunity for action.
Research Design

The focus of this dissertation was a case study of one mentor/protégé pair participating in the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP; however, the cross case team worked together to develop a case study plan proceeding from the common core research questions. Consistent interview guides, standardized observation strategies and protocols, assessment tools, rubrics and document samples were identified and developed by this team. The team representatives met monthly the first year and weekly the second year to coordinate/compare data and ongoing interpretations. Field notes and interview transcripts were shared, as well as ongoing discussion of emerging themes.

Throughout the study, the team sought “holistic description and explanation” as well as added judgment to the phenomenon under evaluation. The study was particularistic in nature. By focusing on particular cases within a particular program, the goal was to understand, inform, and improve practice (Merriam, 1988).

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher was a participant observer and the primary data gathering instrument. Data collection was triangulated by way of interviews, observations, and written document analysis (Denzin, 1970; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1990; Stake, 1995). Along with the novice principal under study, interviews were conducted with the mentor, the superintendent, teachers, and parents. Observations were recorded during regional meetings, triad/diad meetings, and various building level meetings such as faculty meetings and professional development sessions. Document analyses included
participant portfolios, continuous improvement plans, school handbooks, meeting agendas, memos, school newsletters, school report cards, proficiency data, and news articles.

**Data Management and Analysis**

With respect to data management and analysis, all interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. Data was then organized, classified, and coded using manual techniques as well as NUD*IST – a computer software program designed to aid in the handling of qualitative data. Data analysis occurred continuously throughout data collection as the researchers attempted to identify emerging themes as well as tease out anomalies and contradictions (Holsti, 1969; Merriam, 1988). Finally, all tapes, transcripts, documents, and field notes were stored securely during the study and will be destroyed after three years.

**Limitations**

Because the researcher conducted all data collection and analysis, certain limitations apply. With a human instrument, mistakes are made, opportunities missed and personal biases can interfere; however, participant observation “when combined with interviewing and document analysis, allows for a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon under study” (Merriam, 1988, p. 102). To further address these limitations, the following strategies were employed to help ensure internal validity: triangulation of data collection methods; member checks to allow participants to review drafts and validate accuracy; long term engaged observation over a sustained time period; and a participatory mode of research (Merriam, 1988).
Some may argue that a sample size of one also presents a major limitation of the study; however, with qualitative case study research the ability to generalize is not the goal. “The search is not for abstract universals arrived at by statistical generalizations from a sample to a population, but for concrete universals arrived at by studying a specific case in great detail and then comparing it with other case studies in equally great detail” (Erickson, F., 1986, p.130). Positioning this single case dissertation study within the framework of the larger evaluative study of the Administrative Leadership Academy provided the benefits of cross case analysis. Similarly, Patton (1980) suggests that qualitative research should “provide perspective rather than truth, empirical assessment of local decision makers’ theories of action rather than generation and verification of universal theories and context-bound information rather than generalizations” (p. 283). Purposefully selecting the Academy participant to be studied, the data collected, and subsequent understandings gleaned provided the capacity to inform future design of preparation programs and ongoing professional development for school leaders.

Definitions of Terms

Administrator Competencies – a set of standards, designed around the ISLLC standards, with the purpose of guiding educational administrators in the development of knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators (Shaffer, 2002).

expert problem solvers – “Experts as compared with novices: (1) are better able to regulate their own problem-solving processes; … (2) possess more problem-relevant information; … (3) represent problems using more abstract categories and with reference to more basic principles; … (4) identify and possess more complex goals for problem solving and goals related to action plans; … (5) spend more time at the beginning planning their initial overall strategies, are more flexible, opportunistic planners during problem solving, and are able to use a greater variety of approaches to a solution; … (6) have automated many recurring sequences of problem-solving activity; and (7) are more sensitive to the task demands and social contexts within which problems are to be solved” (Leithwood, & Steinbach, 1995, p. 41).
facilitative leadership – “the behaviors that enhance the collective ability of a school to adapt, solve problems, and improve performance [including] behaviors that help the organization achieve goals that may be shared, negotiated, or complementary” (Conley & Goldman, 1994).

frame of reference – often used interchangeably with a ‘meaning perspective’, it represents the complex structure of assumptions, expectations, values, and beliefs through which individuals filter and interpret views of themselves and the events of the world around them (Cranton, 1994; Cranton, 2000; Mezirow, 2000).

habit of mind – a set of assumptions (Mezirow, 2000)

ISLLC Standards – “the organizing framework for professional development, with an emphasis on the instructional aspects of leadership” (Collaborative Professional Development Process for School Leaders, 2000, p. 1).

leadership – “the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal accomplishment” (Hersey, Blanchard & Natemeyer, 2001, p. 321).

management - “a set of processes that can keep a complicated system of people and technology running smoothly” (Kotter, 1996, p. 25).

meaning perspective – see ‘frame of reference’

mentoring – “an ongoing process in which individuals…provide support and guidance to others” (Daresh, 2001, p.3).

point of view – the cluster of meanings used during interpretation and judgment of life’s events (Mezirow, 2000).

power – “the capacity to bring about certain intended consequences in the behavior of others” (Gardner, 1990, p. 55).

problem – a gap between where one is and where one wants to be (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995).

routine or well-structured – when the current state, the desired state, and the procedure to get from one to the other are clearly known (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995, p. 121).

nonroutine or ill structured – when there is lack of knowledge about any of the three elements present in a routine or well-structured problem (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995, p. 121).
principal portfolio – “a collection of thoughtfully selected exhibits or artifacts and reflections indicative of an individual’s experiences and ability to lead and of the individual’s progress toward and/or attainment of established goals or criteria” (Brown & Irby, 2001, p. 2).

reflection – “intellectual and affective activities in which individuals engage to explore their experiences in order to lead to new understanding and appreciation” (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985, p.3).

transformative learning – a revision of assumptions and beliefs, through a self-reflective process which involves examining, questioning, and validating perceptions (Cranton, 1994).

vision – “a picture of the future with some implicit or explicit commentary on why people should strive to create that future” (Kotter, 1996, p. 68).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Administrative Leadership Academy EntryYear Program (EYP) provided professional leadership development to beginning principals. Academy activities were linked to topics covered in university preparation programs. While the program offered support to novice principals across an entire Midwestern state, this case study concentrated on the actions of one participant within one region. Participants committed to two years of involvement during which time they create a professional growth portfolio based on the ISLLC standards. Components of the portfolio were geared toward solving real, job-embedded problems related to student learning. The portfolio development process was facilitated by Academy-sponsored professional development activities and assistance from mentors. With respect to the region under study, the Academy coordinators conducted large group meetings five times a year. These meeting brought all mentor and protégé participants together to share ideas, collaborate, and build networks. In addition, mentors and protégés met several times a year in smaller groups, where the composition of the group was usually based on close geographic proximity.
Finally, mentor/protégé pairs communicated on an as needed basis. The EYP sought to employ sustained reflection through mentoring and portfolio writing as a means to improve leader learning and practice.

The Principalship

The challenging job of building level administration is characterized by a high degree of responsibility (Tirozzi, 2001). Currently, school principals are held accountable for the academic success of all students. And yet, accountability is but one of the forces shaping the principalship in the twenty-first century. As principals facilitate change for the benefit of improving academic achievement, they must maintain a sense of stability so important to the formal system of education (Murphy & Beck, 1994). The issue of consistency versus change is relevant to a discussion of principal as instructional leader versus principal as manager; leaders promote change, managers maintain stability (Kotter, 2001). Principals must be both and do both.

Historical Perspective

The role of school principal did not emerge as a formal educational leadership position until the 1920’s. In this decade of its inception, concern for pedagogy was the major area of emphasis. In the decades that followed, the principal’s role was attentive to each of the following areas of interest: scientific management in the 1930’s; education in a democratic society in the 1940’s and early 50’s; academic excellence in the 1950’s and 60’s; social problems in the 1970’s, a refocus on academic excellence in the 1980’s; and increased expectations coupled with a loss of power in the 1990’s (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). All of these issues continue to weigh heavily on the current role of school principal, making the job enormously challenging. Emphasis on democracy in education
is still prevalent today in the form of site-based and collaborative decision-making. The social problems of the 70’s have not disappeared, but have instead multiplied. Concern for academic excellence continues to fuel the debate about school improvement beginning with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983); and continuing with the more recent passage of *Goals 2000* legislation (National Education Goals Panel, 1996) and the *No Child Left Behind Act* (2001). Thus, in the twenty-first century, “school principals are expected to focus their schools on student learning, yet children come to school less prepared to engage in learning activities” (Grogan & Andrews, 2002, p. 237).

**Current Forces Shaping the Principalship**

The nature of the current job responsibilities, coupled with inadequate salary compensation, result in a shortage of school principals (Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Skrla, Erlandson, Reed, & Wilson, 2001). The insufficient number of school leaders does not appear to stem from an insufficient number of qualified candidates. Indeed, “the number of aspiring principals produced from principal preparation programs is estimated to be 2 to 3 times the number of job vacancies” (Grogan & Andrews, 2002, p. 237). Likewise, superintendents and school boards seem to be satisfied with the quality of candidates emerging from leadership preparation programs (Skrla, et. al., 2001). Instead, the current forces shaping the principalship create an extremely complex and uninviting job environment for potential school leaders.

Murphy and Beck (1994) present several forces shaping the conception of the principalship, with the first being the demand for accountability. Principals now, more than ever before, are responsible for providing objective evidence regarding successful
student achievement of desirable outcomes. Further, principals must face this demand within the context of yet a second force: the evolution toward a post industrial world where organizations have shifted from traditional hierarchies of authority to more shared decision-making and creativity in the workplace. This presents a balancing act for school leaders as they attempt to spread leadership responsibilities among their staff, while at the same time they are held directly accountable for student outcomes.

As challenging as it may be, achieving educational change must involve entire organizations. Fullen (2001) recognizes the importance of relationships as a key resource to school improvement and emphasizes the need to develop school wide professional learning communities. “Working with others who share the same conditions” represents a key factor in defining any undertaking (Wenger, 1998, p. 45). A recent view of cognition suggests that knowledge is best constructed through social interaction. Such collaboration not only enhances individual development, but results in organizational learning as well (Tschannen-Moran, Uline, Woolfolk-Hoy & Mackley, 2000, p. 255).

Kotter (1996) and Fullen (2001) agree that one of the most important facets of a successful change effort is creation of the coalition - putting together the right team of people to move the project to a successful completion. Indeed, research suggests that high performing schools employ group problem-solving (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995), and collegial communities (Grogan & Andrews, 2002). Engagement in group problem-solving processes provides growth opportunities for the individuals, as well as for the educational organization as a whole. “Participation with others in addressing a problem
that demonstrates processes more sophisticated than those possessed by the individual potentially stimulates growth in the individual’s problem-solving capacity” (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999, p. 152).

Murphy and Beck (1994) advance two additional forces shaping the conception of the principalship, the third being the changing social fabric. With an increase in non English speaking families, single parent homes, poverty, crime, and the resultant need for social services within educational settings, the role of leaders in schools grows increasingly complex. These societal pressures result in many students coming to school ill-prepared to learn; even as the emphasis of the principalship in the twenty-first century shifts to improving student outcomes assessed by standard-based accountability measures. The principal’s ability to perform the role of instructional leader is complicated by the need to take on law enforcement and social service advocate roles.

The final force defined by Murphy and Beck (1994) as a national economic crisis, contributes to this internal complexity at the same time it increases external demands for accountability. Job loss among our most vulnerable citizens results in family instabilities which further impede students’ capacities to achieve academically. At the same time schools struggle with the results of this economic down turn; they are also scapegoated as the cause of the economic circumstances in the first place. The rationale is twofold: 1) schools are not adequately preparing productive citizens for the workforce, and 2) educators are consuming a great deal of money while providing a steadily declining service. Educational leaders are thus expected to fix the schools, fix the students, and fix the overall economic situation.
Continuity vs. Change

Though confounding in themselves, these forces also present principals with an inharmonious challenge that is more macro in nature. In response to such demands, school leaders are expected to reform schools, while maintaining a sense of stability and continuity with respect to the educational environment (Murphy & Beck, 1994).

Whether or not the educational system has experienced much reform throughout history is a debatable issue. Indeed, societal forces have imposed change in an attempt to hold the system accountable. Brown versus the Board of Education provided the impetus for the passing of such legislation as Title I, Title IX, and Public Law 94-142. Likewise, the Soviet launching of Sputnik set the stage for the passing of the National Defense Education Act resulting in a greater emphasis on science, mathematics, foreign languages and liberal arts in public schools. In addition, the release of *A Nation at Risk* likely sparked the passage of the Goals 2000 legislation, as well as the No Child Left Behind Act (Uline, 2001).

Each of these no doubt represent important changes in education; however, “reform”, which suggests broad sweeping and grand scale change may be an inappropriate term for describing educational change. Indeed, the last decade of the twentieth century saw continuous improvement replace reform as a change strategy (Uline, 2001). Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) agree that we may not see any major change in a short period of time. They suggest that incrementalism best describes organizational change, including educational organizations, in the twenty-first century.

“It will prevail as the most accurate description of how schools will change over the next twenty years just as it is the most accurate description of how they have changed over the
The Administrative Leadership Academy EYP engaged novice principals in sustained reflection as a way of dealing with the push for change. Such reflection encouraged the practice of thoughtful change – change with a purpose in mind. Self-reflection, reflection with mentors and other protégés, and reflection through portfolio writing all served to guide the actions of novice principals and provide coherence for the unknown (Mezirow, 1991a).

**Role Ambiguity**

The increased demands facing principals result in a growing sense of role ambiguity. Within schools where improvement efforts are underway, principals struggle to fill multiple roles (Murphy, 1994). These roles, according to Murphy and Beck (1994), include principal as: servant, person in a shared community, moral agent, organizational architect in a changing society, social advocate and activist, and educator (1994). As previously stated, principals are expected to be instructional leaders promoting academic excellence. They must do so, however, in the face of a changing society which includes a monumental increase in both non English speaking and non traditional families. The principal must respond to those who view such changes as degrading to the moral fibers of society. In addition, their role as leader must include numerous others as a result of the trend toward collaborative, site-based decision-making.

A study by Glickman, Allen, and Lunsford (1994) also supports the notion of the changing role of the principal. Sixty-six percent of the principal participants felt their role had significantly changed mostly with respect to collaborative decision-making. The
traditional role of directive administrator has been replaced by facilitator and organizer of the decision-making process. Encourager, supporter, and enabler were other descriptors used to define these new roles. Still, whether or not principals perceive their roles as changing, most report curriculum, instruction, teacher development, and student learning as central among their job responsibilities. Increasingly, instructional leadership is what society demands of school leaders, as well as what they expect of themselves.

Research supports the need for principals to assume an instructional leadership role. For example, findings by Andrews and Soder (1987) “suggest that teacher perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader are critical to the reading and mathematics achievement of students, particularly among low-achieving students” (p. 11). Similarly, Heck (1992) discovered a strong correlation between student performance in schools and a set of instructional leadership tasks of principals. First, principal and teacher perceptions of school leadership activities were accurate predictors of achievement outcomes. Second, “principals in high-achieving elementary schools appear to devote substantially more time to the implementation of instructional leadership activities than principals in any other settings” (p. 30). Beyond the time spent, the types of leadership activities conducted also are important factors in predicting school performance. The instructional leadership activities that tended to be the best predictors of student achievement included the amount of time principals spent in classrooms and an emphasis on data-driven dialog, specifically the utilization of test results for program planning.

Thompson (2003) spells out the critical factors necessary to achieve and sustain a high-performing school system. He suggests that the system must provide a nurturing
and supportive climate aimed at enabling all students to meet high standards. In order to monitor this goal the system must be standards-based, holding itself accountable for the success of all its schools. System resources should focus on powerful instructional practice, including high-quality professional development for all employees. Finally, the system must engage in open internal and external communication, as well as effectively collect and use data. Thompson cautions that these factors will be insufficient unto themselves without the development of shared vision and ownership. “In other words, the extent to which these factors can be expected to lead to success is directly proportional to the quality of leadership that is exercised in their implementation” (Thompson, 2003).

Heck (1992) and Thompson (2003) both suggest a correlation between the use of data by the instructional leader, and student outcomes. The administrative professional growth portfolio employed by the Administrative Leadership Academy afforded novice principals the opportunity to partake in data-driven dialog and to practice utilizing data for program improvement. Each of the six components of the portfolio consisted of five questions. Each question required a maximum of two pages of explanation and up to five pages of supporting documentation. The questions forced Academy participants to consider how the following aspects of their learning environment affect student learning and impact the activities of the school leaders: community features, student characteristics, school organizational structure, aspects of curriculum, instruction and assessment, barriers to learning, what students are affected by the barriers, the role of stakeholders in addressing the barriers, the rationale for a chosen rectification strategy, the impact of state or national issues, staff response to such issues, external collaboration
efforts, community and family partnerships, professional development efforts for staff, opposing claims over resource allocation, a review of potential resources, the process of mediation in moving toward resolution, and how the chosen resolution affects student learning (see appendix B for a complete list of the ETS portfolio questions).

Evaluation of the portfolio was performed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) and based upon how well the commentary addressed the specific questions, how well the documentation supported the commentary, and the relevance of the responses and the documentation to the ISLLC standards (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium of the Council of Chief State School Officers, 1999). Educational Testing Service is a large, nonprofit organization devoted to educational measurement and research. It serves a variety of agencies in education, government, and business.

**Instructional Leader vs. Manager**

Evidence suggests that high performing schools benefit from strong instructional leaders. Thus, many constituents inside and outside schools expect principals to assume the role of leader over manager. While there are similarities between leadership and management tasks, the major difference lies in the outcomes. Both create agendas, managers by planning and budgeting, leaders by establishing direction. Both develop a human network for achieving the agenda, managers by organizing and staffing, and leaders by aligning people. Both execute, managers by controlling and problem solving, and leaders by motivating and inspiring. With respect to outcomes, however, managers attempt to maintain order and predictability, while leaders hope to produce movement and change (Kotter, 2001).
Still, the aforementioned consequences of school reform efforts force principals to pay close attention to managerial/administrative matters even as they attempt to lead changes on behalf of improved student learning and achievement (McPherson and Crowson, 1994). According to Murphy (1994), many principals in restructuring schools spend more, instead of less, time with managerial responsibilities. Hallinger and Hansman (1994) suggest that the facilitator role, with its shared decision-making, has actually resulted in more managerial work for school principals, as well as a greater commitment of time. Restructuring has not resulted in a diminution of managerial responsibilities. Instead, consistent with prior research, the district’s reorganization adds new roles and responsibilities to the principalship, many of which are bureaucratic in nature (p. 163).

Perhaps there has been an overemphasis on the diminishing managerial tasks in order to make room for the much needed instructional leadership tasks. For as Louis and Murphy (1994) suggest, management as well as leadership play central roles in school improvements. These central roles include aligning resources with goals, providing adequate information for all staff, supporting growth of teachers in a variety of ways, and managing the school community relationship.
Facilitative Leadership

As principals become more involved in instructional leadership and teachers become more involved in management, the lines of responsibility blur. This transformation of school governance increases conflict in schools. While such conflict may be mild and even constructive, it does require problem-solving and mediating skills on the part of principals (Peterson & Warren, 1994).

Facilitative leadership is one suggested means for handling the conflicts associated with the high demands of these changing school environments, one means to more effectively balance instructional leadership with organizational management functions. Evolving from the term transformational leadership (Lashway, L., 1995), facilitative leadership is defined by Conley and Goldman (1994) as “…the behaviors that enhance the collective ability of a school to adapt, solve problems, and improve performance, [including] behaviors that help the organization achieve goals that may be shared, negotiated, or complementary” (p. 238). The most important aspect of the definition is collective ability; “the facilitative leader’s role is to foster the involvement of employees at all levels” (Lashway, L., 1995, p. 1).

Building teams and practicing collaborative decision-making are two key strategies used by facilitative leaders. Utilization of these strategies was evident in Leithwood and Steinbach’s (1995) study of expert problem-solving. They found that expert principals provide “evidence of high levels of consultation in working out solution processes” (p. 61). Mentoring relationships provide opportunities to share problems and possible
solutions with colleagues. Involvement in professional development opportunities such as leadership academies afford the opportunity for participants to benefit from large group collaboration, as well.

The notion of collective capacity is evident in other key strategies used by facilitative leaders. When leaders create and model the school’s vision, they must do so in a manner that guarantees a shared vision. Because group decision-making is key to facilitative leadership, involving as many stakeholders as possible in the vision creation is one means of establishing a shared belief. Once established, the leader’s actions must affirm his commitment to the shared vision. As previously stated, this sharing of responsibility can result in increased tension for the principal with respect to accountability. While it may seem that a constant shift of responsibility and relationships would serve to blur the accountability issue, “the formal system continues to turn to one person for results” (Lashway, L., 1995, p 2).

The same trade-off holds true for other facilitative leadership strategies such as creating communication networks. Principals operating in a facilitative environment must nurture communication and exploit opportunities by spanning both internal and external boundaries (Conley & Goldman, 1994). In doing so, however, principals must closely monitor the process because the larger the communication web, the greater the chance of altering the intended message. As leaders share responsibility and authority, it becomes increasingly difficult to monitor the activities of the building.

Even though challenges exist, facilitative leadership provides principals with the means to address some of the forces shaping their job. The shift from hierarchy of authority to more shared decision-making requires the principal to behave in a way that
enhances collective problem-solving and collective decision-making. The principal’s source of power, which was traditionally based on formal authority, is now based on mutuality and synergy. “In short, facilitative power is power through, not power over” (Lashway, L. 1995, p. 1).

The Administrative Leadership Academy sought to guide novice principals in developing facilitative leadership skills. As mentors guided novice principals through the portfolio construction cycle, they enhanced leadership qualities that are both pertinent to facilitative leadership and grounded in the ISLLC standards. Building networks and practicing collaboration are key strategies of facilitative leadership. Likewise, these same two strategies were incorporated into Academy regional meeting activities, as well as during individual gatherings of mentor/protégé pairs. Novice principals considered issues pertaining to the ISLLC standards - vision, instructional leadership, management, community engagement, ethics and external influences - as they addressed the portfolio components. Mentors and regional coordinators modeled collective abilities. They collaborated with novice principals in their attempts at identifying barriers to learning in their own school environments, and developing plans to break through such barriers.

Professional Development and Performance-based Assessment

The wave of educational accountability and reform likely contributes to the recognition of and acceptance for increased support for building level administrators. School leaders need structured and sustained opportunities to learn. High quality professional development aimed at increasing knowledge, improving skills, and changing attitudes and values on the part of administrators, teachers, and other school employees, has the capacity to impact the entire culture and structure of the organization. Research
suggests that job-embedded learning, reflection on practice, professional portfolios, journals, support systems, networks, peer coaching, mentoring, and professional associations are the best professional strategies for achieving this desired impact (Skrla, et. al, 2001).

In addition, several of these strategies serve another challenge of the principalship - namely the need for performance based assessment. “Recent demands for accountability and increased public control of school policy-making underscore both the need and challenge to develop and implement … systems for evaluating the principal’s contribution to overall school effectiveness” (Heck, 1992, p. 32). Portfolios and reflective journals serve as formative, performance-based evaluation instruments, and as Heck (1992) suggests, such mechanisms “could be an enhancement to the school’s outcomes” (p. 32). Unfortunately, about 85% of the school districts in the United States rely on summative evaluations performed by a sole supervisor; and such evaluations are rarely successful at identifying areas of needed improvement with respect to performance-based instructional leadership tasks (Heck, 1992).

Concluding Remarks

The demand for accountability, evolution toward shared decision-making, societal ills, and the national economic crisis combine to present a challenging and complex scenario of the current situation facing school principals. School leaders are better able to combat these forces with the help of high quality professional development geared toward modeling strategies utilized by facilitative leaders. The ISLLC standards provide just such a professional development framework for improving leadership performance.
The Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium was created by the Council of Chief State School Officers in partnership with the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). In August 1994, the Consortium went to work developing a model of leadership standards based heavily on research linking productive schools and educational leadership. The ISLLC initiative was a highly collaborative effort supported by numerous organizations and individuals, including financial contributions from a Pew Charitable Trust grant, as well as assistance from the Danforth Foundation. In addition, members from the following professional organizations participated in the development of the standards: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of School Administrators, Associations for Supervision & Curriculum Development, Association of Teacher Educators, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, National Policy Board of Educational Administration, National School Boards Association, and University Council for Educational Administration (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders, 1996).

Seven principles guided the development of the ISLLC standards, created to raise the bar for school leadership practice. The seven principles dictate that standards should: “1) reflect the centrality of student learning; 2) acknowledge the changing role of school leaders; 3) recognize the collaborative nature of school leadership; 4) be high, upgrading the quality of the profession; 5) inform performance-based systems of assessment and evaluation for school leaders; 6) be integrated and coherent; and 7) be predicated on the
concepts of access, opportunity, and empowerment for all members of the school community” (Skrla, et. al, p. 54-5). These principles directly reflect the current literature on the principalship. Said simply, school administrators must be instructional leaders, accountable for student learning. They are to perform this role in a collaborative fashion, involving those who have a stake in the education of children.

The Administrative Leadership Academy incorporated these principles into the professional development curriculum via several different avenues: mentoring pairs/teams provided a network for collaborating on individualized leadership issues; consultants provided information and guidance as how best to collect, analyze, and use data for enhancing educational outcomes; and participants engaged in reflective practice through portfolio writing. The reflective process, as well as the final portfolio product, served to inform the performance-based assessment of the novice principal, as well as the assessment of the total school environment.

Portfolios

While the use of portfolios is not new to certain professionals including artists, photographers, and architects, they represent a more recent phenomenon in the field of education. Portfolios, as an assessment tool, were initially used with students and teachers “. . . and only recently have principals begun to use portfolios to document their experiences, expertise, and progress in leadership” (Brown & Irby, 2001, p. 11). Despite its recent entry into the educational arena, a study by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards found that “80% of teachers surveyed believed that the portfolio process contributed significantly to their professional development” (Wolf, Hagerty, & Whinery, 1995, p.33).
Within the context of preparation programs, portfolios are becoming increasingly popular. In the early 90’s, the utilization of portfolios was proposed to college/university faculty as a viable means of documenting performance and identifying areas of needed improvement. Since then, The American Council on Education, as well as many other organizations, has supported its use (Hebert, et. al, 1998). Colleges and universities see the portfolio as a means to supporting and enriching a standards-based curriculum. The portfolio encourages more careful alignment to a set of standards such as ISLLC, pushing faculty to develop appropriate performance-based activities and assessments which then can become the artifacts for portfolio development.

Student portfolios document progress toward established standards-based benchmarks and allow for reflection on such progress. In addition, students’ strengths, weaknesses, and continuing growth are evaluated via authentic assessment. Across time, students gain self-confidence as they continue to demonstrate their developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions, according to a specific set of standards (Mosley, 2000). The authentic assessment feature of the portfolio also benefits the university. Faculty is provided a standardized means of assessing student progress, as well as monitoring various program components (Brown & Irby, 2001).

While a precise definition of portfolios is dependent on the type, content, and uses proposed by various individuals, there seems to be agreement that the process of developing any portfolio involves collection, reflection, and selection of data (Guaglianone & Yerkes, 1998; Simmons, 1996). These processes are evident in Brown and Irby’s (2001) definition of the principal portfolio as “a collection of thoughtfully selected exhibits or artifacts and reflections indicative of an individual’s experiences and
ability to lead and of the individual’s progress toward and/or attainment of established goals or criteria” (p. 2). The importance of collection, selection, and reflection are also conveyed in Shulman’s definition of “a teacher portfolio [as] the structured documentary history of a set of coached or mentored accomplishments, substantiated by samples of student work, and fully realized only through reflective writing, deliberation, and serious conversation” (as quoted in Wolf, et. al, 1995, p. 31).

Data selection and reflection are evident in the Portfolio Licensure Assessment model developed by the Educational Testing Service. This model was field tested by the Administrative Leadership Academy, as well as programs in Indiana, Missouri, Mississippi, and North Carolina. The ETS portfolio framework reflected Hebert’s (1998) recommendation of including information and documentation as the major components of an administrative professional growth portfolio. Participants of the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP were required to create a maximum of two pages of descriptive information and five pages of supporting documentation for each of the five questions within the various components. The six components aligned with the ISLLC standards and included the following: facilitating the vision of learning within the school community; sustaining a culture conducive to student learning; understanding and responding to the larger context; collaborating with families and communities; supporting professional growth and development; and organizing resources for an effective learning environment. The descriptive information section included written commentary and reflection demonstrating knowledge of the school or school district. Within this section, participants described and analyzed factors that impact student learning pertinent to each component.
The types and/or uses of portfolios fall into four broad categories: professional growth, evaluation, career advancement, and academic growth in preparation programs (Andrejko, 1998; Brown & Irby, 1995 & 2001; Guaglianone, et. al., 1998; Hebert, Meek, & Sarhan, 1998). The professional growth portfolio represents the type most often discussed in conjunction with school principals; however, distinction between the types is not always clear. The career advancement portfolio may contain some of the same documentation as the professional growth portfolio, yet the final product is geared toward evaluation by others rather than self-evaluation and improvement. The actual process of developing the professional growth portfolio may lead to improvement; while the final product sometimes serves as both an evaluation tool and a career advancement document.

This dual purpose approach to portfolio use, i.e., as both a professional growth and evaluation tool, was evident in the ETS model for Portfolio Licensure Assessment. Five states engaged in a two year pilot study, the purpose of which was to norm the portfolio assessment framework for future use as a performance-based licensure assessment tool. This dual purpose approach may reduce the acceptance of the portfolio by licensed administrators. When linked to professional development, the portfolio was viewed with optimism; however, when linked to performance evaluation, these same administrators expressed skepticism (Shaffer, 2002).

Despite such skepticism, the administrative professional growth portfolio doubling as an evaluation tool may be advantageous for principals. As an evaluation tool, the portfolio provides the benefits of “a positive, personal, and individual approach to evaluation ….comprehensive and authentic documentation typically not used in the principals evaluation …[and] valuable insight into their leadership abilities” (Brown &
Irby, 2001, p. 6). Andrejko (1998) refers to this personal and individual approach as a way of capturing the “situatedness” unique to each administrator. The demand for comprehensive documentation forces principals to assume new roles in observing, substantiating, and reflecting - roles that are essential in today’s age of accountability.

When used as an evaluation tool, the distinction between the development process and the portfolio as a final product becomes significant. Generally, administrative effectiveness depends upon the inputs the leader brings to the process. These inputs include the administrator’s personal resources such as knowledge, skills, and abilities, as well as tangible resources such as facilities, equipment, personnel, and budgets. Effectiveness is usually judged according to the outputs of the administrator. The outputs consist of an evaluation of the principal’s performance based on specific task accomplishments. However, the real elements of effective administration are the processes that occur to transform the inputs into outputs. “This process component represents the ‘work’ that administrators actually do” (Hebert. et. al, 1998, p. 17).

These administrative processes take on a variety of classifications. Fayol (1949) observed that administrative functions included planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling. Mintzberg (1973) surmised that the key activities performed by managers could be divided into interpersonal, informational or decisional roles. Kotter (1982) identified agenda setting and network building as the two broad categories for managerial activity. Numerous other classifications exist for describing the work performed by managers.

Portfolio writing helps to bridge the gap between inputs and outputs by capitalizing on the transformation process. The reflective nature of portfolio writing
pushes principals toward a deliberate, critical analysis of the means to the end. Adequately understanding the how and why of any decision provides valuable insight into future decision-making tasks. Through reflective practice, the administrative portfolio offers an alternative approach for evaluating and improving on the principal’s abilities to carry out his/her job responsibilities (Hebert, et. al., 1998).

The portfolio model stresses the importance of reflection which results in a product that has practical application (Brown & Irby, 1995). Reflection involves self-assessment, which promotes administrative growth and results in improved performance. Such improved performance on the part of principals leads to better schools with improved student learning. The importance of reflection with respect to professional growth cannot be over-emphasized. Current literature recognizes the significance of reflection to successful leadership and organizational improvement (Brown & Irby, 2001). For the school principal, such reflection is vital to effective leadership and the portfolio process provides a vehicle for this to occur.

While self-reflection is important to the professional development process, reflection does not limit itself to individual activity. Indeed, valuable meaning is added to the reflection process when it occurs with another person or a group of people (Boud, Cohen, & Walker). Leithwood and Steinbach (1995) found that expert leaders engaged in high levels of consultation with others when working out solutions to problems. Mentoring and/or coaching provide a viable means for such guided reflection. These relationships, in turn, become “powerful tools for leadership development” (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1999, p. 131).
Mentoring

Mentoring is one form of professional development increasing in popularity. Nearly thirty states have instituted some form of educational mentoring (Halford, 1999); and formal mentoring programs specific to administrators have been on the rise since 1985 (Monsour, 1998). Mentoring is now being implemented in a number of university preparation programs across the country with many states requiring mentoring programs for all beginning administrators. Likewise, a rapid increase in field-based internships and clinical experiences occurred throughout the 1950’s and 1960’s (Daresh, 1995). Field-based learning, along with increased collaboration among universities and school districts, and the use of mentors to guide professional development, comprise the key ingredients of the Danforth Program. The Danforth Foundation Program was established in 1987 with the intent of providing aspiring educational leaders with a different and better preparation than those who had completed “more traditional educational administration degree and certification programs of the past” (Daresh & Playko, 1992). Two important aspects of the Danforth Program coincide with the features of the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP: 1) the focus on experiential learning via a mentoring relationship between candidates and experienced local administrators; and 2) the deliberate focus placed on “the value of reflection by candidates” (Daresh, 1987, p. 4).

The increased popularity of mentoring programs can be attributed to numerous factors, one of which is the shortage of teachers and principals nationwide. Chapman’s (1983) Social Learning Model suggests that teacher retention can be improved by successful mentoring programs. This model correlates long-term teacher retention with...
early experiences in teaching, suggesting that “the quality of the first teaching experience seems to be more positively related to teacher retention than is beginning teachers’ prior academic performance or the adequacy of their teacher preparation program” (Odell, & Ferraro, 1992, p. 200). The results of Chapman’s study revealed a 4% attrition rate for mentored teachers, a rate commensurate with the national rate for all teachers at 4.1%. This is significantly better, however, than the 9% attrition rate for beginning teachers, suggesting that mentoring pushes the attrition rate of beginning teachers closer to that of experienced teachers (O’dell & Ferraro, 1992).

The retention of quality teachers, as well as administrators, represents a major challenge to the field of education. According to state legislators, administrators leave their jobs because of salaries and inadequate support during the first years in the leadership position (Halford, 1999). Likewise, much support is needed for beginning teachers in such areas as discipline and management skills, curriculum and lesson planning, school routine and scheduling, motivation techniques, and individualized instruction (David, 2000). Mentoring programs provide such support as teachers and administrators alike view their colleagues as “valuable sources of practical ideas and information, helpful advisors on professional problems, the most useful evaluators of teaching skills, and understanding allies” (Holly, 1982).

The concept of mentoring dates back to Homer’s Odyssey. Mentor was the teacher that tutored Odysseus’s son (Daresh, 1995). Since then, the notion of the older and wiser teaching the young and inexperienced has remained central within various understandings of the mentoring relationship. And yet, some ambiguity as to the precise meaning of mentoring persists. Although a familiar concept, mentoring has a variety of
interpretations and applications due to its highly personal and situational nature. Implemented as it is with different people, in different circumstances, at different school settings, the mentoring role cannot be firmly set. It is instead defined by those who carry out the mentoring relationship (Bolam, McMahon, Pocklington, & Weindling, 1995; Wildman, Maglearo, Niles, & Niles, 1992).

Despite such ambiguity, some commonalities across definitions exist. Crow & Matthews (1998) suggest that “mentoring in an administrative context involves a person who is active, dynamic, visionary, knowledgeable, and skilled; who has a committed philosophy that keeps the teaching and learning of student in focus; and who guides other leaders to be similarly active and dynamic” (p. 2). Daresh (2001) offers a general explanation of mentoring as “an ongoing process in which individuals in an organization provide support and guidance to others who can become effective contributors to the goals of the organization” (p. 3). The notion of guidance is also evident in Ashburn, Mann, and Purdue’s (1987) definition of mentoring as “the establishment of a personal relationship for the purpose of professional guidance” (p. 1). Each of these definitions suggests the same guidance and support that were expected by Odysseus when he entrusted Mentor to tutor his son, Telemachus.

Mentoring provides a valuable professional development tool for entry year administrators fresh out of preparation programs. Because such programs are usually well grounded in theory and lacking in practical application, mentoring provides a valuable link between theory and practice (Hegarty & Simco; 1995, Monsour, 1998). According to Daresh and Playko (1992), mentoring is “the process of bringing together
experienced competent administrators with beginning colleagues as a way to help them with the transition to the world of school administration” (p. 145).

While mentoring programs may bridge the gap between theory and practice, other objectives come into play as well. Modeling by an experienced administrator speeds up the learning of new skills and reduces the stress associated with the entry into school leadership. By working together, the mentor/protégé pair also begins to alter the culture and norms of the school by introducing a collaborative environment (David, 2000).

“Healthy mentor/protégé relationships involve a progression from relative protégé dependence at the beginning of the relationship to autonomy and self-reliance as the protégé grows into a colleague and peer” (Head, Reiman, & Thies-Sprinthall, p. 12 as quoted in Barnett, 1995, p. 45). The mentoring roles and responsibilities also vary with the progression of the relationship. The most passive role would be one of observer whereby the mentor watches the protégé in the natural working environment and takes in information that may be utilized when the mentor is expected to take on a more active role. During the less active phase, the mentor may also provide a listening ear and act as a sounding board for the venting of frustration. As the mentor observes, listens, and brainstorms with the protégé, he/she has opportunity to provide objective assistance to the novice principal. The mentor may also directly instruct, advise, encourage the expression of feelings, and offer specific feedback based on information gathered while observing. Finally, the mentoring roles may include setting objectives and monitoring and/or evaluating progress. The combination of such roles provides the support and encouragement needed for the development of confident and competent administrators (Daresh, 2001; David, 2000; Southworth, 1995; Vonk, 1993).
Coaching

According to Gallwey (2000), the success of any of these roles will depend on the protégé’s ability to “learn from the inside out, instead of the outside in” (p. 12). Both mentors and protégé must learn to trust the natural learning process. For mentors this means discontinuing the conditioned response to make corrective statements; while for the protégé it means lessening their dependency on technical instruction. Gallwey’s work considers learning and coaching - how a great coach can accelerate the learning process, diminishing the gap between potential and current performance. Whether a teaching/learning relationship between two people should be referred to as coaching or mentoring is unclear. It may be a linguistic debate; and yet, the distinction between coaching and mentoring is varied and sometimes ambiguous throughout the literature.

The term coach “derived from Kocs, the name of a village in northeastern Hungary, where carriages and cars were traditionally made” (Senge, 1999, p. 106). The word ‘coach’ was first used in the English language to mean ‘a kind of carriage’. The notion of moving people from where they are to where they desire to be remains a key concept within modern definitions (Witherspoon, 2000).

The rapid growth of coaching as a professional development tool relates to the bottom-line benefits and their relevance in today’s rapidly changing world. Because coaching is usually delivered on-the-job and in real time, the coach is able to subsume a holistic perspective of the situation at hand. In addition, the coaching process is adaptive, recognizing and honoring individual needs (Freas, 2000; Lyons, 2000). Finally, coaching affords the opportunity for reflective dialogue which is vital to the learning process.
Coaching presents executives with an opportunity to engage in a dialogue of development. Where there is no coach, the chance for this reflective dialogue may be missed. When executives have no one to talk to, there is no tested or evolved dialogue, there is no attitude formation, and so an important part of executive thinking – thinking through – is missing” (Lyons, 2000, p. 16).

It is difficult to derive a definition or description of a coach since there are no professional standards currently in place for judging competence. Presently, anyone can claim the title, “coach” (Beckhard, 2002). Still, many attempt to define or describe important factors related to coaching. Witherspoon (2000) defines coaching as “a professional relationship…to enhance effective action and learning agility…through a deliberate process of observation, inquiry, dialogue, and discovery…” (p. 167). Relationship, inquiry, and dialogue appear to be key components prevalent throughout most of the literature on coaching. For example, research on leader-as-coach found that investment in relationships was the factor that most often attributed to coaching effectiveness (Kouzes & Posner, 2000). Lyons (2000) proposes that the power of the coaching dialogue lies in the coaches questioning ability – the ability to bring submerged issues to the surface. Senge (1999) suggests that while most people’s mental images of coaching include yelling and telling, the key to coaching success actually involves listening, asking questions, and helping people clear things in their own minds. Listening and asking are also a part of what Crane (2000) refers to as coaching beliefs. His list also includes facilitating and empowering, modeling accountability, lifting and supporting, celebrating learning, focusing on the process, and creating bottom line results. Finally, Senge (1999) maintains that successful coaching depends on skillful feedback, with
timing being an important aspect of the feedback process. He suggests that “feedback is often most effective not after someone has done something, but when you notice them contemplating the action” (Senge, 1999, p. 111).

Attention to individuality seems to be the ultimate goal of coaching. Pinchot and Pinchot (2000) claims that the goal of coaching is neither to add knowledge, nor to fix wrongs, but instead to provide personalized positive training on how to learn. He suggests that the coaching model is built upon independence or “helping people develop on their own terms” (p. 43). Using the term client and practitioner, Kegan (1982) also suggests that the practitioner’s hopes for the client’s future are something from which the client needs protection. It is the coach’s responsibility not to change ‘clients’, but to compassionately guide them along their desired path (Senge, 1999).

Given the above description of coaching, it is easy to see the similarities to mentoring. Relationship is vital to both processes, as is dialogue and questioning or reflecting. Indeed, some would maintain there is no clear distinction between the two processes. Though there are similarities in descriptions and definitions, most authors refer either to coaching or to mentoring exclusively. Few use the two terms interchangeably; and some use one word to describe what the other does, i.e., mentors coach.

One possible way to distinguish the two is in identifying who performs the coaching/mentoring; however, even this meets with some ambiguity. Lyons (2000) suggests that coaching is performed by an external supplier, while mentoring is provided by an internal person. He states that coaching supports an important facet of leadership, this being “the need to be in touch with the reality beyond the formal boundary of the
organization” (p. 17). He further suggests that “the term ‘mentoring’ is widely used to describe an activity closely related to coaching: “A mentor is likely to have had a successful personal track record in a role similar to that of the client” (p. 17). Thus, according to Lyons, mentors have held positions similar to the person(s) they are mentoring, whereas coaches are likely to be from a different discipline. On the other hand, Senge (1999) makes a statement about coaches that sounds very much like Lyons’ concept of mentors. He suggests that coaches are “people who have ‘been there and who know how to manage and design the journey” (p. 106).

While the research team described here employed the term “mentor” with respect to the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP activities; many aspects of the coaching model are consistent with the description of this mentoring. Relationships, dialogue, feedback, and guidance are key components of both constructs. Building relationships and engaging in reflective dialog, the mentors/coaches provided feedback that guided the protégés on the journey toward growth and independence. Thus, the argument could be made that the mentor participants of the Administrative Leadership Academy “coached” their protégés. Whatever the preferred term, the intent appeared to be facilitating professional growth on the part of the protégés.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Mentoring

If conducted effectively, mentoring requires a major commitment by mentors, as well as protégés. Research to date suggests this time commitment is viewed as the central disadvantage of the mentoring relationship (Bolam, et. al., 1995). Most experienced administrators have difficulty finding sufficient time to properly engage in
the mentoring relationship, let alone the novice principal who is struggling to survive the transition to administration. Still, commitment to the process, by both the mentor and protégé, results in numerous advantages.

While it is easy to see how protégés would benefit from expert guidance and modeling, these beginners have an equally positive impact on their veteran mentors (Bolam, et.al., 1995; Daresh, 2001; David, 2000). The importance of reflective practice and relationship with others is once again evident in the numerous benefits. The opportunity to engage in reflection is cited as a benefit to both the mentor and the protégé. The benefits for the novice educator include the development of a collaborative relationship which provides support, reassurance, and an additional perspective. The mentor gains personal satisfaction by sharing with and helping others. The relationship also provides the mentor with opportunity for continuous professional learning by hearing/seeing alternative views on professional issues (Bolam, et.al., 1995).

If one accepts the notion that organizations can also learn, then the schools/school district also reaps the benefits of successful mentoring relationships. According to Southworth (1995), “the process of mentoring has a part to play in developing schools as learning organizations. The processes of mentoring - reflection, analysis, appraisal, evaluation, self-help, and professional learning - are the media for a learning organization” (p. 25). When novice principals work with a mentor, they make time for the reflective process. Their work environment is characterized by much interruption, fragmentation, reactivity, and unexpected events. Mentoring forces a “time out” in the action and provides an opportunity to reflect on the protégé’s actions and approaches to leadership. The sharing of beliefs, values, and ideas by the mentor and protégé leads to
further reflection and self-analysis. As the novice principal and mentor model reflection and analysis, other staff in a learning school will likely follow, offering peer assistance. Appraisal and evaluation cannot help but be incorporated into the reflection and analysis process, contributing to the professional development of all involved. These mentoring processes each “contribute to developing the workplace conditions associated with learning schools” (p. 25).

As a result of such organizational learning, successful mentoring relationships can provide for the school district: increased productivity, improved performance, and lower turnover (David, 2000). The district also benefits from more capable staff - staff that possesses attitudes of lifelong learning, higher motivation levels, increased job satisfaction, and an approved sense of self-esteem (Daresh, 2001).

**Mentor Training**

The ability and know-how to accomplish mentor roles do not come without proper training. Mentor training is perhaps a most important, yet sometimes neglected aspect of mentoring programs. The extent, as well as the content of the training, is a relevant issue to address. As to when and how frequent, Barnett (1995) suggests that mentor training should be ongoing. “To expect mentors to be able to grasp and excel in their roles as cognitive coaches without periodic debriefing, feedback, and monitoring of their process, is to underestimate the complexity of this new mentoring role” (p. 56).

The content of mentor training, according to Barnett, should include “orientation to the mentoring role, instructional leadership skills, human relations skills, and mentor process skills. Process skills include problem finding, problem solving, and reflection. These skills need to be developed, refined, and mastered as a result of such training.
David (2000) also suggests that observation methods, feedback strategies, and conference procedures be included as major foci of mentor training sessions. In addition, participant feedback from an administrative mentor program in Minnesota reveals additional training needs. After gathering and analyzing data from interviews with six administrative mentor/protégé pairs, a top recommendation was the need to train mentors in adult development. Knowing how adults learn best provides both the mentors and the program coordinators important information to consider when planning mentoring activities. The Minnesota participants also recommend planning workshops around participant needs and providing the same information to mentors and protégés so that expectations are known.

Matching mentors and protégés along interests, learning styles, and geographic proximity is another recommendation from the Minnesota participants; and one that is controversial. Research is inconsistent as to the importance of matching pairs along gender lines, personality types, age, geographical proximity, building grade levels, or any other feature. Adequate time at the beginning of a program is necessary in order to allow mentor/protégé pairs to evolve; however, research suggests that mentor/protégé pairings usually results from deliberate matched pairs as opposed to naturally-evolving ones (Daresh, 1995). A final recommendation of the Minnesota participants is the providing of ongoing opportunities for sharing with other mentoring pairs (Monsour, 1998).

While the Minnesota study builds a list of specific recommendations for successful mentoring programs, Wildman, et. al. (1992) question whether a rigid list of specifications are appropriate for a highly personal and individualized process such as mentoring. From research on teacher mentoring, they discovered that mentors and
protégés often refer to affective components when summing up their mentoring experience. Words used to describe successful mentor characteristics included sensitive, helpful, emotionally committed, nurturing and encouraging, and enthusiastic. Thus, they concluded that “because mentoring involves highly personal interactions, conducted under different circumstances in different schools, the role of mentoring cannot be rigidly specified…. Mentoring, like good teaching, should be defined by those who will carry it out” (p. 212).

David (2000) supports the notion that personalities play a role in the mentoring process. He suggests that, with respect to mentor/protégé pairings, learning opportunities will be maximized by not matching personalities or educational views. In addition, when selecting pairs, David recommends that there be high priority to similar job assignments, close proximity, differences in experiences, and differences in age by more than five years. He further suggests that mentors should have positive attitudes, be enthusiastic, reveal their commitment to lifelong learning, and have the opportunity to decline in any given year.

Even the best training will not always produce successful mentors. Research suggests possessing certain skills and abilities contributes to the mentor’s success. The most important skills appear to be those pertinent to relationship building such as listening skills and oral and written communication skills. Counseling skills are also sited, including the ability to provide feedback in a non-judgmental and sensitive fashion. Attitude is also important. Effective mentors demonstrate enthusiasm about investing time and energy in the professional development of others (Bolam, et. al., 1995; Daresh, 2001).
Daresh (2001) cites the ability to model reflective practices as an important requirement of the mentoring role. It is the mentor’s responsibility to listen, observe, advise, and encourage the protégé throughout important decision-making and problem-solving processes. The feedback the protégé receives is based on thoughtful reflection by the mentor. Modeling such reflective practices will provide the protégé with the skills needed to engage in self-reflection or reflection with other, when the mentor is no longer in the picture. The feedback provided by mentors enhances the professional growth and development of protégés and is vital to effective adult learning (Daresh, 2001). The importance of the mentor/protégé relationship, as well an emphasis on reflective practice, is woven throughout the literature on adult learning. Indeed, relationships with others and reflection are the key components of transformative learning theory.

**Adult Learning Theory**

Theories of adult learning enter and exit the fields of education and psychology. These changing perspectives appear to be a product of the social context of the time. “Adult learning has been viewed as a process of being freed from the oppression of being illiterate, a means of gaining knowledge and skills, a way to satisfied learner needs, and a process of critical self-reflection that can lead to transformation” (Cranton, 1994, p. 3). Critical reflection and transformative learning theory are important components of mentoring, and thus, highly relevant to activities of the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP. Transformative learning theory, with its emphasis on relationships and reflection, will be further explored following a discussion of issues pertinent to the context of adult learning in general. The discussion begins with a review of the perspectives that have dominated adult learning theory throughout the latter half of the
twentieth century. Next, a section describing certain adult development constructs proves necessary before attempting to describe the works of prominent theorists, as well as defining and categorizing adult learning.

**Historical Perspective**

Prior to transformative learning theory, several other perspectives dominated adult learning literature. In the 1950’s the behaviorists’ view of learning as a response to environmental stimuli took center stage (Cranton, 1994). Behaviorists such as Skinner (1953) & Watson (1958) emphasized the role of the environment in shaping behavior; while others such as Mead (1930) stressed the importance of individuals in shaping the environment (Karier, 1986). In the 1960’s the humanists advocated the value of experience to the learning process. Maslow (1970) and Rogers (1969) were key contributors to this perspective which viewed people as inherently good, in control of their own destiny, and possessing infinite potential (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). And, in the 1970’s, cognitive psychologists stressed the importance of information processing mechanisms with respect to changes in memory (Cranton, 1994). The basis for this perspective was that behavior could best “be explained by taking into account the influence of cognition, existing knowledge, and the reasoning capacities of the behaving organism” (d’Ydewalle & Denis, 2000, p. 298). Each of these perspectives influences current theories of adult learning.

**Adult Development**

Several constructs pertaining to adult development deserve explanation before a further discussion of adult learning can occur. A ‘frame of reference’, often used interchangeably with a ‘meaning perspective’ represents the complex structure of
assumptions, expectations, values, and beliefs through which individuals filter and interpret views of themselves and the events of the world around them (Cranton, 1994; Cranton, 2000; Mezirow, 2000). Dimensions within a person’s frame of reference include not only a ‘habit of mind’ (a set of assumptions), but also a ‘point of view’ which comprises the cluster of meaning used during interpretation and judgment of life’s events (Mezirow, 2000). Mezirow suggests that three categories form the basis for meaning perspectives: epistemic, which relates to knowledge and the way it is used; sociolinguistic, which is based on social norms, cultural background, spoken language, and interaction with others; and psychological, which represents not only a person’s self-concept, but also their personality preferences (Cranton, 1994).

Progression through adult development occurs when there is an elaboration of a person’s frame of reference/meaning perspective, when a new frame of reference is established or when there is a transformation of habits of mind or points of view (Mezirow, 2000). Three assumptions appear common across the various stage theories of adult development. First, a specific set of demands or new circumstances are presented requiring an adaptation or a change in behavior patterns. Second, meaning perspectives are revised based on an analysis of the difference between current and past realities. Finally, a new and grounded understanding of reality results (Gould, 1991). And yet, the degree to which development occurs depends upon the ‘dependability’ of the frame of reference. That is, the more willing a person is to combine other peoples’ points of view with knowledge from their own life experiences, the more likely this development will occur. As Mezirow (2000) suggests, “a more dependable frame of reference is one that is
more inclusive, differentiating, permeable (open to other viewpoints), critically reflective of assumptions, emotionally capable of change, and integrative of experience” (p. 19).

**Adult Learning Theorists**

Over time, a number of prominent theorists have informed the discipline of adult learning. Although Piaget (1972) is often associated with child development, the final two stages in his four stage theory of cognitive development - concrete operations and formal operations – apply more specifically to adult development (Glickman, Gordan, & Ross-Gordon, 2001). Beyond a child’s sensorimotor and preoperational development, young adult and adult learners are able to think problems through mentally and deal with abstractions as opposed to always relying on real or concrete objects (Peterson & Felton-Collins, 1986). Likewise Kohlberg (1973) and Loevinger (1976) advance a stage theory of learning. Each views learning as hierarchical. When individuals advance from one stage to the next, each level represents higher mental capacities.

Kegan (1994) further contributes to the hierarchical perspective proposing a theory in which adults pass through five levels of consciousness as they grow and transform their meaning perspectives. The levels include incorporative (0), impulsive (1), imperial (2), interpersonal (3), institutional (4), and inter-individual (5). Levels one, three, and five correlate with the fundamental human need for togetherness; while levels two and four relate to the human need for separateness (Kegan, 1982). Two constructs relevant to Kegan’s (1994) theory are constructivism which is “the idea that people or systems constitute or construct reality’ (p. 198), and developmentalism which is “the idea that people or organic systems evolve through qualitatively different eras of increasing complexity according to regular principles of stability and change” (p. 198-9).
This constructivist developmental approach shares with Jung’s (1971) type theory the notion that people actively design their realities and that such realities are holistic and consistent across various life contexts. Jung’s ideas about personality types have greatly influenced the field of adult learning mainly through the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator test. The test, developed by Katherine Briggs and her daughter, Isabel Briggs Myers, assesses personality preferences and distinguishes the different ways people approach experiences (Kegan, 1994).

Theorists such as Erikson (1978) and Levinson (1979) propose a non hierarchical sequence of development. While they maintain that everyone passes through the same developmental periods, they posit that “one period is not higher or better than the preceding ones” (Levinson, p. 319). Erikson hypothesizes that throughout life “individuals pass through a series of stages of emotional development wherein basic attitudes are formed” (Hendrick, 1990). Levinson’s theory contends that people travel through a series of eras, with each era lasting roughly twenty to twenty-five years. These eras’- labeled childhood and adolescence, early adulthood, middle adulthood, and late adulthood - are separated by transition periods lasting roughly four to five years. Levinson (1979) maintains that “everyone lives through the same developmental periods in adulthood, just as in childhood, though people go through them in radically different ways” (p. 41).

Gilligan’s (1982) research on moral development was no doubt influenced by her early working relationships with both Erikson and Kohlberg at Harvard University. Gilligan’s data was collected mostly through interviews with men who were thinking about enlisting in Vietnam and women who were contemplating abortions. The primary
focus of her research came to be moral development in women. Gilligan asserted that women possess different moral and psychological tendencies than men – men thinking in terms of rules and justice, women thinking in terms of caring and relationships; both of which should be valued equally by society. This assertion was a criticism of Kohlberg’s stage theory of moral development whereby the male justice orientation of morality was considered a higher stage than women’s relationship orientation of morality.

Classifications of Adult Learning

While difficult to capture a precise definition of adult learning, distinct principles of effective practices in facilitating adult learning do exist. Learning is voluntary. Learning is self-directed with an aim toward empowering adults. Learning is participatory and collaborative. It is practical; and continuous reflection is a necessity (Cranton, 1994; Glickman, et. al, 2001).

Throughout the literature on adult learning theory, learning and/or knowledge is classified in numerous ways. While Cranton (1994) warns that “any classification system is arbitrary and open to question”, it is important to review several classifications that have a direct bearing on the work with entry-year principals (p. 41). Marsick and Watkins (2001) describe two categories of learning - incidental and informal. Incidental learning, a component of informal learning, is a fortuitous byproduct of some other event or activity. On the other hand, informal learning is somewhat more intentional. While often integrated within daily routines, it is not highly conscious and can be influenced by chance. Informal learning results from internal or external stimuli, involves an inductive process of reflection and action, and coincides with the learning of others. Examples of informal learning include self-directed learning, networking, coaching, and mentoring.
Kegan (2000) distinguishes between informational learning, involving a change in what we know, as opposed to transformational learning, involving a change in how we know it. Recognizing a change in how we know increases the likelihood that such knowledge will be transformed to other situations. Additional classifications include practical knowledge and emancipatory knowledge (Habermas, 1970), each components of transformational learning theory. Emancipatory education provides a key link to transformation theory. As defined by Mezirow (1991c), “emancipatory education is an organized effort to help the learner challenge presuppositions, explore alternative perspectives, transform old ways of understanding, and act on new perspectives (p. 18). It is a process whereby both learners and educators critically reflect on real problems (Heaney and Horton, 1991). In short, it is “an organized effort to precipitate or to facilitate transformative learning in others” (Mezirow, 1991b, p. xvi).

Transformative Learning Theory

Mezirow is considered the father of the transformative learning theory movement - a movement with a twenty-year history in the arena of adult education (Grabove, 1997). Although not a direct extension of prior theories, Mezirow’s ideas can be traced to humanism and critical social theory (Cranton, 1994). Further, transformational learning takes on an emancipatory view by championing liberation, a cognitive-rational approach by emphasizing the importance of reflection and discussion, and a developmental approach by acknowledging the importance of mentoring and contextually-based learning (Baumgartner, 2001).

Transformative learning results in a revision of assumptions and beliefs, through a self-reflection process which involves examining, questioning, and validating perceptions
(Cranton, 1994). Mezirow (1991b) defines this manner of learning as “the process...through critical self-reflection, which results in the reformulation of a meaning perspective to allow a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrative understanding of one’s experience” (p. xvi).

Transformative learning represents a non linear and non hierarchical theory of adult learning. There is no real distinction between stages - learners move back and forth between blurred stages, sometimes experiencing more than one stage at a time (Cranton, 1994; Taylor, 2000). In addition, the theory derives from a constructivist assumption which suggests that personal meaning is obtained and confirmed through human interaction and communication (Cranton, 1994).

The interactions and communication that occurs within mentor/protégé groups, as well as the self-reflection that occurs during the portfolio writing process, facilitate the transformative learning process. Daloz (1999) supports the notion that interaction with others and self-reflection lie at the heart of transformative learning. He suggests four conditions necessary for transformation: the presence of the other, reflective discourse, a mentoring community, and opportunities for committed action. Further, Brookfield (2000) advances two central elements of transformative learning which include objective reframing involving critical reflection on other’s assumptions and subjective reframing involving critical reflection on one’s own assumptions.

Taylor (2000) also recognizes the importance of relationships and nonconscious learning as significant factors in the transformation process, but adds affective learning as well. He suggests that “transformative learning is more than rationally based; it relies on the affective dimension of knowing such as developing an empathetic viewing of other
perspectives and trusting intuition” (p. 303). Without recognizing and/or expressing feelings, Taylor contends that the learner cannot critically reflect, leave behind the past, or accept new realities. The importance of affect will again surface during a further probing of the two key components of transformative learning - relationships and reflection.

**Relationship with others.** The importance of others with respect to an individual’s learning is a theme strongly emphasized throughout the literature on transformative learning. Cranton (1994) proposes that “when a person is interpreting the meaning of a new experience and examining the validity of prior learning, discussion with others provides a vehicle for learning” (p. 27). Mezirow (1991d) and Habermas (1984) go so far as to claim that learning is dependent on consensual validation from others. The roles others play include validating self-concept, questioning and challenging, providing alternative perspectives, providing feedback, and testing new assumptions through discussion (Cranton, 1994). Moving to a new meaning perspective becomes easier as the learner engages in a relationship with others who share the perspective (Taylor, 2000). Whatever the arena, the goal of the relationship will be to engage in discourse - “a dialogue devoted to assessing reasons presented in support of competing interpretations, by critically examining evidence, arguments, and alternative points of view” (Mezirow, 1997, p. 6). Mentoring is one such arena providing access to just such a communication process.

Daloz (1999) speaks of the adult learning quest as a journey with the mentor serving as a magician, healer, teacher and guide. He suggests that Dante’s *Divine Comedy* “is surely the most brilliant and richly detailed account of a transformational
journey ever written” (p. 28). Virgil, as a mentor to Dante, engenders trust, issues a challenge, provides encouragement, and offers a vision. In addition, Daloz offers a vivid description of a successful mentored transformational journey: “Our life is still there, but its meaning has profoundly changed because we have left home, seen it from a far, and been transformed by that vision. You can’t go home again - or rather, the home to which you return is not the one you left” (p. 27).

In keeping with the journey analogy, the mentor must not only transmit knowledge but must do so in a way that is unique to the goals of each individual’s journey. The guiding principles for effective mentoring should include engendering trust, giving the protégé a voice, introducing conflict, emphasizing positive movement, and keeping a focus on the quality of the relationship (Daloz, 1999; Daloz, 1986).

Support is one of the central functions of mentors. “Culture as a whole is guilty of providing a challenging curriculum without the necessary support to master it” (Kegan, 1994, p. 244). Acts of affirmation can include providing structure, expressing positive expectations, serving as advocate, sharing oneself, and helping to enrich the transformation process. The boundaries of support are soon penetrated, however, by the second function of mentoring, which is, providing challenges. Mentors challenge their protégés by setting tasks, engaging in discourse, heating up dichotomies, constructing hypotheses, and setting high standards (Daloz, 1999). Although these functions appear to run at cross purposes, mentors must penetrate or challenge their own support, sometimes serving as advocate and sometimes acting as devil’s advocate. For as Daloz (1986)
suggests, “by offering opposed and juxaposed frames of reference, we can help [protégés] to make meanings that are correspondingly broadly based, that rest on a felt sense of the legitimacy of the other” (p. 150).

The third function of the mentor is providing a vision - a helping hand through the transition. Mentors help protégés find their way by offering a map, suggesting new language, and providing a mirror for self-reflection (Daloz 1986, & Daloz, 1999). By providing support, challenges, and vision, the mentor helps the protégé “to become a competent traveler” (Daloz, 1986, p. ix).

Kegan (1994) claims that “people grow best when they continuously experience an ingenuous blend of support and challenge” (p. 42). Likewise, Daloz (1986) presents four possible scenarios for low to high support in conjunction with low to high challenge (Figure 2.1). He proposes that low challenge combined with low support will lead to stasis, while low support combined with high challenge will lead to retreat. Low challenge with high support results in confirmation; and perhaps the optimum scenario, high support accompanied by high challenge will lead to the desired growth.

![Figure 2.1: The Effects of Support and Challenge on Development](imageURL)

(Daloz, 1986, pg. 214)
Providing such support and challenge is particularly important early in a person’s career. Daloz (1996) acknowledges the timing of such involvement. He contends that “mentors are especially important at the beginning of people’s careers or at crucial turning points in their professional lives. The mentor seems to manifest for protégés someone who has accomplished the goals to which they now aspire, offering encouragement and concrete help” (p. 20). When discussing consciousness levels, Kegan (1994) claims that “an adult with third order consciousness will need access to support that provides fourth order consciousness….Although dogs may learn to swim by being thrown into deep water, the capacity for fourth order consciousness is not an instinct, it evolves” (p. 106, p. 169). Good mentoring can provide the necessary support during this challenging time of evolution.

Levinson (1979) posits that mentors most frequently appear when protégés are in their twenties or thirties and that such a relationship can be the most important event for a person in early adulthood. On average, the relationships last two to three years and provide protégés with model qualities and characteristics. The mentor/protégé relationship is equally important for mentors in the period of middle adulthood. “There is a measure of altruism in mentoring - a sense of meeting an obligation, of doing something for another being….But much more than altruism is involved: the mentor is doing something for himself. He is making productive use of his own knowledge and skill in middle age” (p. 253). Mentors use the relationship to maintain a connection with youth.
Reflection. The Positivist philosophy of technical rationality has long influenced professional practitioners with regard to problem-solving methods. This rigorous method involved solving “well-informed instrumental problems by applying theory and technique derived from systemic, preferably scientific knowledge” (Schön, 1987, p. 3-4). As efforts to explain scientific knowledge grew in sophistication, practitioners and theorists alike recognized that research-based theory and techniques were not always appropriate - that some situations defy technical solutions. In a world of great uncertainty and rapid change, many areas of practice fell outside the bounds of technical rationality. The inappropriateness of the technical rational model to divergent situations sparked the need for an alternative form of practice. Schön (1987) is credited with challenging technical rationality according to reflection-in-action. The distinction rests in who reflects and for what purpose. Where technical rationality employs outside experts to develop and reflect on theory which practitioners then apply, reflection-in-action involves practitioners in both the reflection and the theory development (Beck & Kosnik, 2001). Thus, reflection-in-action refers to the process of thinking about and articulating one’s own practice (Meyer, 1992).

Schön (1987) distinguishes between knowing-in-action and reflection-in-action. Knowing-in-action is “the sort of knowledge we reveal in our intelligent action – publicly observable, physical performances…” (p. 25). It is the spontaneous, yet skillful execution of some action, whereby “the knowing is in the action” (p. 25). On the other hand, reflection-in-action is more conscious and is triggered by a surprise or unanticipated event that does not fit into one’s existing understanding (Beck & Kosnik, 2001; Schön, 1992). Knowing-in-action is acquired through experience; reflection-in-
action requires experimentation. Practitioners possess a repertoire of tacit and spontaneous responses that have been acquired through experience (knowing-in-action). The surprise or unanticipated event gives rise to thinking (reflecting), which gives rise to experimentation (action) (Schön, 1992).

Although new to some practitioners, the notion of reflection-in-action is by no means a new construct. In his 1933 book, *How We Think*, Dewey defined reflection as “active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusion to which it tends” (p. 49). Dewey surmised that such reflective thinking was the goal of education (Kitchener & King, 1991). A look at more recent definitions reveals that they do not vary significantly from Dewey’s original thoughts.

Webster (1961) defines reflection as “consideration of some subject matter, idea, or purpose, often with a view to understanding or accepting it or seeing it in its right relations” (p. 1098). The idea of a triggering event and a change in meaning perspective is added to the definition as presented by Boyd and Fales (1983) - “the process of internally examining and exploring an issue of concern, triggered by an experience, which creates and clarifies meaning in terms of self and which results in a changed conceptual perspective” (p. 100). New meaning or understanding is also central in the definition by Boud, Keogh, and Walker (1985), as well as the idea that emotions play a part in the process. Reflection is “a generic term for those intellectual and affective activities in which individuals engage to explore their experiences in order to lead to new understanding and appreciation” (p. 3). As the father of transformative learning theory, for which reflection is a major component, Mezirow (1991d) maintains “reflection is the
The current accountability movement and emphasis on student academic success pushes educators to teach beyond rote facts, all the way to higher level thinking. This has placed reflective thinking and reflective writing at the forefront of academic skills (Cranton, 1994). Educational leaders must understand, support and model the development of these academic skills for teachers and students alike.

Consideration of the types, functions, and stages of reflection serves to further clarify its meaning and purpose. According to Cranton (1994), there are three types of reflection: 1) content reflection which addresses the what of problems; 2) process reflection which considers how problems are to be addressed; and 3) premise reflection which asks why the problem exists in the first place. Assessing the what, how, and why of an event or situation serves to guide further action. Reflective learning results when learners gain as much detail as possible, review the affective dimensions, and reevaluate the experience (Mezirow, 1991a).

A number of familiar tactics can be used to facilitate the reflection process, including advising, listening, answering, demonstrating, observing, initiating, and criticizing. Each of these strategies builds upon the next bringing private convictions to public scrutiny (Schön, 1987). Reflection can be stimulated through the use of critical questioning, consciousness raising, praxis, and journal writing (Cranton, 1994). Writing helps the learner to recognize that process and results are inextricably linked (Daloz, 1986). Marsick (1991) places this writing back within the context of relationships, advocating learning journals as “useful tool[s] for reframing, as well as for helping
people become aware of their own practical reasoning and theory building….” (p. 41).

He suggests that these learning journals be discussed in groups.

While specific tools and strategies aide the reflective process, the ability to reflect is also dependent on innate factors such as developmental level and psychological type. Kitchener and King (1991) put forth a reflective judgment model which suggests “that the ability to make reflective judgments is an outcome of a developmental sequence that both limits learning and can be influenced by learning” (p. 160). Their model is based on a seven stage process with stage one representing knowing characterized by a concrete belief system, and stage seven representing knowing characterized by uncertainty and subjectivity. They have identified developmental parameters for learning that have implications for education. “First, individuals are quite consistent in their reasoning across different tasks” (p. 166). On average, students in the same stage will approach ill-structured problems in a similar fashion. Second, “even under conditions designed to elicit the highest stage of reasoning of which people are capable, individuals are seldom able to produce reasoning that is more than one stage above their typical response” (p. 166). These data suggests there is an age-related ceiling on the highest possible attainment level for reflective judgment. Third, the data strongly suggest that there is a sequential progression of change in reflective judgment capabilities; and that individuals seldom comprehend assumptions or produce reasoning that is more than one level above their stage of typical performance. Educational leaders benefit from such research as they attempt to move students toward higher level thinking. Those who train educational leaders may also gain from these understandings as they structure reflective opportunities within their preparation and professional development programs.
Personality type represents another factor impacting one’s reflective abilities. Cranton (1994) presents a viable argument supporting psychological preferences as relevant to transformative learning theory. Considering the goal of individuation with respect to both adult education and transformative learning, she suggests that “self awareness is the foundation of mindful transformation, and becoming conscious of how we function psychologically is pivotal to self awareness” (p. 187). Knowing that extroverts are oriented to external objects, people, and events; introverts are oriented to personal inner factors; thinkers judge by logic; feelers judge by value; sensors place emphasis on facts, details and concrete events; and intuitives place emphasis on possibilities and imagination, Cranton analyzed the process of transformative learning through the lens of psychological type theory. For each of the following personality types – extraverted thinking (ET), extraverted feeling (EF), extraverted sensing (ES), extraverted intuitive (EN), introverted thinking (IT), introverted feeling (IF), introverted sensing (IS) and introverted intuitive (IN) - she asked the question, “would a person of this type be likely to: be aware of values and assumptions, be receptive to trigger events, question values and assumptions, engage in content and process reflection, engage in premise reflection, engage in rational discourse, revise values and assumptions, and revise meaning perspectives” (p. 108).

From her analysis, Cranton (1994) concluded that psychological preferences do have an effect on the transformational learning process, especially when moving from critical reflection to transformation. Some personality types are more likely to engage in premise reflection while others are more likely to revise meaning perspectives. For example, “thinking types eagerly engage in several components of the process but in the
end hold onto their principles and assumptions; feeling types readily reverse their values but are not given to critical reflection and discourse” (p.118). Information on personality type could prove very beneficial to mentors as they guide protégés through the transformative learning process. Such information could assist program planners as they attempt to assign mentor/protégé pairs. In addition, having knowledge of a protégé’s psychological preferences could provide the mentor with valuable information. For example, having insight into how personality type impacts learning and development, leadership style, goal setting, and conflict resolution could greatly enhance a mentor’s ability to provide the most appropriate individualized guidance.

Conclusion

Novice principals need high quality professional development as they transition to building level administration. Novice principals face numerous challenges as they enter their administrative careers. Being accountable for student academic success tops the list. Such accountability proves even more difficult when coupled with the other forces shaping school experiences and, thus, the principalship. The emphasis on shared governance forces principals to share decision-making, while still accepting the brunt of accountability. Societal issues such as crime, poverty, and an increase in non English speaking families, adds to the difficulty in achieving academic success as children from these vulnerable families come to school ill prepared to learn. In addition, the education system receives much of the blame for the nation’s economic crisis. People perceive schools as consuming a great deal of money, yet not providing desired results (Murphy & Beck, 1994).
Addressing these challenges takes time, but results are expected now. Facilitative leadership, with its emphasis on shared decision-making, provides a means to deal with the needed change. The sharing of problems and solutions with a large number of people proves beneficial to everyone involved. Still, such change will likely take more time than people want to allow. Incrementalism best describes how the educational system has changed in the past and how it will likely change in the future (Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach, 1999).

The goal of the Administrative Leadership Academy under study was to assist novice principals in confronting these challenges by improving their learning and leadership practices. Emphasis was placed on the use of sustained reflection as a tool for solving job-embedded problems. Mentoring and portfolio writing provide the vehicles for developing reflective practices, providing much opportunity for self-reflection, as well as for reflecting with others.

Reflection, which involves intellectually and affectively exploring experiences for new understanding (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985), is a key component of transformative learning theory. Examining, questioning and validating ones perceptions is needed for transformative learning to occur. Reflection, according to this adult learning theory, is enhanced by discussion with others. Such discussion provides a vehicle for learning (Cranton, 1994). Mentoring serves this purpose. Through discussion, mentors question, challenge, and validate the assumptions of the novice principals as they engage in the learning process.

While one would not expect an overnight transformation in the way principals solve problems; sustained reflection through mentoring and portfolio writing has the
capacity to impact the performance of novice principals. Knowledge and skills gained through such focused participation, coupled with past experience, will likely equip novice principals with the tools needed to better handle the non-structured problems so prevalent within schools. As principals develop expert problem-solving skills, their confidence grows. To some degree, the confidence becomes contagious as newly developing instructional leaders employ the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of the ISLLC standards. Collective problem solving and collaboration become the norm. Challenges and problems are no longer feared, but instead viewed as potential opportunities for learning and growth (Leithwood & Steinbach, 1995). Within this new context of collaboration and opportunity for growth, instructional leaders become the facilitators for building organizational capacity. In their role as instructional leader, they guide the collaborative efforts in the direction of improving instructional effectiveness, and ultimately increasing student learning and achievement.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The research methods applied within this study are supported by an interpretivist perspective, “which portrays a world in which reality is socially constructed, complex, and ever changing” (Glesne, 1999, p. 5). Utilizing an interpretist lens requires the researcher to concentrate on the interactions of human relationships so prevalent within the educational environment. Glesne (1999) suggests that “…every human situation is novel, emergent, and filled with multiple, often conflicting meanings and interpretations…” (p. 22). The construction of knowledge through social relationships represents an important aspect of the mentoring component of the Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program.

Research Design

Choosing a particular design for research inquiry is best determined by considering information needs, i.e., what kind of information is being sought, where will the information be obtained, who will use the information and how will it be used, when is the information needed and what resources are available to conduct the study (Patton, 1990). The Administrative Leadership Academy intended to provide meaningful professional development to novice principals so that they would remain in their
positions, performing effectively and with adequate levels of job satisfaction. Ongoing
evaluation of professional development activities helped determine the effectiveness of
such interventions. Specifically, what effect did the Academy curriculum,
mentoring/coaching, and the development of an administrative portfolio have on
improving administrator practice?

In an attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of the Administrative Leadership
Academy in its formative years, a two-year qualitative, evaluative, case study was
conducted. The dissertation study was framed within the larger two year study and
focused on the nature of the mentor/protégé coaching process, as well as the development
of skills necessary for reflective administrator portfolio writing. The researcher was the
primary data gathering instrument and a participant observer in the Academy. A novice
principal and her mentor were the subject of the study, and were observed at all Academy
functions as well as on the school site. Data collection methods included interviews,
observations, and document analysis. Interviews were conducted with the novice
principal, mentor, superintendent, teachers, and parents. Observations occurred at
Academy regional meetings, mentor/protégé diad meetings, and building level meetings
conducted by the novice principal. In addition, documents pertaining to the
demographics, goals and objectives, and student performance of the school and school
district were analyzed.

Qualitative Research Methodology

In the past decade, qualitative methods have grown in popularity within
education-related research (Attride-Stirling, 2001). No doubt this popularity results from
the numerous characteristics of this research method so befitting a dynamic and relational
environment such as education. The ability to engage in face-to-face dialogue as well as to gather data onsite allows for a more holistic picture of the participants being studied. These characteristics seemed most appropriate for the data gathering needs of this study.

For example, personal contact (Patton, 1990) and compelling narrative (Janesick, 2000) between and among individual participants were observed during regional meetings of the Academy, as well as during mentor/protégé small group sessions. Similar data were obtained on site as the principal interacted with staff, students, and parents. Gathering data at the school site extended the possibilities for naturalistic methods of inquiry, taking into account contextual issues beyond attendance at Academy-sponsored functions (Patton, 1990). Studying individual participants allowed the researcher to investigate, analyze, and report findings in great depth and detail. Interviews with parents, teachers, the superintendent, and the mentor; observations at regional and building level meetings, observations of the physical school environment; and analysis of documents such as continuous improvement plans, school handbooks, proficiency results and school report card data allowed the researcher to obtain a more holistic understanding of the impact of the Administrative Leadership Academy on leadership practice, and ultimately, on student performance (Janesick, 2000).

Case study

A case study format allowed this researcher to probe deeply (Bassey, 1999) into the particulars of the situations, events, and phenomena (Merriam, 1988) surrounding a mentor/protégé team as they engaged in the activities of the Academy, as well as the application of such activities within the school environment. Studying the Academy participants in the school setting (Bassey, 1999) provided rich, thick, descriptive data
permitting theoretical generalizations to be made inductively as they emerged (Merriam, 1988). Prolonged engagement with purposefully selected participants allowed the researcher to collect sufficient data in order to explore significant features, create plausible interpretations, test for trustworthiness, construct and convey convincing and worthwhile arguments, relate the arguments back to the literature, and provide insight into possibilities for further research (Bassey, 1999).

Providing a holistic perspective of a program and detailed description of individuals in their natural setting, “case study can be a prime research strategy for developing educational theory which illuminates policy and enhances practice” (Bassey, 1999, p. xiii). The Administrative Leadership Academy modeled administrative professional development activities centered on reflective practice. The results of this evaluative case study informed policy makers and practitioners as to the possible outcomes of utilizing such practices. This was essential information for policy makers as they develop the mandated requirements for the preparation and continued professional growth of educational administrators.

Because this dissertation research was situated within the context of a larger study, the interactions between five researchers, studying three different cases, allowed for cross-case analysis. The investigation of frequencies within cases, as well as the aggregation of these measures across different cases, improved the potential transferability of the research findings (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1995). Transferability is not the ultimate goal of qualitative research, however, individual interpretation and application of the findings is an expectation. Having three cases that possessed different characteristics (i.e., urban vs. rural districts, elementary vs. middle/junior high vs. high
school buildings, female vs. male administrators, racial variation, and different geographical regions within the same state) aided in the individual transferability process.

**Holistic Approach.** Researchers in a qualitative case study look at the particulars of a single case in a manner that solicits a “holistic description and explanation” of the phenomenon under inquiry. It is the “in-depth investigation of the interdependencies of parts and of the patterns that emerge” that enables the researcher to “predict from a single sample” (Sturman, 1994, p. 61).

The holistic feature of qualitative case studies takes on an even greater significance when the research being conducted is within an educational setting, where human relationships and interactions are so prevalent. “The distinguishing feature of case study is the belief that human systems develop a characteristic wholeness or integrity and are not simply a loose collection of traits” (p. Sturman, 1994, 61).

As this researcher studied the novice principal, many others who interacted with this case study participant were also interviewed and/or observed. “One of the important principles therefore in researching holistic experiences is to try to maximize the number of perspectives, or to access the experiences in different ways, and from different angles” (Fook, 2002, p. 87). The subjectivity of the researcher will be questioned less when the final report contains documentation from numerous others who have had direct contact with the case study participant. For the novice principal participants of the Academy, the mentor, as well as the superintendent, teachers, and parents provided these additional perspectives.
Purposeful Sampling. Quantitative research usually involves random sampling. This process involves selecting subjects from a larger group in a manner that assures each individual is chosen by chance (Vogt, 1999). On the other hand, qualitative research usually involves non random sampling. There are several reasons for using such a strategy. “Qualitative researchers neither work (usually) with populations large enough to make random sampling meaningful, nor is their purpose that of producing generalizations. Rather, qualitative researchers tend to select each of their cases purposefully” (Glesne, 1999, p. 28-9).

Purposeful sampling is based on the premise that the researcher wants to gain a great deal of insight into the phenomenon under study; therefore, the sample needs to be one which provides the greatest opportunity to learn (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 2000). For this study, the novice principals under study and the accompanying mentors were selected purposefully. Regional coordinators assisted in the selection of mentor/protégé pairs, employing prior knowledge to choose participants they believed best contributed to the understanding of reflective practice via mentoring and portfolio development. They recommended participants who demonstrated genuine interest and engagement in Academy activities. Although participants were invited to participate in the study based on coordinator recommendation, their ultimate decision to participate was strictly voluntary. To add breadth to the findings, the research team attempted to select participants who cut across several demographic characteristics. The sample included participants who represent three different regions of the state, three different district types
(urban, rural, and small urban/suburban), and three different school levels (elementary, middle, and secondary). The sample also included variation with respect to participant race and gender.

Evaluative - Patton (1990) defines an evaluation as “any effort to increase human effectiveness through systematic data-based inquiry” (p. 11). In addition, Stenhouse (1988) maintains: “In evaluative case studies a single case or collection of cases is studied in depth with the purpose of providing educational actors or decision makers (administrators, teachers, parents, pupils, etc.) with information that will help them to judge the merit and worth of policies, programmes or institutions” (p. 50). Performing a qualitative, evaluative, educational case study allowed the researchers to better understand and appraise the activities of the Academy (Bassey, 1999). Passing the descriptive, explanatory, and judgment-based findings onto policy makers may affect professional development opportunities for school leaders (Merriam, 1988). This influence may, in turn, impact administrative practice within the school setting.

Researcher Role

In a qualitative case study, “the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1988, p. 19); and therefore directly influences the quality of information observed and obtained (Patton, 1990). One way to enhance the quality of the findings is to take on the role of a participant observer (Merriam, 1988). Participant observation is a process through which the “observer’s presence in a social situation is maintained for the purpose of scientific investigation” (McCall & Simmons 1969, p. 91). Participant observation allowed this researcher to actively engage and
experience the Academy activities while still carefully observing and consciously recording details of the situation (Glesne, 1999).

According to Spradley (1980), there are varying degrees of involvement/participation when one takes on the role of participant observer. As shown in Figure 3.1, the type of participation ranges from nonparticipation where the researcher only collects data through observation, to complete participation where the researcher studies a situation in which he/she is already an “ordinary participant” (p.61).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Involvement</th>
<th>Type of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Involvement</td>
<td>Nonparticipation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Spradley, 1980, p 60)

Figure 3.1: Types and Degrees of Participant Observation

For the Academy study, this researcher participated at a moderate level, maintaining “balance between being an insider and outsider” (p.60). When gathering data at the school environment, the researcher took on more of an outsider role, observing the activities, people, and physical environment. During regional Academy meetings, however, the researcher took a more active role in activities. Both types of involvement are necessary when a participant observer comes to a social setting with the intent of gathering data (Spradley, 1980).
Some consider participant observation an oxymoron because the term implies simultaneous subjectivity and objectivity (Tedlock, 2000). Actively participating in activities may impact the findings since “an observer cannot help but affect and be affected by the setting, and this interaction may lead to a distortion of the real situation” (Merriam, 1988, p. 103). Such subjectivity can serve as an advantage to qualitative research, allowing the readers to become more involved in the meaning-making process as they attempt to transfer the findings to their own contextual situations. Gergen and Gergen (2000) suggest that, “as researchers join participants in inquiry and writing, the line between researcher and subject is blurred, and control over representation is increasingly shared” (p. 1035).

Grounded Theory

Traditional views of research suggest that theorizing involves a methodical set of ideas, developed and applied a priori, which serve to explain as well as to generalize. An alternative perspective suggests there are a variety of processes and experiences that enable the development of theory. Grounded theory is one such method in which “theory grows out of extensive direct observation in a natural or non-experimental setting” (Vogt, 1999).

Grounded theory is defined by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as “the discovery of theory from data systematically obtained from social research” (p. 2). Such theory, they contend, is composed of conceptual elements known as categories, as well as hypotheses which define the relationship between the categories. Although categories may prove difficult to define in a highly volatile arena such as education, Glaser and Strauss
recommend that the categories be “abstract enough to make [the researcher’s] theory a general guide to multi-conditional, ever-changing, daily situations” (p. 242).

Grounded theory methods enable the researcher to develop theory from experiences encountered during data gathering rather than imposing preconceived theory (Fook, 2001). Generating theory requires constant redesign and reintegration of notions; thus researchers cannot code first, and then analyze. When the goal is to generate theory from data, the three processes of collecting, coding and analyzing data must be done together as much as possible. Throughout this process, the researcher identifies emerging gaps and decides on the next steps for data collection. This process, referred to as theoretical sampling continues until one achieves data saturation (Glaser and Strauss). Since obtaining data saturation would suggest an infinite timeline, this study employed a modified version of grounded theory. Because this study was framed within the context of the larger two year evaluative study, saturation was achieved to the degree that time allowed.

Glaser and Strauss also recommend comparative analysis as a strategy for furthering discovery of grounded theory. Such comparative analysis adds validity to a study as replication validates facts. Comparing data across case studies enabled the researcher to not only benefit from his/her own insights, but the insights of other researchers throughout the entire study.

Data Collection

Case study research has no specific formula for data collection methods, but instead relies on an eclectic and evolving approach (Bassey, 1999). Given the dominance of the interpretivist perspective in qualitative case study inquiry, the researcher’s data
collection methods must gain access to multiple perspectives through prolonged and in-depth interaction with relevant people (Glesne, 1999). Because of the people-oriented nature of the educational environment, this researcher heeded the advice of Lofland (1971) with respect to collecting qualitative data: get close to the people and situations in order to capture depth and detail, seize what is actually said and what actually takes place, include a great deal of description concerning the people, interactions, activities and settings, and include direct quotations. Detailed description of the Academy activities was obtained through numerous methods. With the researcher as the main research instrument, the three data collection methods chosen for this study included interviews, observations, and document analysis (Bassey, 1999; Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1988; Patton, 1990). This use of multiple data collection methods, known as triangulation, served to add credibility to the research findings (Glesne 1999; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 1988).

**Interviews**

To some degree decisions about whom to interview and what questions to ask emerge in qualitative research (Merriam, 1988). For this study, a preliminary set of questions was developed by the research team. This more deliberate process allowed for careful consideration of the structure and content of interview questions, the order of questions within the protocol, the categories of interview participants, and the timing for various questions across the research timeline. The kinds of questions asked included background/demographic questions, knowledge questions, experience/behavior questions, and opinion/value questions (Patton, 1980). The category of questions asked centered on the major constructs of the academy investigation: mentoring, portfolio
development, and school practice. The participants interviewed included the novice principal and mentor, teachers, parents, and the superintendent (see appendices C-F for copies of the interview guides).

The nature of the interview questions were semi-structured so that the research team could take advantage of the “codable nature” of pre-established categories (Fontana & Frey, 2000), while still allowing for a certain degree of open-ended response from the participants. While unstructured, open-ended interview questions better capture the participant viewpoints without influencing those points of views with questionnaire categories, they are not without limitations. Unstructured questions require more time, effort, and, in the case of written responses, better writing skills on the part of the interviewee. Likewise, the researcher’s task is more difficult as well. Such difficulties include the inability to probe or extend responses and the increased difficulty in analyzing data that is neither systematic nor standardized (Patton, 1990). Thus, the desire of the research team to obtain specific information in a finite time period resulted in the choice to structure questions across specific categories.

Most interviews took place in an individual, verbal, face-to-face format and were tape recorded and transcribed. Some transcriptions were done by a paid transcriber. Others were transcribed by the researcher because transcription is “an important step in the process of ‘meaning-making’ and co-construction of interpretive findings” (Cannon Poindexter, 2002, p. 75). In addition to tape recording, hand written notes were taken to capture off-target talk or conversation that occurred after the interview was complete. Often such conversation adds a great deal of enhancement to the respondent’s answers (Glesne, 1999).
The one exception to the individual, verbal face-to-face interview format was a focus group interview with six teachers which occurred near the end of the study. In addition, those staff members who were either unable or did not wish to participate in the focus group interview, were invited to address the focus group questions in written form and send their responses to the researcher. Self-addressed stamped envelopes and a copy of the questions were provided to all full-time certificated staff members. By using this modified focus group interview format, over 65% of all staff provided some feedback to the focus group questions (see appendix G for the focus group interview questions).

Observation

According to Merriam (1988), to be considered a research tool, observation must serve a purpose, be deliberately planned and systematically recorded, and be subjected to checks and controls with regard to validity and reliability. Because of the emerging nature of qualitative research, any observations taken in the early stages of data collection could indeed serve a future research purpose. The method of recording observations for this research was to record hand-written observations into a spiral notebook, then type and transfer the information into the data collection software program as soon as possible, preferably the same day. A consistent format was applied when transferring all observation notes to electronic version. The format included information on the contact type, site, and date, names of all people present, the recording of detailed observations, and a final analysis of salient points and emerging themes (see appendix H).

Formal observations were conducted at all Academy related events including regional meetings, as well as mentor/protégé small group meetings. At the school
building level, observations were taken at numerous functions such as leadership team meetings, faculty meetings, professional development activities, continuous improvement plan meetings and community meetings. Likewise, observations of the physical environment were noted during any site visit in an attempt to better understand the school culture.

**Document Analysis**

Documents provide stability and objectivity to the qualitative case study, “ground[ing] an investigation in the context of the problem being investigated” (Merriam, 1988, p. 108). In addition to supporting the situatedness of the study, written texts are important components of qualitative research because they endure time, are often easily accessed and usually require minimal cost to obtain. Despite these advantages, the use of document analysis for data collection warrants a word of caution. The actual analysis of written documents lends itself to subjectivity since the researcher’s interpretation may differ somewhat from the meaning originally intended by the creator. As Hodder (2000) suggests, meaning does not reside in a text but in the writing and reading of it. As the text is reread in different contexts it is given new meanings, often contradictory and always socially embedded. Thus, there is no ‘original’ or ‘true’ meaning outside specific historical contexts (p. 704).

The gap between the author’s original meaning and the reader’s understanding lends itself to the increased possibility of multiple interpretations or partial truths. Despite researcher subjectivity in interpretation, document analysis still increases the validity of the findings as one component of triangulated data sources. When used in
conjunction with observations and interviews, documents provide another form of evidence for which any suspected researcher biases can be understood and compared (Hodder, 2000).

For this particular study of the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP, documents were collected, read, analyzed, and stored throughout the duration of the study. School documents included continuous improvement plans, handbooks, meeting agendas, memos, newsletters, newspaper articles, school report cards, and proficiency data. Portfolios, written by program participants, constituted important documents to be analyzed, as well as all material distributed at any Academy functions.

Data Analysis

Just as is the case with data collection, “there is relatively little said on how to analyze the textual material that qualitative researchers are presented with at the end of the data gathering stage” (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 386). It is also difficult to make a clear distinction between data collection and data analysis because with qualitative research, the collection, analysis, and reporting often occur simultaneously (Meriam, 1988; Stake, 1995).

Kvale (1996) argues that the researcher’s collected information, whether interview transcripts, fieldnotes, or site documents do not yet constitute data. Such materials only become data when they endure some formal means of analysis. This analysis usually involves separating information into parts. Analysis should commence with a review of the research proposal, followed by several reads through all data, making notes in the margins (Merriam, 1988). These margin notes represent the initial attempt to organize the data into meaningful parts.
Thematic analysis was the dominant tactic utilized in this study and “is arguably the most common approach to analysis of data in the social sciences” (Roulston, 2001, p. 280). Some preliminary categories from the literature review and pre-pilot data were generated, but likely altered as additional themes and patterns emerge (Fook, 2002). The research team kept an ongoing list of emerging themes to use when analyzing and coding data (see appendix I for a list of themes/codes). Thematic analysis occurred both manually and via a computer software program for qualitative data analysis. For manual analysis, the researcher read and made margin notations on all observation, interview, and documentation material. This manual note-taking represented the preliminary attempts to search for patterns and themes, building a logical chain of evidence to support later theoretical assumptions (Huberman & Miles, 1984).

NUD*IST served as a primary research tool for managing documents and building and testing theories about the data. "NUD*IST is a computer program designed to aid users in handling non-numerical and unstructured data in a qualitative analysis" (QSR NUD*IST 4 User Guide, 1997). The research team imported interview and observation transcripts to NUD*IST. To aid in the theory building process, the software program provided the means for coding, sorting, and searching the large amount of qualitative data.

Data Storage

All materials gathered were stored by the researcher. Files with description and dates were maintained for all documents, observation/field notes, and interview transcripts. All interview tapes were also labeled and properly stored. With the
exception of the final report and dissertation, all materials pertinent to data collection will be destroyed three years after completion of the study.

Trustworthiness

For the results of this study to have any impact on educational leadership practice, the findings must be believable and trustworthy. Policy makers, as well as practitioners, must deem the findings valuable, reliable, and ethically sound (Merriam, 1988). Guba and Lincoln (1989) offer the following criteria for judging the trustworthiness of a qualitative study: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. These criteria parallel traditional standards of internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity.

Credibility

Certain limitations are inevitable when one is dealing with a human data gathering and analyzing instrument - mistakes are made, opportunities are missed, and personal biases interfere (Merriam, 1988). Thus, credibility in qualitative methods “hinges to a great extent on the skill, competence, and rigor of the person doing fieldwork” (Patton, 1990, p. 14). In order to increase the credibility of results, procedures are implemented to verify the subjective interpretations of the researcher as a human data gathering instrument. The following verification procedures were implemented throughout the qualitative evaluative case study of the Administrative Leadership Academy EYP: prolonged engagement and persistent observation, triangulation, and member checking (Glesne, 1999; Merriam, 1988).

Prolonged Engagement and Persistent Observation. Data gathering for this dissertation was contained within and benefited from the larger in-depth evaluative study
Triangulation. Triangulation “is an effort to see if what we are observing and reporting carries the same meaning when found under different circumstances” (Stake, 1996, p.13 as quoted in Perez, 1999, p. 116). The idea is “to examine a single social phenomenon from more than one vantage point” (Schwandt, 1997, p. 163). In this particular study, there were two forms of triangulation. The data collection methods triangulated to include observations, interviews, and document analysis. The use of multiple data collection methods provided a comparative advantage. It allowed the
researcher to compare what people were saying in public versus private, and to see if what they said was consistent over time (Patton, 1990).

Triangulation of investigators also occurred due to the nature of the evaluative study. Within the context of the larger Academy study, three researchers, each studying a different case, collaborated on numerous aspects of the research project. Collaboration on the development of interview protocols, identification of codes and emerging themes, and analysis of data provided the means for a cross-case analysis.

**Member Checking.** Member checking is “a sociological term for soliciting feedback from respondents on the inquirer’s findings” (Schwandt, 1997, p. 88). It allows the participants to review drafts in order to validate accuracy and or suggest alternative language (Stake, 1995). For the purposes of this study, the participants were invited to review their own interview transcript, as well as portions of the data collection analysis that represented their viewpoints. Not only was participation in the study voluntary, but the participants had input as to what data was collected as well as what data to include or exclude from the final report. Glesne (1999) refers to this as “open democratic research” (p. 124).

**Transferability**

Although transferability parallels the more traditional standard of goodness known as external validity or generalizability, there is a prominent disconnect between the two notions (Wolcott, 1995). According to Guba and Lincoln (1989), with qualitative case studies the burden of claim to transferability lies with the receiver of the findings and is dependent on the “degree of similarity” between the context of the researcher and the context of the reader (p. 241). By providing an extensive and detailed
account of the study, the researcher facilitates “transferability judgments on the part of others who may wish to apply the study to their own situations” (p. 242).

**Dependability**

In quantitative research, reliability refers to the extent to which others can replicate the findings through like research (Merriam, 1988). Dependability represents a parallel term for qualitative research referring to “the stability of data over time” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 242). Qualitative studies in fields of social science do not lend themselves to replication because the findings are socially and contextually situated, making them impossible to recreate.

Because what is being studied in education is assumed to be in flux, multifaceted, and highly contextual, because information gathered is a function of who gives it and how skilled the researcher is at getting it, and because the emergent design of a qualitative case study precludes a priori controls, achieving reliability in the traditional sense is not only fanciful but impossible (Merriam, 1988, p. 171).

**Confirmability**

Confirmability parallels objectivity in conventional criteria. It is concerned with “establishing the fact that the data and interpretations of an inquiry [are] not figments of the inquirer’s imagination” (Schwandt, 1997, p. 164). The use of member checks, as well as maintaining an organized documentation system helped this researcher establish confirmability. An accurate documentation system provided an audit trail that assisted in linking the subjective interpretations of the researcher back to the data.

**Ethics**

Four guidelines seem to overlap all codes of ethics adopted by major scholarly associations: accuracy, deception, privacy and confidentiality, and informed consent (Christians, 2000). With respect to the qualitative evaluative case study of the
Administrative Leadership Academy, accuracy and deception were addressed through such credibility tactics as triangulation and member checks. Protecting the privacy and confidentiality of all participants through the use of pseudonyms was also employed. Informed consent for this research involved submitting an application for full review to the Behavioral and Social Science Institutional Review Board. All participants were asked to read participant information letters revealing the duration, methods, risks, and purpose of the research project (see appendix J), as well as read and sign informed consent forms (see appendix K).

Limitations

Case study research has been criticized for its lack of rigor, for its lack of basis in scientific generalization, and for the extended time needed to conduct studies which results in “massive, unreadable document[s]” (Yin, 1994, p. 9). Likewise, small sample sizes limit what can be learned about a population, program, or phenomenon. However, Rawlings (1942) advocates the opposite. He states that one “may learn a great deal of the general from studying the specific, whereas it is impossible to know the specific by studying the general” (p. 359). Studying the particularities of a single, purposefully selected case in a naturalistic setting can indeed provide thick rich data that are reality based. In addition to a strong basis in reality, Adelman, Kemmis, and Jenkins (1980) recognize the following additional advantages to case study research: the attention to subtlety and complexity, the recognition of viewpoint discrepancies and the offering of support for alternative interpretations, the production of descriptively rich material, the contribution to action, and the presentation of data in a more publicly accessible format.
Qualitative research in general also suffers criticism. Stake (1995), suggests that the contributions are slow and biased and the subjective reporting of the findings offer little payoff to the advancements of the social sciences. The validity of truth is often questioned in qualitative research because “the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1988, p. 19). How one knows is affected by what one knows and what knowledge one possesses influences one’s views (Landson-Billings, 2000 & Lincoln & Denzin, 2000). Usher and Edwards (1994) question the truthful representation of qualitative inquiry when the “knowledge claimed is dependent upon the activity of the researcher” (p. 148). Likewise, Richardson’s (1992) view on the subject is that “no matter how we stage the text, we - the authors - are doing the staging. As we speak about the people we study, we also speak for them. As we inscribe their lives, we bestow meaning and promulgate values” (p. 131). Still, Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggest that opinion should not be seen as a limitation, but instead as a “springboard” for generating theory in qualitative research. They advocate the deliberate “cultivation” of reflection on past experiences as a viable and valuable source of data for systematic theorizing (p. 252).

Significance of the Study

School principals, now more than ever, are being held accountable for student achievement. This increased accountability contributes to the growing shortage of school administrators. Quality professional development is needed to assist novice principals in the transition to the high demanding job of school administration, to provide them with tools for success, and to keep them in their jobs longer. This study can potentially provide policy makers, preparation programs, and professional development
organizations with information concerning the impact of sustained reflection on the
professional growth of beginning school administrators. In this case, mentoring and
portfolio writing provided the vehicle for such reflection.
This chapter provides a discussion of the data analysis for this study. The chapter begins with a brief overview of the educational climate of the state, a description of the school district setting, and an introduction to the culture/climate of the school. The data will be used to support a discussion of the professional growth of Mrs. Reed, an early career principal at Unified Junior High School in Unified School District. Academy participation, mentoring support, and portfolio writing will all be discussed with respect to their supporting roles for such growth. A discussion will pursue as to the effect of the principals’ growth on the student outcome data for Unified Junior High School. Finally, a correlation between the skills needed to develop administrative portfolios and to perform as an instructional leader will be proposed based on an analysis of student outcome data across a cohort of the Administrative Leadership Academy participants.

Accountability within the Larger Context

In the Midwestern state where the study took place and at the time of this study, all school districts faced performance assessment against legislatively mandated accountability standards. State legislation, effective November 21, 1997 abolished the existing system for monitoring school performance and created a new system based on
specific state performance standards including mandatory testing for all students in
grades 3rd – 8th. Revised first in 2000 and again in 2003, the primary provision of the bill
mandated that schools and school districts undergo yearly evaluation based on
performance standards including graduation rates, attendance rates, and specific
percentages of students demonstrating proficiency on state-administered standardized
tests. The legislation further mandated that the individual school and school district
results be public information. Thus, beginning in 1998, the District Report Card/School
Report Card became an annual document for reporting school/school district performance
with respect to student achievement. The districts are rated based on satisfactory
completion of specific standards known as performance indicators. The most recent
district report card consists of 22 performance indicators. The first fifteen indicators
reflect a 75% passing rate on 4th, 6th, and 9th grade proficiency examinations in the five
content areas of citizenship, mathematics, reading, writing, and science. Five additional
indicators represent an 85% passing rate for 10th grade students who took the 9th grade
proficiency tests as 8th, 9th, and 10th graders. The final two indicators represent a 93%
attendance rate and a 90% graduation rate. Prior to 2003, there were 27 indicators,
including the current 22, plus 12th grade proficiency results on each of the five academic
content areas.

Based on performance across these indicators, districts can rate in one of four
categories: Excellent – district met 21 or 22 performance indicators; Effective – district
met 17 to 20 performance indicators; Continuous Improvement – district met 11 to 16
performance indicators; Academic Watch – district met 7 to 10 performance indicators;
and Academic Emergency – district met 6 or fewer performance indicators. Districts
receiving the ranking of Academic Emergency, Academic Watch, or Continuous Improvement are required to generate continuous improvement plans. These plans include concrete and measurable goals and objectives for improving student outcomes. Those districts operating under Academic Emergency and Academic Watch submit plans to the State Department of Education. In addition, these same districts receive support and guidance provided by the State Board of Education. ²

Simultaneous to this regularized reporting of outcome data, the State Department of Education, in conjunction with Advisory Committees and the Board of Regents, recognized a need to further clarify the specific learning standards against which school and district performance was measured. The challenge came in removing uncertainties about grade level to grade level expectations, as children transition through the educational system. Educators, policy makers and the general public agreed that realistic, clear and carefully aligned academic content standards were foundational to any improvement efforts. In 1997, six writing teams were appointed and charged with drafting these common expectations. Writing teams for each of the content areas – the arts, English language arts, foreign languages, mathematics, science, and social studies – consisted of individuals representing teachers, university professors, parents, and community leaders. In January of 2000, the Governor convened a Commission to further examine the work surrounding the content standards, also calling for the development of content standards in the additional area of technology.

² Information about the School/School District Report Cards was obtained from the State Department of Education website.
English language arts and mathematics were the first two content areas to be developed. The drafts standards underwent numerous revisions based on public feedback and were eventually adopted in December, 2001. Based on this early work, state officials defined the process for developing the remaining five content standards as including the following steps: identify an advisory committee for each content area; create writing teams; develop common expectations to serve as a framework for drafting the content standards; invite local and state professional organizations to review initial drafts; solicit public feedback through such means as focus group meetings, public service announcements, and electronic feedback; and obtain adoption by the State Board of Education. Following adoption of the standards, Department of Education curriculum specialists would develop curriculum guides and models, parent handbooks, and achievement and diagnostic assessments based on the academic content standards and grade-level indicators.

Following this proposed plan, the social studies and science academic content standards were adopted in December, 2002. Every elementary teacher in the state received bound copies of each of the four content area standards; and middle/high school teachers received copies of those particular to their content areas. The resources are designed around standards, benchmarks, and indicators. Within each standard, a set of benchmarks provide key grade level checkpoints in order to judge student progress toward meeting the particular standard. Within the benchmarks, there are grade level indicators which further articulate the essential learning necessary for completion of the benchmarks.
At the present time, the remaining three content areas of foreign language, technology, and the arts are in draft form, scheduled to be adopted in December, 2003. Due to substantial cuts in the state education budget, the remaining standards may not be printed in book form, but only made available via the Internet.\(^3\)

The emphasis on standards-based accountability with respect to student educational outcomes has and will continue to impact the decision-making processes for educational leaders throughout this Midwestern state. State initiatives and mandates such as those described above, in combination with national mandates, force educators to constantly consider how their actions support the bottom line goal of improving student outcomes. The use of data becomes increasingly important to the decision-making process. The *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) is one such national mandate impacting the importance of data-driven dialog in the school environment. A re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), NCLB interprets the major educational reform efforts set forth by President Bush. Built around assessment, accountability, and school improvement, the act is designed to “close the achievement gap with, accountability, flexibility, and choice so that no child is left behind” (NCLB Act, Reauthorization of ESEA, H.R.1/P.L. 107-110). NCLB calls for the dissemination of data from school districts to the State, from the State to the public, and from school districts to the public. The act requires districts to meet or exceed state objectives as evidenced through mandatory assessment of not less than 95% of all students including economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and

\(^3\) Information about the Academic Content Standards was obtained through a personal interview with an associate director at the State Department of Education.
students with limited English proficiency. These assessment results must be published annually via the School/School District Report Card. The Report Card must include number, names, and duration of schools identified for school improvement; district achievement data compared to the statewide data; and school building achievement data compared to district achievement data and statewide achievement data. The act further stipulates that public school choice must be offered to parents whose children attend a school failing to make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years. Information regarding any corrective action must be published and disseminated to the public and to parents of students enrolled in the corrective action school. Parents must also be informed of their right to request information regarding the professional qualifications of their student’s classroom teacher. Parent notification prevails throughout numerous other provisions of the NCLB act forcing school districts to capitalize on data as a vehicle for continuous improvement.4

Profile of Unified School District

At the time of this study, Unified School District had an average enrollment of approximately 2300, with 52% male and 48% female students. Eighty-eight percent of the student population was white, while several minority groups made up the remaining 12% - 6% African American, 1% Asian, 1% Hispanic, and 4% Multi Racial. Zero percent of the student population was classified as English as a Second Language (ESL); and 42% of the K-6 students and 32% of the 7-12 students took advantage of the free or reduced lunch program. Per pupil expenditure for the 2001-02 school year was $7100.

4 In addition to the actual act, information about the No Child Left Behind Act was obtained from the State Department of Education website.
With respect to district revenue, 49% came from local funds, 45% from state funds, and 6% from federal funds. There were 142 full-time teachers, with 69% being female, 31% male, and 2% minority. Nearly half of the teaching staff held advanced degrees and the average annual salary was $42,000. The district also employed about 75 support staff and 11 administrators.

The 72 square mile school district included the 10 square miles of Unified City and a portion of the rural, agrarian county within which it was located; however, most of the student population came from the city, which was also the county seat. The population for Unified City was approximately 12,000 residents. Most residents found employment within local business/industry, including a university that offered both undergraduate and graduate programs. Despite a fairly low unemployment rate, the City had a significant number of individuals on a limited income. Approximately 31% of the city’s population received social security income, and 21% received retirement income. A little over 7% of families were living at or below poverty level; however, this number was significantly higher when other risk factors were included. For example, when looking specifically at single female parents with children under the age of five, the percentage of households at or below poverty level increased to 41%. Over 37% of children in Unified City were born with one of the following three risk factors: a teen mother, an unwed mother, or a mother with no high school diploma. Sixteen percent were born with at least two of these risk factors; and 7% were born with one of these risk
factors. These demographics combine to make the passing of bond issues and operating levies all the more difficult for Unified School District as this fixed income population may feel threatened by rising property taxes.

The student population for Unified School District has remained stable for many years and district enrollment projections suggest the trend will continue. A facility study conducted in June, 1993 revealed that the student population for the district had not increased or decreased more than 100 students throughout the previous ten years. The same held true for the ten year period between 1993 and 2003. Although growth posed no significant challenge for the school district, size and age of the facilities did present legitimate concerns. For example, the afore-mentioned facility study discussed the inadequate size of the junior/senior high school. The two connecting schools sat on 17 acres, a site far below current guidelines of 150 square feet per pupil or approximately 70 acres in the case of the student population for Unified Junior and Senior High Schools. The junior and senior high buildings shared an auditorium and cafeteria and were absent areas large enough to adequately house concerts, assemblies, athletic events, and parent meetings. Classrooms size did not allow for adequate aisle space or such things as computer and projection areas. In addition, the study also highlighted the inadequacy of specialized features due to the age of the buildings. Although they are in fairly good condition, the buildings do not contain the same features and benefits that newer school buildings contain such as labs for science, home economics, and computers.

---

5Statistics for this section were obtained from census data from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau and from a County Community Economic Development Agent.
The newest building within the Unified School District was the 3rd-4th grade building. It was the only building under 100 years old, with an original construction date of 1955 and a six-room addition in 1965. One of the K-2 elementary buildings began as an eight-room brick building in 1899. Although it burned in 1919, it was rebuilt on the same site in 1921. This building also underwent a six-room addition in 1955. The other K-2 elementary building was originally constructed in 1865 and rebuilt in 1900. It underwent a two-room addition in 1923, a three-room addition in 1948, and a four-room addition in 1955. The high school was originally built in 1874, burned in 1896, and was rebuilt and reopened on the same site in 1898. Because the new building was built with a turreted tower, it was affectionately referred to as the “Castle on the Hill”. A new adjoining building was constructed in 1929 and became the junior high school. In 1930 the high school burned, but the junior high was saved. The building was rebuilt the following year, retaining the castle-like facade. The 5th-6th grade building opened in 1849, becoming Unified’s first public school.6

The rich history of the district and its facilities mirrored the history of the community at large. There appeared to be a fairly small degree of transience among the population as the majority of families remained a part of the community for generations. Attendance by this researcher at a monthly Community Connections meeting reinforced this point. Community Connections was a parent organization which provided needed services to the Junior and Senior High Schools staff and students. While fund raising was not their primary goal, they did organize and operate several events each year in

---

6Information about the history of the schools came from a 1997 document written by three committee members of the county Genealogical Society.
order to raise money to provide needed services. In the past they provided such things as scholarships, financial support for students who could not afford the cost of educational field trips to Boston and Washington, D.C., and monetary gifts for all teachers to supplement their out of pocket expenditures for needed educational items. On the particular night that this researcher attended the meeting, there were fourteen parents present, each of which held an office or chaired a committee. Of particular interest was the fact that all fourteen women were either graduates of Unified School District or married to a Unified graduate. They joked that while being alumni was not a requirement of membership, it accurately describes the Community Connection organization every year.

Parents of the current Unified School District students attended these same schools, as did their own parents. Traditions were established within the walls of these buildings, making change difficult. The community supported the extra curricular activities of the schools, especially athletics and music. At the junior high level, over 50% of the students were involved in the vocal music program alone. A strong tradition for UCSD was their annual Christmas Eve concert which was heavily attended by the community. Mr. Ryan, the curriculum director for the school district and the mentor involved in this study, provides a description of the Unified School District culture.

It is rich in tradition. The whole community rallies around the athletic teams, the arts, and the music. Music is very big in this district, in fact; it is standing room only at all music performances. They are very, very supportive in the junior and senior high. You have 150 kids in the vocal music program in seventh and eighth grades. So you have 50% of the student population involved. The high school has a Christmas Eve concert and many townspeople come to the concert before they go to their respective church services. Other places I’ve been you would never
think about having a Christmas Eve concert; but the community is just rich with tradition and has been able to maintain norms that probably existed back in the 1950s.

Another tradition, dating back more than fifty years, pertained to a graduation ritual. Each year the graduating class exits the “Castle” doors and walks down the hill before entering the stadium where the graduation ceremony takes place. Considered an important rite of passage shared by many generations of Unified students, community members expect the same opportunity to be afforded to future students. Thus, any plans to renovate the high school, without the means to keep the graduation tradition alive, met opposition.

In addition to size and age of the buildings, the 1993 facility study addressed the configuration of the grades housed within the various school buildings of Unified City Schools. There were two buildings which housed grades kindergarten through 2nd, one building which contained 3rd and 4th grades, one building for 5th and 6th grades, and the connecting building which housed both the 7th through 8th grades at the junior high and the 9th through 12th grades at the high school. The study recommended a change in grade configurations to include only K-5 buildings, a 6-8 middle school as opposed to a junior high school, and a 9-12 high school. After making needed improvements in specialized facilities, the existing 7-12 building was to be used as a high school, with the construction of a new middle school on 30 acres serving an additional 700 students.7 Neither new building construction nor building reconfiguration had occurred at the time of this study and the prospects that it would happen in the near future were doubtful.

---

7 The 1993 Facility Study was provided by the superintendent and is on file at the Unified School District Administration Office.
According to the UCSD business manager, the district would go to the voters again in November, 2003 for renewal of a permanent improvement levy. Although discussion continued as to when and how to seek funds for new construction, it would likely not occur for a number of years, as the district was not eligible for additional state dollars until 2011.

With respect to standards-based accountability, Unified City School District achieved a continuous improvement rating. In 2000, the first year that the District Report Card rated school districts based on the previously mentioned performance indicators, UCSD stood under Academic Watch having met only 10 of the 27 performance indicators. In 2001 they remained in Academic Watch, meeting 13 of the 27 indicators. Given the Academic Watch status, a State Department of Education consultant was assigned to provide support to the district. In 2002, they moved into the Continuous Improvement category having met 15 of the 27 indicators. And in 2003, they remained in the Continuous Improvement category while meeting 12 of the now 22 indicators.

Climate at UJHS

Mrs. Reed became the principal of Unified Junior High School in January, 2001 after the previous principal retired. Her professional experience prior to coming to Unified included two and a half years as an assistant principal and ten years of teaching mathematics at the high school level, all within the same district. At the beginning of this case study Mrs. Reed had been the principal at UJHS for only half a school year.

At the time Mrs. Reed became principal, poor staff morale posed a major concern at UJHS. The school previously operated under a teaming approach. For this approach the principal selected the teams. In the beginning the teams consisted of five teachers –
two language arts, one science, one social studies, and one math. Eventually the encore
teachers (band, choir, home economics, special education, health, physical education, and
technology) were added increasing the size of each team by two teachers. The teams
included one 7th grade team, one 8th grade team, and one split grade team. The teaming
approach developed and improved throughout its three year duration. It is important to
note that during this experimentation with a teaming approach to instruction, Unified
continued to operate largely under a junior high model as opposed to a middle school.

To allow adequate time for the needed collaboration, Monday mornings were
designated as teacher work times, with a late start for students. Parents did not approve
of students being home on Monday mornings. Community members rallied for the
dissolution of this policy. They challenged the school board with threats regarding the
passage of future levies. As a result, the district eliminated the Monday release time and
indeed, the next two operating levies passed. However, this decision resulted in the
UJHS faculty voting to end teaming. While many felt strongly that teaming was their
preferred instructional approach, they refused to continue absent the extra provision of
time.

The issue of low staff morale plagued Mrs. Reed as she began her career at UJHS.
Mrs. Reed described the negative climate in one of the ETS portfolio components.
Addressing the question concerning significant barriers to learning in your school, Mrs.
Reed described three: “gaps and redundancies in curriculum, the lack of short cycle
assessments for providing comparative data, and very low staff morale”. With respect to
low staff morale, she gave the following background description:
Unified Junior High School began the teaming concept blindly in the early 1990s. It began with some difficulties, but eventually began to function fairly well. Then feuds and disagreements began to develop between and among teams. One team grew very strong and powerful within the building. As a result of a loss of staff development time, the teachers decided to no longer work together as teams. Some teachers were bitter and angry about this decision, while others were relieved to end the teaming approach because of all the feuding. The strong and powerful team in the building was an 8th grade team of teachers who still remain a strong and powerful group within the building. They seem to ‘bully’ others into accepting their ideas and views. It creates hostility and rivalry between the 7th and 8th grade teachers. Some of the junior high staff display a lack of professionalism with one another. They say and do hurtful things to one another that make the working environment very difficult. This behavior sometimes carries over into their dealings with students. Many times teachers and students speak to the school guidance counselor and/or the principal about a teacher who has hurt their feelings or made them mad.

Within the documentation portion of this same portfolio slice, Mrs. Reed provided a timeline of events occurring during the 2001-2002 school year that reflect this negative climate. The data exemplified how the negativity of a few staff members affected other teachers, students, parents, and the administration of Unified Junior High School. The following entries document the pressures applied to teachers who express interest in various school improvement functions.

September – Several teachers began telling other teachers not to participate in the Building Improvement Council (BIC). They said it is not a paid position so do not participate. Several teachers spoke with the principal about this and said they would like to participate, but at this time it was more important for them to not cause waves with the other teachers. Only two teachers and the guidance counselor chose to participate.

October – The first school dance and only four new teachers and the student council advisor show up.

November – A committee was being formed to look at incentives and rewards to motivate students. The goals were to increase student effort on assignments and decrease the number of behavior issues. Six teachers and the guidance counselor came to the first meeting. They said this was something they believed in and wanted to participate, but they also stated that they were being and would continue to be chastised for participating. They were told that the teachers did all
of these things when they had teaming and since it was taken away no one should put any time or effort into this work.

As suggested above, some of the junior high teachers believed that teaming was taken away from them, while the administration maintained that the teachers chose to discontinue the teaming approach. Indeed, it was not teaming that was removed by the school district, but instead the one-half day planning option. Still, the decision left some teachers untrusting of the administration. As the following example shows, they were reluctant and/or defiant when it came to trying anything new proposed by the school administration.

September – A teacher refused to sign the district computer network acceptable use policy. The narrative included with the unsigned form stated, ‘I have no reason to sign this. As a professional I resent the implication of this form. It will be used against teachers when the administration wants to get someone. I have no trust in our present administration’s ability to be fair and honest in their dealings with the staff of U.J.H.S. Either treat us as professionals in the future or continue to show your lack of respect. Trust, Loyalty, Respect, and Honesty should be a two way endeavor. Unfortunately at U.J.H.S. we cannot count on the administration to be fair and honest, i.e., teaming loss, technology loss, OWA loss, Industrial Arts loss, addition of new courses without adding staff. Please take my computer away if you don’t feel I can be trusted’.

While the previous examples depicted actual attempts at influencing teachers’ decisions concerning involvement/noninvolvement in school activities, other examples reveal outright disrespect and unprofessional behavior between teachers.

September – Two new teachers came to the principal and discussed the negativity from the older staff in the teacher’s lounge and sought advice on how to handle it.

October – Two teachers had a disagreement in the teacher’s lounge over a non-school related conversation. One teacher threw a sandwich at the other and the one who got hit came to the office, said he was leaving and to get a sub – the office had no clue why he was leaving.

November – A teacher came in to talk with the principal over hurt feelings. The teacher heard that she was the topic of conversation, very negative conversation,
during the 8th grade teachers’ lunch period. The teacher was crying, hurt, and embarrassed.

January – At a staff meeting one table of teachers rolled their eyes and made disrespectful comments as another teacher gave her opinion on a topic.

March – A special education teacher discussed with the principal about how disrespectful a regular education teacher was treating her during inclusion class and at IEP meetings.

This same time of unprofessional and disrespectful behavior was being experienced by students as well.

February – Five student council representatives came in to speak with the principal about the way one of the teachers was treating students in math class.

February – Three students came in to talk to the principal about how one of the teachers on lunch duty was treating other students. They stated he picks on certain students.

April – Several teachers talked to the principal about how negative some of the other teachers are about kids and administration. The topics during one of the conference periods and one of the lunch periods are most often complaining about kids, other teachers or what administration (mainly central office) has done to someone.

May – Several parents called and/or came in to discuss an 8th grade teacher who was not explaining material well and when students asked questions, they were either made to feel stupid for asking or were not even acknowledged.

These and other incidents relating to low staff morale consumed Mrs. Reed’s time and energy throughout her first full year at Unified. Constantly mending the wounds caused by unprofessional staff behavior resulted in her spending more time as a human relations advocate and less time as an instructional leader. Mrs. Reed viewed instructional leadership as the most important domain of her job. “The most important part of my job is helping teachers become better teachers and helping students achieve.”
According to Mrs. Reed, achieving this goal required spending a great deal of time in the classroom; however, the majority of her time was being spent on discipline. She attributed the high incidents of student discipline, at least in part, to low staff morale and some teachers’ unwillingness to be innovative and try new things.

I think right now, some of the discipline issues are [teacher related]. It is not that we have bad teachers; but we have teachers who are not willing to try new and innovative things. The students are bored. They get a lot of lectures. There are group activities going on, but they are tedious activities such as work sheets.

Issues surrounding difficult staff weighed heavily on Mrs. Reed’s own ability to be receptive to new and innovative ideas. At Academy regional meetings she could be observed rolling her eyes or smiling with the other Unified principals who had first hand knowledge of her staff. When innovative ideas were shared among Academy participants, she might say to a colleague, “that would probably never work with my staff” or “can you see my staff being receptive to that”.

These same types of reactions were also observed at the first few CIP roundtable meetings, where most discussions reverted back to the issue of poor staff morale. At one meeting, Mr. Ryan suggested the possibility of utilizing the newly learned Baldridge model for addressing staff morale. Mrs. Reed reacted with a heavy sigh, “I have no idea how long [improving staff morale] will take!” The consultant’s response: “You are talking about changing culture; it is going to take a long time.”

It was obvious that other administrators within the district knew of the issues Mrs. Reed faced and agreed with her perception that low staff morale was a critical barrier to learning at UJHS. Mr. Ryan stated the following:

Mrs. Reed came into a very difficult situation with a difficult staff. They were bound to try to run off whoever they could. They were still angry about the loss
of planning time and the resulting decision to discontinue the teaming approach. They had a tremendous amount of bitterness and a lack of trust for administration. They were lashing out at one another. So before she could propose any kind of academic, professional or curricular change, she had to address staff morale.

The superintendent offered similar remarks. “She has inherited a staff that historically has been one of the most difficult staffs. We have had two previous administrators who wanted out of that building to escape working with those people.” So with her only administrative experience thus far being as an assistant principal, Mrs. Reed began her principal career in a less than optimistic environment.

Shortly after she began her job at Unified, Mr. Ryan, the Unified School District curriculum director, invited her to become involved in the Administrative Leadership Academy when they began a new cohort in the fall of 2001. Just finishing up his participation as a protégé in the previous cohort, he agreed to serve as a mentor in the next cohort. As reported by Mr. Ryan, he “lobbied and coaxed” to have a significant number of UCSD principals involved. The superintendent agreed that the Academy would benefit Mrs. Reed. He maintained that as a beginning principal, Mrs. Reed needed “to be provided as many opportunities for success as possible.” The superintendent and Mr. Ryan also discussed how participation in the Academy could be beneficial to other building administrators in the district.

One principal struggled as a building level administrator; and the superintendent was seeking ways this leader might experience success. The superintendent stated that he saw participation in the Academy “as an avenue for providing such an opportunity so that this principal could have a mentor and so that he could also discuss some of his successes and challenges of the job with other people”. Another administrator currently served as
an assistant principal and the superintendent saw participation in the Academy as an opportunity “to make sure [the] foundation that he was developing was solid so that he could take over the high school when it becomes available”. Another individual had about five years of administrative experience with the district. The superintendent felt that her skills as a principal could be greatly enhanced by hearing and seeing what others school leaders were doing. As he stated, “I really believe she has the skills, it is just that she has some areas that could be enhanced by attending the Academy, mainly communication and public relation skills”.

The other three building level administrators in the district were, for the most part, achieving success as experienced administrators. With two of them near retirement, the superintendent and Mr. Ryan did not see the need to extend the invitation to them. Four of the seven building level administrators in the UCSD were invited and agreed to participate in the Administrative Leadership Academy as part of the 2001-2003 cohort. Thus, Mrs. Reed was not only provided a mentor from the same school district, she also had opportunity to network with protégés both from within her district as well as numerous other mentor and protégé groupings from around her region.

Academy Influence

The Academy provided regional-based support to novice principals throughout the entire Midwestern state. Although each of the five regions differed in their delivery of services, they still had as their ultimate goal, to provide much needed support to early career principals as they transitioned into building level administrative roles. The coordinators for the region under study utilized large group meetings to provide opportunities for networking and collaborating. All mentor and protégé participants had
the opportunity to attend five regional meetings each year. At these meetings, participants engaged in numerous reflective activities facilitated by the coordinators. Such activities provided both the novice and the experienced principals with tools to take back and implement in their own school settings. For example, each mentor and protégé participant received copies of Kegan and Lahey’s (2001) *How The Way We Talk Can Change The Way We Work* and Bernhardt’s (2002) *The School Portfolio Toolkit*. Several regional meetings focused on ways of utilizing these resources for continuous improvement. The sharing of suggestions and ideas from participants accentuated the coordinators’ expertise.

In addition to large group meetings, several small mentor/protégé group meetings occurred in an attempt to engage novice principals in more targeted data-driven dialog surrounding the issues specific to their school environment. These reflective discussions centered on the ETS portfolio components and the ISLLC standards. A regional coordinator attended each small group meeting providing additional support to mentors as they attempted to engage novice principals in the actual portfolio writing process.

**Mentoring Support**

Mentoring constituted one of the major components of the Administrative Leadership Academy. The goal was to pair experienced and early career principals together in a forum that would, according to the State Academy coordinator, “play a part in redefining the principalship.” The timing of the Academy support was running parallel to the development of State Department of Education policy with respect to principal licensure requirements. Thus, Academy participants were helping to develop a
model for good mentoring curriculum, and assuming that the new licensure standards would include a mentoring requirement, Academy Entry Year participants could become the mentors of the future.

Academy mentors were experienced principals who possessed three or more years of building level administrative experience. Most were still serving as principals or district level administrators. In a few cases, retired principals came back to serve as mentors. Although these mentors were not currently involved in a leadership role, they had the advantage of more time to spend with their protégés.

Mentors usually worked with no more than five early career principals. Mentor/protégé groups could be from the same school district as is the situation with this study; however, in most cases, the groups were comprised of administrators from a variety of districts within the same geographical location. Pairing according to close geographical proximity was suggested by the regional Academy coordinator only after attempts at allowing groups to evolve naturally proved unsuccessful. At the first two regional Academy meetings of the 2001-2003 cohort, coordinators gave participants several opportunities to move around and place themselves with one of the identified mentors; however no movement occurred. For the sake of time, coordinators identified the mentors by geographic location and suggested that if a protégé had not yet placed themselves in a group, perhaps they would want to pair up with the mentor closest to their geographical location. At this time, several participants moved to different tables and the groups were finalized.

While Academy coordinators and participants agreed with research that supports the need for mentor training, the content for such training evolved throughout the pilot
programs. Academy coordinators solicited participant feedback as they developed a mentor training curriculum model. Mentor trainings, conducted by two Academy representatives, were offered throughout the entire Midwestern state during the summer, 2003. At the time of this writing, two of the six trainings were complete; and at least with respect to one of the training sessions, the majority of the trainees were the protégés from the 2001-2003 Academy Entry Year Program.

Each mentor trainee received Lindley’s (2003), *The Portable Mentor* to use as a resource guide. The training sessions emphasized relationship skills. Role-playing activities provided opportunity to practice and enhance the art of listening as well as asking reflective questions. In addition, because of the licensure legislation in this Midwestern state, mentor training centered around the ISLLC standards and a standards-based, performance-based assessment. In the case of the Administrative Leadership Academy, this meant portfolio development.

Utilizing the language from the ISLLC standards, the primary goal of the Principal Mentor Training Program was “to provide training that enhanced the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of principal mentors so that they could more successfully assist entry year principals and assistant principals in promoting the success for all students.” In addition, the secondary goals of the Training Program were twofold: “To clarify action steps that a principal mentor could initiate to help entry year principals and assistant principals 1) successfully fulfill the responsibilities related to the entry year, and 2) grow professionally and thus be better prepared to acquire a professional license.”
Mr. Ryan acknowledged that mentor training needed to include an understanding of the portfolio development process. His response to a question about the qualifications good mentors possess included the following:

I think that certainly the mentor has to have a sense of confidence in the portfolio itself. Having gone through the process and having a keen understanding of what it will look like as it unfolds for that individual principal. Because when you have the whole picture – when you have the stumbling blocks that you had to overcome and the hurdles that you had to jump in order to make it happen – it automatically gives you stories and examples to draw from as you are talking and interacting with the early career principal.

Mr. Ryan also emphasized the need to be trained in higher order thinking. He recognized the challenge in being able to create reflective and provocative questions. As he stated, “I think you have to have training in it and you have to practice it.”

Mr. Ryan used continuous improvement plans (CIPs) as the context for performing his mentoring role. He engaged his protégés in reflective dialog surrounding building continuous improvement plans. Mr. Ryan described the current CIPs as containing “very summative action steps and even more vague measures of improvement.” His goal was for each principal to make their CIP a more useful and living document – a document to guide their improvement strategies. The group utilized the State assigned consultant, available to the district as a result of their Academic Watch status, to assist in facilitating these discussions. One of the first things the consultant recommended was “to go with an annual CIP [as opposed to a three year revision plan] where all stakeholders could be involved in the production ..., and could look at measures throughout the course of the following year”.

A second change occurred in the design of the district’s action plan for continuous improvement. Mr. Ryan implemented this change as a result of information
obtained from Academy activities centered on portfolio development. The existing action plan format required buildings to respond to five areas for each improvement plan: goals and measures (clear and measurable), activities (what will be done), responsibilities (who will do it), time line (when will it be done), and evaluation procedures (how will success be determined). Mr. Ryan added a sixth area to the form: what is the barrier to student learning?

This change grew out of Mr. Ryan’s involvement with writing a portfolio as a novice principal participating in the Administrative Leadership Academy. Participants from his cohort spent a significant amount of time on the first two components of the portfolio: facilitating the vision of learning within the school community (A1) and sustaining a culture conducive to student learning (A2). At the end of their pilot program, participant feedback suggested that it made more since to write A2 first as opposed to A1. Within A2, participants were asked to identify three significant barriers to learning, describe the students most affected and what learning needs are impacted by one of the barriers, describe stakeholder involvement in understanding the barrier, and describe a strategy to address the barrier, as well as a rationale for the strategy selection.

The participants felt that answering these questions first better set the stage for addressing the remaining components within the portfolio.

Mr. Ryan felt this change to the UCSD action plan was significant for two reasons. First, it served as baseline data. Placing this new area at the beginning of the action plan document reinforced the notion that a description of the barrier reflected the beginning status prior to improvement. Secondly, Mr. Ryan saw this change as an additional opportunity to link portfolio development to leadership practice. He hoped
that by aligning the CIP more closely to the portfolio components, the principal protégés would not view writing the portfolio as additional work. Instead the portfolio would “write itself” as the building administrators tended to their continuous improvement plans.

Together Mr. Ryan and the consultant conducted CIP Roundtables. These Roundtable discussions involved one hour meetings with each building level principal on a bi-monthly basis. Mr. Ryan described the format and purpose of the Roundtables as follows:

What I usually do is, prior to the meeting, I give them two or three provocations as to where I think they should be in their leadership and the deployment of those action steps in that CIP. What I try to do is create questions that pull them back to thinking about their particular CIP document – again, the importance is in asking the right questions. This is, of course, directly linked to the barriers to learning we were working on today [referring to components of the ETS portfolio that were being discussed by coordinators at an Academy regional meeting]…. When we have our talks, I pose the questions formally to them and I begin to write down what I hear them saying. This is typed up and delivered to them and they get a copy of their own building and all the other buildings in the district so that they can see where their colleagues are going as well.

Providing the principals with a written follow-up served two important purposes for Mr. Ryan. First, this written documentation provided the protégés with data to guide their leadership growth and building improvement. Secondly, Mr. Ryan used this as an opportunity to further build their trust and his commitment in the mentor role. “Taking the time to write down what they have said and put it together for them and serve it to them, really builds some strong ties between you and them”. For Mr. Ryan, the passive task of listening coupled with the active task of writing, reinforced his commitment to helping them grow as leaders.
Portfolio as a Reflective Tool for Growth: Content, Context, and Controversy

The ETS portfolio model used by the Administrative Leadership Academy was designed around the ISLLC standards. The six components of the portfolio – facilitating the vision of learning within the school community (A1), sustaining a culture conducive to student learning (A2), understanding and responding to the larger context (B1), collaborating with families and community (B2), supporting professional growth and development (C1), and organizing resources for an effective learning environment (C2) – aligned with the six ISLLC standards for school leaders. In addition, the five questions within each component forced participant to consider factors that cut across all of the standards. Thus, by completing at least one component, participants experienced exposure to all six ISLLC standards.

Academy coordinators proposed that a quality portfolio possessed several key characteristics, the first being that it tells a compelling story about the schools vision while recognizing the barriers to student learning as well as the internal and external forces shaping the educational environment. The portfolio should maintain a specific focus across all sections as the leader conveys his/her knowledge of the organization, relevant stakeholders, and necessary resources for goal attainment. The portfolio should describe the leader’s role in each strategy or initiative. Finally, the portfolio should include reflection pertaining to the specifics of each portfolio section.

Because the Academy Entry Year Program was a pilot project, participation was voluntary, as was the option to complete a portfolio. As an additional incentive, the region under study offered free college credit to those participants completing a portion of the portfolio. Of the 188 mentors and 203 early career participants in the 1999-01
Academy cohort, 64 completed a portfolio (four of six components were required to be considered a completed portfolio). For the 2001-03 cohort, there are 185 mentors and 190 early career principals participating in the Academy. Since their portfolio components are not due until the end of summer, it is unknown how many will complete the portfolio requirement (based on feedback from the previous group, only two components are required from these participants). Numerous participants signed up to receive college credit; however that is not necessarily indicative of how many will complete a portfolio since some people may not benefit from earning college credit at this particular stage in their professional career.

During these pilot periods, the State Department of Education was in the midst of developing new licensure requirements for teachers, as well as principals. The State-supported Academy Entry Year Program served as a vehicle for providing documentation around the design qualities for principal professional development programs. Developing a portfolio supported the belief by Academy coordinators that a professional development experience should be performance-based and product-oriented. The mentoring component supported their belief that professional development should occur in small learning communities. In addition, the coordinators, proposed that the professional development experience should be job-embedded (aligned with the building CIP), standards-based (framed by the ISLLC standards and emphasizing the Academic Content Standards) and a multi-year commitment of engagement.

The state Academy director was involved in numerous State Department of Education facilitated meetings surrounding the development of the principal licensure standards. In October, 2001 he attended an “Advisory Committee” meeting. The
purpose of the advisory committee was to advise on issues of teacher and administrator licensure; and parents, teachers, and counselors from across the state comprised the committee. The Academy director presented the portfolio as a viable means of professional development/licensure for principals. Not all attendees agreed, however; so the Academy director was asked to return in January, bringing with him both a supporting and opposing principal to testify on behalf of the portfolio as a vehicle for professional growth. Before the January meeting occurred, development of the principal licensure standards rapidly and unexpectedly progressed. A Joint Committee for Agency Rules and Regulations was working on a policy recommendation for teachers and someone on the committee inquired about principals. A proposal was shared. The committee combined the principal proposal with the teacher policy recommendation and it became law. The recommendation for both teachers and principals included mentoring support, as well as a portfolio requirement to convert a provisional licensure to professional status.

In January, State Department of Education Officials met with the Academy director and representatives from Elementary and Secondary Administrators Associations to discuss the conflicting views of the portfolio as a viable means of professional development for early career principals. A representative from the Associations addressed the question posed by a State Department of Education official as to what type of professional development novice principals needed. “You give them a mentor, you require them to attend professional conferences – you don’t make them do portfolios! They can’t do it. Why add on something of this caliber when there is already a shortage of administrators.”
In response, the state Academy director maintained that important skills transfer from portfolio preparation to practice. Early Academy coordinators defined such skills as documentation, deliberation, diagnosis, and design. Documentation is a management system for capturing, organizing, and communicating knowledge about educational conditions, processes, and outcomes. It presents a picture of what we see and what we know. The quality of the documentation impacts diagnosis which involves identifying what learning has taken place, as well as the conditions that enhance or impede the learning process. Once a diagnosis is made, design skills are used to develop a plan of action. The design spells out the conditions and processes necessary to improve desired performance outcomes. Finally, and perhaps most important, deliberation skills are used to revisit and reflect on the experience. Such deliberation provides knowledge about what was learned from the experience and leads the principal back to further documentation and design. Improving these skills through portfolio writing provides a means of linking learning to leadership practice.

The state director also pointed out that a portfolio provides a means for performance-based assessment, beyond additional “seat time” professional development and assessment. He acknowledged that, “while a portfolio may not be the only means of performance-based assessment, it was the only one proposed at this time.” He challenged naysayers to propose alternatives.

The need to encourage proposals for alternative means of performance-based assessment was further fueled by representatives from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). In the fall of 2001, ETS statisticians made a report concerning the most recent scoring of portfolios from the 1999-2001 Academy participants. They surmised that
there was not enough predictive validity, and maybe even not enough content validity, surrounding the portfolio as an assessment of professional growth. They further proposed that if principals had a choice of options and chose the portfolio that might work; however, requiring the portfolio as the only means of performance-based assessment would likely not hold up if challenged in a court of law.

An Academy coordinators’ meeting in February, 2003 provided a venue for the Associations to share proposals for alternate performance-based assessments. The Administrative Leadership Academy coordinators met quarterly to introduce and support portfolio work. They used these meetings to advise and seek advice from State Department of Education officials, as well as to learn best practices from each region. Because of differences in delivery of services from one region to the next, it was important to report out on a regular basis. The reporting out by coordinators seemed to enhance productivity and provide one means of accountability. At the February meeting, the Elementary Administrator Association representative presented a prototype for an alternative performance-based assessment. At the end of the presentation, one regional coordinator asked, “Isn’t your proposed framework an online version of a portfolio?” The response: “Well, I guess so.”

At the final regional Academy meeting in June of 2003, The State Department of Education liaison reported that she had worked closely with both the Elementary and Secondary Administrators Associations in the past months as they continued to develop proposals for licensure options other than the ETS (State Department of Education endorsed) portfolio. She provided them guidance to bring their proposed programs up to the standards set forth earlier with respect to the characteristics of quality professional
development programs. However, at the time of this writing, the only approved avenue in place for obtaining a professional principal licensure was the State Department of Education Entry Year Program which required a standards-based portfolio.

Association representatives were not the only ones to express negativity toward the portfolio writing process. Indeed some Academy participants from the 1999-2001 cohort concurred with the unrealistic expectations of writing a portfolio in the early years of the principalship. Their negativity was captured by several university researchers who were conducting studies around the portfolio component of the Administrative Leadership Academy. One such study resulted in an evaluation report of the motivation factors involved in completing the ETS portfolio; whereas two other studies provided qualitative and quantitative analyses of the benefits and burdens of the portfolio component. This researcher’s presence during the data gathering phase of these studies provided the opportunity for gathering preliminary data pertaining to the portfolio process. In addition, participation at regional and statewide meetings allowed for the recording of field notes and journal entries surrounding the conversation and activities of novice principals, mentor principals, and regional coordinators.

This researcher captured participant perceptions about the mentoring and portfolio process by observing focus group interviews, as well as informal round table discussions. Focus group questions, for example, included the following: “To date, what has been the most beneficial aspect of the Academy?” Frequent responses included “dialog”, “being with other colleagues”, networking”, “interaction”, “working with my mentor/mentee” and “building relationships with other administrators”.
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Response to the portfolio development process was less favorable, reflecting people’s concerns about writing. Responses to a focus group question concerning the least beneficial aspect of the OPLA included the following:

The key word here is that I haven’t liked writing the components and putting it down. It’s difficult to find the time with everything else, but I think it has been difficult.

I think it’s the actual writing that has been the least beneficial part. I’ve been thinking about researching it, talking to the individuals, the process is a lot more important than the product. So I think that if you had to pick the least important parts, it’s the portfolio.

The writing has forced me to become more of a reflective practitioner. I think that if I could have avoided the writing. I don’t like the writing. It’s time consuming.

The first participant’s concern about time was also evident from feedback obtained in the round table discussions. While most participants seem enthused about reflecting verbally with a mentor, most were less excited about the prospects of reflecting in writing. The consensus was that it was difficult to complete four portfolio components in one year. These feelings of frustration with writing the portfolio came from participants who were still in the early stages of the writing process. Participants who completed an ETS portfolio, such as the mentor from this study, seem better able to appreciate the reflective benefits involved in the writing process.

Having recently completed an ETS portfolio through participation in the Academy, Mr. Ryan could provide his four protégés advice for completing this process, as well as an example of a final product. Mr. Ryan believed strongly that one of the qualifications of a good mentor was a sense of confidence in the portfolio itself. “Having an understanding of what the portfolio will look like as it unfolds, coupled with the
ability to listen, to sympathize, and to ask appropriate provocative questions is the kind of reflective, analytical interaction imperative when grooming new principals.”

Mr. Ryan utilized the act of writing to generate reflective thought. He kept a professional journal as a tool for thinking through and planning actions. He described the portfolio as providing the same type of opportunity.

What the portfolio process does is to solidify where you want to go with your particular building or district. Going through the whole process of writing is laborious; there is no question about it. But going through and solidifying your thoughts – putting them down in words, on paper – allows you to better plan and articulate to others, as you perform your leadership role.

Mr. Ryan appeared to have a concrete understanding of the portfolio process, as well as the purpose of completing an administrative portfolio for school leaders.

The portfolio process is really built around the ISLLC standards. What the components do is they materialize or they create an arena for you to think through those standards and what they mean and how those standards relate to you as a building leader. You pull in your documents and what you’re using as a leader. You make that part of your plan for what you do and you have the opportunity to see your mistakes and learn from those mistakes in a very systematic way.

While he emphasized the benefits associated with the process of writing the portfolio, Mr. Ryan also points out the value of the final product.

If I were to go on an interview, I would certainly take my ETS portfolio because I would want to talk about the process itself and how that process enabled me to grow as a leader. I think people who are conducting interviews would want to know how you go about improving, growing, and attending to your learning. The portfolio provides a good compendium of information and experiences to share. It provides rich documentation of how you can make things happen as a leader in a particular school building.

Providing rich documentation for a particular building was a challenge for some Academy participants who changed buildings and/or school districts during the time of their involvement with the program. Mr. Ryan experienced just such a change. He was
serving as a high school assistant principal in a large suburban district during the first year of participation with the Academy. The following year he took over as curriculum director for Unified City School District.

Because the ETS portfolio was divided into six distinct components, it was feasible to complete components using data from different schools/school districts. However, it was more difficult to appreciate the continuity of the entire document when it did not reflect data around a single educational environment. In addition, the final document provided more value to the participant and his/her organization when it had application to a current leadership role. Mr. Reed recognized the value of using data from one school district.

I was midway through the Academy experience when I changed jobs and districts. Although I had already begun collecting data, I decided to make the portfolio all about Unified. Even though it meant more work, I knew it would be more beneficial to me in the long run; and more beneficial to the school district because I could use my portfolio as a prototype for other novice administrators who were embarking on the task of creating a professional growth portfolio.

Mr. Ryan did share his portfolio with the four early career principals from Unified. He chose to give them copies near the end of the second year. Although he was more than willing to share, he didn’t want his document to stifle their personal ideas around the portfolio components. Mr. Reed’s portfolio represented a valuable model for the protégés, even though it was geared to the entire school district and his role as curriculum coordinator. The next section will look at how the Academy Activities, the mentoring support, and the portfolio impacted the professional development of Mrs. Reed.
Growth of Mrs. Reed

An analysis of Mrs. Reed’s growth throughout her two years of participation in the Administrative Leadership Academy will be grounded in Leithwood and Steinbach’s (1995) view of expert problem solving, emphasizing how experts as opposed to novice educational administrators address components of the problem solving process. Reflection and collaboration, two major constructs of transformational learning theory, represented the major tools used by Mrs. Reed to move toward expert status. The researcher’s perception of her growth will be validated by testimonial from colleagues that worked with Mrs. Reed, specifically, teachers at Unified Junior High School, the superintendent of Unified City Schools, and Mr. Ryan, the mentor who also served as curriculum director at Unified until February, 2003.

Throughout most of her first full year at Unified, Mrs. Reed seemed stifled by the low staff morale at the Junior High School. At one point she even commented, “I left a job as an assistant principal, making more money than I do now, and the staff liked me! What was I thinking?” Comments at CIP Roundtables and Academy regional meetings, suggested that she had definitely identified low staff morale as a problem or barrier to learning, but could not conceive of opportunities that might arise from this problem. Her reaction to suggestions for continuous improvement usually included comments about being fearful of trying anything new because of staff negativity and their lack of trust in administration. “I don’t think my staff would go for that!” or “Could you see my staff trying that?” expressed her lack of confidence in implementing new ideas. Her fear associated with carrying out procedures, as well as viewing low staff morale as an obstacle, exemplified problem solving characteristics of novice educational
administrators. Whereas expert school administrators recognize and deal with constraints to goal accomplishment, novice principals tend to view constraints as major obstacles to problem solving.

With respect to problem interpretation, Mrs. Reed knew that the teaming incident had initiated poor staff morale, and was well aware of the resulting behaviors that were being displayed; however, she seldom identified the problem in connection to the broader mission and vision of the school. Through CIP Roundtables, Mrs. Reed was continually reminded of the district/building goal of improving student performance; but, poor staff morale stood in the way of achieving this goal.

Mrs. Reed seemed to view the low staff morale as one large problem and rarely spoke of subcomponents or manageable pieces of the larger whole. Neither did she speak much about involving the staff in the solution process. The staff’s negativity toward administration likely contributed to Mrs. Reed’s presumption that she was dealing with this problem by herself. This presumption was reinforced by the fact that only two teachers chose to participate in the Building Improvement Council (BIC) during the 2001-02 school year. Although others were interested, pressure from influential staff members prevented them from taking the initiative.

While signs of moving from novice to expert problem solving were evident in the 2002-03 school year, the transformation in Mrs. Reed actually began in the spring of 2002. At the April CIP Roundtable, Mrs. Reed again brought up negative staff morale in conjunction with the plans to implement curriculum mapping at Unified. Mr. Ryan was supportive and encouraging, suggesting that maybe mapping would help – “perhaps with consensus among departments and grade levels, the flavor will change.” Realizing her
own negativity, Mrs. Reed said, “You know, I am starting to sound just like my staff, and I need to get over it and move on!” In a follow-up interview approximately one year later, the researcher asked Mrs. Reed about that comment. She said, “Yes, I do remember that comment and it was a real turning point for me.” She acknowledged that the mentor and State Department of Education consultant, as well as participants of the Administrative Leadership Academy, had been providing her with ideas and opportunities throughout the past year; but her leadership abilities were dampened by the constraint of poor staff morale.

Mrs. Reed’s actions began to take on characteristics associated with expert problem solvers. With respect to problem interpretation, expert administrators spent more time and effort during problem formulation, attempting to evaluate or assign meaning to problem information. Mrs. Reed utilized the summer months interpreting the staff morale problem through the use of reflection. She described the final episode that culminated a long year of negativity with staff.

I thought the year ended on a horrible note. The one individual, Stan, who is known district wide for his negativity, along with another teacher, said very negative comments to me personally at the end of the year checkout. He said what a horrible year he had and all these different things. So I thought long and hard all summer on how I was going to handle that next year. It might turn out exactly the same, but I didn’t want it to.

The use of reflection was encouraged and reinforced to Mrs. Reed throughout the previous year by Academy coordinators and her mentor, Mr. Ryan. Self reflection and reflection with others were both presented as tools for growth. Personality/type theory proposes that most individuals prefer one form of reflection; and that while they may be able to successfully engage in the other, it means going outside of their comfort zone.
Mrs. Reed described her summer reflection process and her preferred mode of self-reflection as opposed to reflecting with others.

I am the type that likes to think alone. I spend a lot of time when I am in the car, in the bathtub, who cares where I am. Everything just runs through my mind constantly. So I would say I do my best thinking alone. I don’t know if the best ideas come from that, but all the background stuff starts there. I also understand that there are a lot of pieces and you need to bounce your ideas off somebody else. Everything I come up with is not going to be the be-all and end-all. So I [reflect with others] because I know that is a necessity; but I am not as comfortable with that part of the process.

While self-reflection was Mrs. Reed’s chosen method for reflecting about Stan and other negative staff, decisions resulting from such reflection led to a much greater emphasis on group problem solving and participatory decision-making. There was a department chair position opening and Stan applied for it. Although she had reservations, Mrs. Reed met with him in mid August.

In the meeting, I decided to bring up the fact that we had issues to deal with. I said there were things I disagreed with that he had done, but I also felt like some of it was my fault in being new to the position. Having never been a principal, I made some poor choices. We just started talking about how he felt and how I felt and we had disagreements; but we worked through the whole conversation. At the end he thanked me for having him in and talking. About four or five weeks later, I met with him and stated that I felt he was off to a great start and that things were going real well. He said he felt that the turning point was the meeting we had before school started. I then offered him the department head position and he accepted.

The discussion with Stan and the ultimate decision to place him in a leadership role was significant. By admitting her own shortcomings and relinquishing some power to Stan, Mrs. Reed began building a trusting relationship. Although good news doesn’t usually travel as fast as bad, the issue of trust did seem to spread to other staff members. Staff seemed more willing to collaborate with building level administration as is evident
by the increased interest in the BIC. Participation more than doubled with five people volunteering to serve on the 2002-03 committee as opposed to the two the previous year.

Collaboration and participatory problem solving became the primary decision-making mode at Unified Junior High School during the 2002-03 school year. Three venues provided the primary avenues for such collaboration – staff meetings were held the first Wednesday of each month, department chair meetings the second Wednesday of each month, and Building Improvement Council the third Wednesday of each month. The continuous improvement plan provided the direction for each of these collaborative decision-making groups – all staff were responsible for curriculum mapping, department heads were responsible for focusing on open-ended extended response questions and the BIC focused on staff morale. Mrs. Reed frequently used data at each of these meetings to generate discussion.

Even though participation on the BIC was voluntary and involved no additional monetary incentive, most of the six members were usually present at the four meetings attended by the researcher. At one meeting, Mrs. Reed referred directly to the CIP document and suggested that “the ball had been dropped” with respect to three staff morale items and that they “needed to be brought back to the front burner.” The first was to put a box in the staff lunch room for peer teacher recognition, the second was to develop a more confidential issue bin box as opposed to sticky notes on the wall, and the third was a display case designed to honor and recognize the staff. Mrs. Reed was quick to admit neglect of her own responsibilities to these matters and others added their own
admission of neglect. A time frame was established for getting each of them done, as well as assignment of responsibilities. The researcher was afforded the opportunity to see each of these plans put into action.

A display case in a main hallway at Unified Junior High School was used to honor staff. Each department including administration and guidance were allotted two weeks to display paraphernalia about themselves such as photographs, awards, diplomas, etc. Seeing old photos provided some comic relief and the sharing of personal history and accomplishments provided for topics of positive conversation for both staff and students.

Both the issue bin and the peer teacher recognition program were also implemented during the 2002-03 school year and became a regular part of the monthly staff meetings. With the issue bin, staff placed comments, questions, or concerns in a box located inside the staff lunch room. Mrs. Reed shared them at each monthly staff meeting and a limited amount of time was spent discussing them. While staff and student morale was woven into most of the issues, so too was the bottom line goal of creating a positive environment for learning. Sample issues include the following:

I would really like to see a junior high pep band at the home games – girls volleyball, and girls and boys basketball. I have talked to a handful of 7th grade band members and they seemed real receptive to the idea. This might be a way to improve student morale. Is this something that would be possible?

Students who cheat – should they lose their card privileges?

Will the number of incoming 7th graders have any impact on whether any current 7th or 8th graders will be retained?

It seems that the same teachers are in the hallways between classes. Everyone would like an opportunity to finish up grading papers or be on the computer; however, it is unfair for the same people to watch the halls and the others to get
the time to themselves. Maybe this should be part of the evaluation process or we
should be assigned days.

I’m curious as to whether anyone would be interested and willing to meet during
the summer to discuss issues, concerns, and solutions – a time when we could
really get into some of the issues that are holding us back.

Although they usually could not be worked out on the spot, the issue bin format
allowed for rich discussions about areas of concern. In addition, it provided the means
by which such discussion could occur in an open environment for all stakeholders to hear
and have input.

Staff meetings also provided the vehicle for the peer recognition program. At
each staff meeting, Mrs. Reed presented several framed certificates of appreciation to
staff members who were recognized by their colleagues for some specific activity, effort
or accomplishment. Recipients of peer recognition awards included the secretary and
associate secretary for “constantly putting staff and students first”, the maintenance and
custodial staff for “keeping such an old building in such good shape” and two teachers
for the “huge amount of time and energy put forth in planning and coordinating the 7th
and 8th grade trips to Washington and Boston.”

The department chairs’ responsibility to the CIP was addressing weak areas of
instruction, one of which was students’ ability to write short answer extended response
questions. Again, meeting monthly with this group of teachers provided Mrs. Reed with
opportunities to practice facilitative leadership. She continued to gain trust by presenting
this group with problems that had no pre-determined solutions and engaging them in
data-driven dialog surrounding the building’s continuous improvement plan.
At one meeting, Mrs. Reed presented graphs she had created depicting the results of each department’s first round of assessments for extended response questions, as well as a comparison of the similarities between these results and proficiency test scores. The data fueled the discussion which included teacher satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the results, best timing of next short cycle assessment, an analysis of how realistically their assessments were preparing students, and providing teachers with knowledge beneficial in preparing students for state mandated proficiency tests.

At another department chair meeting, Mrs. Reed used provocation as the vehicle for discussion; a process that had been modeled by Mr. Ryan during the CIP Roundtable discussions. Mrs. Reed introduced a building concern that sparked a lengthy and engaging conversation. “What can we do about the number of kids failing? What can we do differently with the things we have control over?” She then presented the data to support her concern – a graph which showed that 49 out of 186 7th graders had three or more F’s midway through the second semester. The data were telling and teachers introduced a variety of ideas including concerns about not wanting to “water down the curriculum” or being anymore lenient about accepting late assignments, the school district discipline policy concerning the inability to punish students for failing to do homework, and changing the structure of the school day to free up more instruction time. Then one teacher asked the question, “Mrs. Reed, is someone from the district office questioning you about the number of student failures?” She quickly replied,

No, absolutely not. This is all from me and what sparked the interest was when I was creating eligibility lists for sports, I decided to look at all students, not just those on sports teams. My computer program allows me to see performance data up to the minute and in a variety of ways – by student, by teacher, by course, and
school wide. I don’t have any answers, but actually seeing that many failures really bothered me. The data presented on a bar graph was powerful.

After this explanation and reassurance that central office was not pointing fingers or placing blame, the teachers seemed even more engaged in the conversation, concentrating their efforts on how they could help the students who really did want to learn. The meeting lasted 45 minutes longer than the scheduled time. By admitting that she didn’t have the answers and soliciting their input, Mrs. Reed continued to build trust within her relationship with staff and build ownership in the building continuous improvement plan by engaging staff in a collective problem solving effort.

As the discussion of failing students continued, Mrs. Reed asked the question, “should any student be retained more than once at the K-8 grade levels?” Limited discussion occurred mostly with respect to the benefits received by other students in the educational environment, as opposed to the benefit for the person being retained. Mrs. Reed readily shared her values on this issue and conveyed her personal conviction that “no student in grades K-8 should be retained more than once.” Awareness of one values and the willingness to use them during the problem solving process is characteristic of expert problem solvers.

The use of group problem solving also describes expert educational administrators and is conveyed through the above examples with Mrs. Reed. She utilized several available venues to engage her staff in group reflection surrounding school building problems despite her own personal preference to engage in self reflection. She also displayed expert problem solving in her attempts at processing solutions. She was
not intimidating or restraining to others, but instead remained open to new information and allowed for ample discussion around a given idea.

Additional testimonial supports the researcher’s claim that Mrs. Reed experienced professional growth during her second full year as a principal at Unified and took on problem solving characteristics befitting an expert as opposed to novice educational administrator. One source of support came from the teaching staff. In order to get at an understanding of their perception of change, the following focus group questions were presented to the entire staff:

- Do you perceive Mrs. Reed as an instructional leader, and if so, what are some of the things she does that conveys such a perception?

- What changes, if any, have you observed about Mrs. Reed’s leadership style/qualities from last year to present?

- What significant changes, if any, have you observed at UJHS since Mrs. Reed became principal?

The questions were presented to the entire staff at the April, 2003 staff meeting and everyone had the opportunity to respond either in a verbal face-to-face format or in writing. Over 65% of the staff provided some form of feedback. Gaining trust through the use of data-driven dialog, collaborative problem solving and participatory decision-making were the themes that characterized staff responses. Sample responses to the question about perceiving Mrs. Reed as an instructional leader included the following:

- She has looked at test scores and tried to set up plans to deal with problem areas. She has an excellent background about curriculum issues.

- Mrs. Reed is an instructional leader. She makes herself available to students and staff. She maintains a professional image and uses staff meetings to inform and seek information from teachers.
She uses data to make decisions which encourages us to do the same thing in our classroom.

I feel she is an instructional leader. She doesn’t come through as hers is the only way; she listens and tries to see other options and consider our points of view. However, if an idea is not feasible, she doesn’t beat around the bush. She comes right out and let’s us know so there aren’t any false hopes.

She continually asks for input, establishes committees to work through situations, and is open to comments, questions, etc. She definitely has an ‘open door’ policy.

Increased confidence in her leadership abilities and a willingness to engage in participatory leadership characterized the responses to the question about changes in Mrs. Reed’s leadership qualities.

She is more confident about herself and her job.

She has made some changes mid-year that she probably would not have done last year.

She is very open with discussions and listening to our opinions as to what we need and feel.

She provides for more positive celebrations for the accomplishments of staff.

She is stopping to listen to teachers ideas more. While I understand that our staff can be negative, listening to our majority opinions can be important.

She has found ways to make the teachers responsible for decisions and solutions to problems. In the past, staff would blame administrators if they didn’t like a decision or if the results of a change did not suit their needs. Mrs. Reed has taken several problems to the BIC to collaborate in finding workable solutions. Now we can’t gripe because we were part of the decision-making process. Implementation of the ‘issue bin’ process helps get things out in the open and helps solutions begin.

Actively engaging staff in the problem solving process conveyed her confidence in their abilities and expertise. Increase in staff buy-in resulted from Mrs. Reed’s continuous effort to include them in all aspects of the decision-making process.
Of the eighteen teachers who provided either verbal or written responses to the focus group questions, only two revealed negativity; and even they hinted of growth. Both of these written responses included, “No, I do not” as their answers to perceiving Mrs. Reed as an instructional leader. With respect to observed changes in leadership qualities, they wrote the following:

She has started to realize that there are several members of this staff who can assist her without threatening her authority. She still has some growing to do in the area of self-confidence. If she were not so lacking in confidence she could better accept advice.

I can honestly say that she has tried to mend some fences with me; however, I still cannot trust her to back me in a pinch, or give me an honest evaluation.

Neither of these teachers responded to the third question.

Responses to the third question about significant changes since Mrs. Reed has been the principal at UJHS included the following:

Consistency, discussion, feedback, and a sense of professionalism summarize the significant changes.

Mrs. Reed has made a continual effort to get feedback, and she has treated everyone fairly.

The biggest changes have been in the areas of more consistent discipline and a more up front approach with staff.

What I have observed is an increased emphasis on looking forward, a concentration on what is critical, i.e., proficiency results, and an openness to new and innovative ideas.

Strong leadership has been the biggest change. She allows our input and tries to make things work.

The biggest change is that I now have confidence that our leader is truthful in what she says. I believe that I am supported by administration. I can see that she is constantly learning each year. We all learn from mistakes; she admits when she had made mistakes and moves on.
We have made strides in rewarding the students who strive for success, both behaviorally and academically. Our staff meetings do not disintegrate into catty arguments rehashing past events that we have no control over (like Monday team planning time). Compared to past years this is a significant change. Mrs. Reed refocuses the direction of the conversation, and has been flat-out directive about dropping issues that are pointless or need to be dealt with privately.

Increased confidence in her own leadership abilities combined with increased staff trust has afforded Mrs. Reed the room to be directive to staff when the need arises, while still placing the greatest emphasis on participatory leadership.

The superintendent further validated Mrs. Reed’s growth with respect to problem solving. In May, 2003 the researcher had a discussion with the superintendent around the following two questions:

Since the inception of the State Report Card, what are some of the ways your district has addressed areas of concern or needed improvement?

What evidence, if any have you observed with respect to Mrs. Reed’s professional growth in the past two years?

The superintendent’s response to question 2 included the following:

I’ve seen tremendous growth when it comes to her ability to identify a problem and once she has identified that there is a problem, the process that she goes through in trying to resolve that particular problem. I think the Administrative Leadership Academy played a major role in her growth because of the opportunity to interact with others – the opportunity to have conversation with people who have similar problems and the opportunity to brainstorm and bounce ideas off of each other.

He further acknowledges her use of participatory leadership to improve the staff morale problem at Unified Junior High School.

Her problem solving abilities continue to grow. I viewed her as a strong person in that area to begin with, but she is still growing. In the two plus years that she has been here, I have seen her turn around some of the attitudes in that building by simply working with them in the problem solving mode. By saying, “Here is the problem, let’s solve the problem. How can we solve it working together? Let’s not have this adversarial relationship. Let’s identify the problem, and then let’s
try to find ways in which we can solve this problem together.” I could go one and could name individual staff members that she has turned around. One staff member, for example [Stan], had refused to accept the end of the year teacher appreciation gift. This year was the first time in four years that he accepted the gift. So I think she has made tremendous progress with this staff.

Finally, in May, 2003, the mentor, Mr. Ryan, responded to the following questions during a face-to-face interview:

How do you think the Academy has either served or failed early career principals?

In what ways do you perceive that the mentor role could be expanded or reframed in order to be more useful?

In what ways, if any, did you observe Academy curriculum experiences being implemented in leadership practice of any of the program participants?

What were the most important things you hoped the UCSD early career principals would obtain from their participation in the Academy?

As a mentor, in what ways did you help them in accomplishing their goals?

What type of growth if any have you observed in Mrs. Reed since she has been at Unified?

Through discussion around these questions, Mr. Ryan validated Mrs. Reed’s growth as well as the role the Academy played in nurturing her professional development. In response to question six, Mr. Ryan stated that “she has done a remarkable job changing the environment in that building and spending a great amount of time listening. She has taken tools she obtained from participation with the Academy and implemented them at her building.”

Examples of Mrs. Reed’s utilization of Academy information surfaced when Mr. Ryan responded to question three concerning ways in which Academy curriculum
experiences were being implemented in leadership practice. He didn’t hesitate in his response to this question.

A prime example is when we met Dr. Johnson at the summer, 2002 regional Academy meeting. We said, “Wouldn’t it be great if we could get him at the district convocation in the fall?” We asked him and he said, “Yes.” After the convocation, Mrs. Reed took the ball and ran with it. She constructed a radar diagram around his seven themes with her staff because one of the things she had been working on was pulling the staff together. I viewed this action as a success for me as a mentor. I provided resources and inspiration for a principal to take her building forward – to address the needs of the building. As a curriculum director, I feel it is my responsibility to give good resources and inspiration to principals – and hope they know where to go from there. Mrs. Reed knew what to do. But none of it would have happened if we had not been involved with the Academy.

Mr. Ryan makes reference to Dr. Joseph F. Johnson, Jr. who was a guest speaker at the summer, 2002 Academy meeting for the region under study. Dr. Johnson has conducted extensive research in the area of high performing/high poverty schools (Johnson, Lein, & Ragland, 1998). He incorporated Academy-generated data from a previous Academy activity into his presentation. The previous activity occurred at the February, 2002 regional meeting where Academy participants were invited to bring a teacher from their building. With elementary teachers in one group and secondary teachers in another, the teachers were invited to response to the following two questions:

How does your school leadership challenge and support existing curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices?

How does this leadership impact: a) your individuality, b) communities of practice within the school, and c) the school as a whole?

Mentor and early career principals were also afforded limited opportunity to add input; however, the majority of the emphasis was on teacher responses. Dr. Johnson’s
presentation at the Academy regional meeting centered on connecting responses to these questions, as well as the ISLLC standards, to the research on high performing/high poverty schools.

During the August, 2002 convocation, Dr. Johnson shared some of the findings from the high performing/high poverty schools with the UCSD staff. The common characteristics of these schools were grouped into seven themes: 1) focus on the academic success of every student; 2) no excuses; 3) experimentation; 4) inclusivity: everyone is a part of the solution; 5) sense of family; 6) collaboration and trust; and 7) passion for learning and growing. Mrs. Reed combined this new knowledge with recently acquired knowledge from another professional development training to create a radar diagram depicting how closely her building’s culture resembled those associated with the high performing schools.
In August, 2002, Mrs. Reed collected baseline data from her staff around the seven themes of high performing schools. She collected the data again in June, 2003 to see if staff perception had changed during the school year. Although the change may be minimal, there was indeed movement in the right direction. With the exception of experimentation, staff perception was slightly more positive in all seven areas. The change with respect to collaboration and trust, sense of family, and everyone is part of the solution, likely reflect Mrs. Reed’s practice of group reflection around problem solving and decision-making. In addition, the use of data driven dialog could have influenced the remaining themes centered on student learning. The negativity concerning
experimentation likely represented some of the teachers’ unwillingness to try new things because of the loss of Monday collaborative planning time.

Mr. Ryan also shared a second example of Academy influence on Mrs. Reed’s professional growth. Specifically he referred to the Academy meeting where participants brought a teacher from their building. While most participants brought teachers who were excited about teaching and considered positive role models with respect to instructional leadership, Mrs. Reed decided to bring a teacher who contributed to the low staff morale climate at Unified Junior High School. Mr. Ryan viewed this decision as “important in contributing to an increased trust level between staff and administration.” Referring to a conversation around extended response questions, he stated that the neat thing was that the conversation at the Academy was carried back to the school by the teacher and there was this incredible breakthrough. The teachers had enough trust in Mrs. Reed to go to her and admit that they neither knew how to write good extended response questions nor knew how to determine if a student answered it correctly. This was a big step for a group of people to admit they lacked ability; and it led to professional development in that area. In fact, an Academy coordinator provided sample rubrics as a means for grading the extended response questions.

In a discussion with the researcher prior to the February meeting, Mrs. Reed shared her thoughts about which teacher to bring. Although there were many enthusiastic and positive teachers who could have represented UJHS, she felt that others within her building “needed to be there” to benefit from the positive influences that Academy networking provided.

While the previous section represents the perception of Mrs. Reed’s growth by teachers, the superintendent, and the mentor; Mrs. Reed’s own perception is equally important. In an attempt to reveal her thoughts on how the portfolio, mentoring and
Academy activities impacted her professional development, a follow-up interview was conducted in May, 2003. The following four questioned guided the discussion:

Discuss what progress, if any, that your building made with respect to the three barriers to learning identified in your portfolio – lack of short cycle assessments, gaps in curriculum, and low staff morale.

Several administrators in the district commented on your success in improving staff morale at UJHS, specifically with respect to one individual (Stan). Could you discuss the process you went through in accomplishing this goal?

Discuss how you engage in reflective practice. What works best for you?

How has your involvement in the Academy affected your early career as a principal (portfolio, Academy activities, and mentoring support)?

In responding to question four, Mrs. Reed addressed each component separately.

While Mrs. Reed recognized the value of the reflective process involved in addressing the portfolio components, the time needed for writing presented the biggest challenge.

If I only had more time to concentrate on it – time is everyone’s issue. I hear the same thing from teachers and students. I could see doing something like this over a period of two to three years; but having a first year principal accomplish it would be out of the question. I don’t think in the first year I would have had a minute to think about anything like this. Even in the second year, I engaged in a great deal of reflection throughout the school year; however, the writing piece had to wait until June. It would be wonderful and more beneficial if you could write as you went, but we have all been there. I feel like this is a criticism of the process, but it’s not. I just don’t know how you make it better.

Despite Mr. Ryan’s effort to align the CIP more closely with the portfolio components, Mrs. Reed still perceived the portfolio writing as additional work for which there was no time.

Mrs. Reed acknowledged the value of the Academy activities. She also addressed the regional differences in delivery of services throughout the statewide Academy,
specifically recognizing the value of the regularly scheduled large group meetings conducted by the region under study.

I think some of the activities we did this year and last year at the regional meetings were very helpful. I took some of those tools and used them in staff meetings. Some were more productive than others, but it is always trial and error to see what works for you, what doesn’t, and how you can change it to fit your needs….I think the structure in this region which provided for the opportunities to come together as a group was beneficial. Although I would have preferred to hold the meetings on Saturdays so that I didn’t have to be away from the building; I would guess others would not share my sentiment. But yet sometimes it is good to get away from things and get a new perspective before coming back. I don’t know. But I do know the meetings were beneficial – I can’t imagine going through the process and not having personal contact intermittently throughout the whole thing. We met, we gained knowledge, we took it back and tried it, and then we met again. There was always a room full of people who could give you advice if things didn’t go well.

Most Academy participants shared Mrs. Reed’s view about the Academy regional meetings. It was always difficult to get a way for a whole day; and to worry what was happening in the absence of the administrator. However, the benefit of networking and collaborating with colleagues far outweighed the stress of being out of the building.

Finally, Mrs. Reed shared her views about the benefits of having a mentor during the early stages of the principalship.

I would say that my relationship with Mr. Ryan and the mentoring piece had the biggest impact on my early career as a principal. I talked with him it seemed like daily at the beginning, trying to learn everything. He is the one that actually got me involved in the Academy. I would not have had a clue if it had not been for him. Bouncing ideas off someone like Mr. Ryan was very helpful. When I had a problem I could call and say, “This is what I am doing or this is what I am thinking about. What do you think? Do you have any other ideas?” With him leaving the district, that piece has disappeared.

Serving in the same district greatly enhanced the mentoring relationship. Having first-hand knowledge of the educational environment made it much easier for Mrs. Reed to discuss ideas with her mentor without lengthy explanation of background data.
Likewise, Mr. Ryan’s job of mentor proved easier because of his ability to affect or change things that would benefit the early career principals.

Altering the design of the continuous improvement action plans and establishing bi-monthly CIP roundtables are two examples of things Mr. Ryan implemented in his mentoring role that would not have been feasible had he been employed by a different district. Mrs. Reed shared her views about the CIP roundtable discussions. Two aspects of this format proved difficult for her. First of all, she considered herself a “real results person” so it was difficult to come out of an hour long meeting and have nothing concrete to show for it. Secondly, as previously discussed, she preferred to reflect alone, so regularly scheduled reflective discussions with two other people left her feeling somewhat uncomfortable. However, she finally realized that the meetings provided a foundation for later productivity.

A lot of conversation took place and I didn’t think they were productive. It was hard to spend an hour of time in the middle of the day when things were going on. I later realized that ideas I was having were coming from conversation during the CIP roundtables. The conversations were indeed creating ideas that were leading to change. So I think that was very valuable.

Mrs. Reed made reference to Mr. Ryan leaving the district. In February, 2003 he took a new job with the State Department of Education. Although he agreed to maintain the mentoring role, it was definitely not the same. While he was always a phone call away, his new job prevented him from continuing the regular face-to-face encounters with the early career principals through CIP Roundtables, Academy Regional meetings, and mentor/protégé small group meetings. In fact, the CIP Roundtable discussions ceased to occur after he left, despite the original plan to continue them under the leadership of the acting curriculum director and the outside consultant. Two things led to
the dissolution of these bi-monthly meetings. First, the acting curriculum director was temporarily covering three full-time positions until the best replacements could be found. Thus, her available time was limited. Secondly, the outside consultant, who was a retired school administrator, returned to a full-time position as an elementary principal making it all the more difficult to schedule meetings.

Mr. Ryan’s departure did not appear to have a detrimental effect on Mrs. Reed. Mr. Ryan modeled and praised the importance of reflective practice and collective problem solving throughout his many encounters with the early career principals from Unified. Much of the data presented in this chapter demonstrates how Mrs. Reed began implementing both of those practices into her own leadership style and, by doing so, improved upon a major barrier to learning within her school building. One final example suggests that Mrs. Reed dealt with the loss of her own mentor by making the transformation into the mentoring role for another Academy participant.

In the second year of the study, Mrs. Reed gained an assistant principal. The individual who was placed in the role was previously an elementary principal in the district and already one of the Unified Academy participants. As a result of his new position, he struggled with his role in the Academy. He was unsure if he could still attend the meetings because of a comment made by the superintendent suggesting that there should always be one administrator in the building if at all possible. After intervention by the mentor and words of encouragement from the academy coordinators he decided to finish with the Academy. However, he had done very little work around portfolio development. He signed up for course credit for spring, 2003 and set out to complete two portfolio components.
Mrs. Reed signed up for credit winter quarter and shared her portfolio components at the February regional meeting; however, she did not sign up for credit hours for spring. Instead of continuing work on her own portfolio, she mentored her assistant principal, guiding him through the portfolio development process. As she put it, “since we were dealing with the same situation, it didn’t matter whose portfolio we worked on, it was the process that was important.” The assistant principal had the opportunity to share his portfolio work in a small group at the final Academy regional meeting in June, 2003. As he shared with the group, his continuous reference to Mrs. Reed suggested that she contributed greatly to the deliberative process. And, since these components were different than the one Mrs. Reed had already written, she too benefited from serving in the mentoring role.

While the above discussion around Mrs. Reed’s professional growth suggests positive changes in her leadership ability from one year to the next, there has yet to be any discussion about how these changes affected student outcomes. Indeed, it is highly unlikely that any one factor in an educational setting can account for changes in student outcomes. Numerous reform efforts characterize the current educational arena making direct cause/effect relationships nearly impossible to determine. Still, analyzing trends in student achievement data across time provides the impetus for entertaining at least some possible relationship between various efforts and outcomes.

For Mrs. Reed, attempting to show a correlation between her professional growth as a leader and increased student achievement proves difficult for several reasons. First, while there is no set rule for how many years of comparison data is sufficient, two years is not enough time to determine if trends or patterns exist within the proficiency data.
Secondly, determining what to compare presents a problem. Ideally, it would be nice to compare test results for the same group of students over time; however, the type of tests taken each year by the Unified students do not necessarily lend themselves to such a comparison. In the 6th grade, the students take a nationally normed proficiency test. In the 7th grade, they take the Stanford test, which is also nationally normed but does not necessarily compare to the previous test. In the 8th grade they take the Terra Nova, which is also nationally normed but does not necessarily compare directly with either of the previous two tests. In the 9th grade, they take another nationally normed proficiency test which could be compared to the 6th grade results except that even those two tests differ in format – one is both multiple choice and extended response questions, while the other is strictly multiple choice. Even if it were feasible to compare student achievement across these two tests, it would not help Mrs. Reed since it would take over three years to obtain the results for the same group of students.

Another option would be to look at 9th grade proficiency results over a period of several years since they are the cohort of students whose most recent educational experiences occurred at Unified Junior High School. For Mrs. Reed such data is not yet available. Indeed the most recent 2003 Unified District Report Card reveals the 9th grade proficiency results for the 2001-02 school year. These results would be from the students who were 8th graders when Mrs. Reed became principal in January, midway through the year. Therefore, the current available data does not even represent good baseline data, let alone comparison data.

Even if time allowed for the comparison of data across the same cohort of students, another factor plays into the difficulty of comparing student outcome data over
time. The State Department of Education continues to raise the bar with respects to passing scores on proficiency tests. Changing the cut off scores from year to year makes it all the more difficult to establish and analyze trends in student outcome data.

The new state accountability system may prove beneficial to the problem just outlined. Mandatory testing in grades 3-8 that are clearly aligned with the academic content standards will provide for more consistent accountability measures. Using student achievement data to assess school faculty will likely prove more feasible as the state continues to enhance and improve upon the educational accountability system.

Growth of Academy Participants

While inappropriate to claim that involvement with the Administrative Leadership Academy activities had direct causal influence on student outcomes at Unified Junior High School, additional data suggests a possible relationship. Because of low numbers within the sample size and the qualitative methods used for data collection, it is not feasible to attempt to establish a statistical correlation using quantitative data analysis methods. The value of the descriptive data within this qualitative study is highly dependent on the researchers’ ability to capture human interactions in a naturalistic environment, therefore, no attempts were made to control for confounding variables. Most school districts are currently involved with numerous reform initiatives intended to impact student achievement. It is highly likely that many intervening variables impact student outcomes in the twenty-first century. Still, a descriptive analysis of the available data suggests that a relationship may exist between the ability to write a quality professional growth administrative portfolio and the ability to engage in instructional leadership practices that lead to improved student achievement outcomes. The
portfolio’s emphasis on data proves vital to such practice. The instructional leader is better able to monitor the performance of teachers and students by collecting data, and developing improvement strategies based on the data.

Of the novice principals participating in the 1999-2001 pilot study for the region under study, 11 completed a portfolio and submitted it to the Educational Testing Service (ETS) for evaluation (Mr. Ryan was one of the portfolio finishers from this cohort). Based on the results, the Academy regional coordinator ranked the portfolio finishers as scoring high, medium, and low. Of the 11 finishers, 5 fell into the high range, 3 into the medium range, and 3 into the low range. Because all 11 finishers were elementary level administrators, 4th grade proficiency test scores provided the most appropriate indicator of improvement or decline in student outcomes. The participants completed most of their portfolio writing during the summer after the 2000-2001 school year; thus, student achievement data from the 2002 and 2003 School Report Cards reflect the year prior to and just after completing the portfolio, respectively. A comparison of the 2002 and 2003 Report Card data with respect to the summative change in scores across all five test areas of citizenship, math, reading, writing, and science revealed noticeable results. Individually, some high scoring portfolio finishers show a decline in their 4th grade proficiency tests scores, while some low scoring portfolio finishers show an increase in their schools 4th grade proficiency scores. However, as a group, the participants scoring high on the portfolio experienced an 8.6% average increase on the 4th grade proficiency tests, while the low scoring participants achieved an average decrease of 2.1%. A graphical representation of these findings is presented below. Such results, at the very least, suggest that the skills needed to complete the portfolio, i.e., documentation,
diagnosis, design, and deliberation may transfer to instructional leadership practice resulting in a positive effect on student achievement outcomes.

Table 4.2: High and Low Performing Portfolio Finishers for Region 1

Because delivery of services varied across regions of the Administrative Leadership Academy, a comparison of these same data across all regions would serve to support or negate this assertion. However, numerous factors influence the researcher’s ability to compare across regions. For example, one region produced 11 portfolio finishers, two of which were high scoring and 4 of which were low scoring; however, there was no proficiency data available for one school in each category. When considering data from an already small sample, missing just one from each category greatly impacts the results. Similarly, in another region which produced 9 portfolio finishers, 4 scored high and 1 scored low; however, there were no data available for the
school whose administrator finished the portfolio in the low category. Thus, a comparison for this region was not feasible. Missing data plagued a third region which produced 2 high scorers and 6 low scorers out of a possible 15 portfolio finishers.

Schools for the two high scoring leaders were new buildings with only one year of proficiency data. In addition, one school from a low scoring portfolio finisher contained only primary grades lower than 4th, so there were no proficiency data available.

Data for the one remaining region provided an opportunity for comparison. For this region which produced 10 portfolio finishers, 1 scored high, while 6 scored low. For the school under the leadership of the high scoring portfolio finisher, the average increase in 4th grade proficiency test scores was 6.7%. For the schools under the leadership of low scoring portfolio finishers, the average increase across test scores was only 1.4%. A graphical representation of these findings is presented below. The results for this region also suggest that skills utilized in portfolio development may carry over to improved instructional leadership practice, having the capacity to impact student achievement outcomes.
Data from this two year qualitative case study supported the notion that sustained reflection and collaboration enhanced the professional growth and development of novice principals as they transitioned into building level school administration. An Administrative Leadership Academy, with its emphasis on mentoring and portfolio development provided the vehicle for such reflection and collaboration. Use of these tools proved beneficial in moving one early career principal toward becoming an expert problem solver. Mrs. Reed used data to enhance communication about the educational conditions within UJHS. She presented pictures of what was already known to initiate discussions about the conditions that were enhancing or impeding student achievement.

Table 4.3: High and Low Performing Portfolio Finishers for Region 2

Summary
The data provided the impetus for reflective and collective discussion around diagnosis of problems, as well as improvement strategies. While it is unclear how such growth impacts student outcome data, the evidence does suggest that such growth positively impacted the school climate. Once an atmosphere of trust between administration and teachers was established, teachers were more willing to partake in collaborative efforts around improving the learning environment of the school. While it is difficult to claim a direct link between leadership practice and student outcomes, findings from this study do provide direction for further research as well as provide implications for policy recommendations around the most appropriate means of professional development for school principals.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This dissertation study explored the actions of one mentor and one early career principal throughout their participation in an Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program. The Academy focused on supporting the continuous professional development of beginning administrators by nurturing reflective leadership and learning practices. Mentoring and portfolio writing, as a means of group and self reflection, were the primary methods of support instituted by the Leadership Academy. The literature on adult learning theory supports the use of reflective practice as a tool to enhance adult learning. The researcher applied Leithwood and Steinbach’s (1995) expert problem solving framework to examine the growth of the early career principal throughout her two year participation in the Academy.

Following an introduction to the study in Chapter One, Chapter Two reported the research surrounding the current state of educational administration, supporting the need for professional development for early career principals. The chapter further highlighted the research on the aspects of professional development related to the Administrative Leadership Academy, specifically mentoring, portfolio writing, and reflective practice as viewed through adult learning theory. Chapter Three outlined the qualitative research
design and methodology chosen for this case study, and Chapter Four presented a qualitative analysis of how involvement in the Administrative Leadership Academy impacted the professional growth and development of the novice principal. Discussion in Chapter 5 moves to the conclusions of the study and their implications for policy recommendations and future research around the professional development of early career principals.

Summary and Findings

Mrs. Reed began her career at Unified Junior High School in January, 2001, at a time when standard-based accountability characterized the educational environment of this Midwestern State. Although she recognized that instructional leadership was the most important part of her job, several barriers impeded her engagement in that role. Two of these barriers – gaps and redundancies in curriculum and the lack of short cycle assessments – related directly to curriculum and assessment, both of which were vital to the state mandated reform around increasing student outcomes. The third barrier – low staff morale – was negatively impacting the implementation of any changes that could positively affect the first two barriers to learning.

Shortly after beginning her career at Unified, Mr. Reed accepted the invitation to participate in the Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program. Joined by three other early career principals and one mentor from her district, she embarked on a journey of professional growth and development characterized by group and self reflection. These practices were modeled by other Academy participants, Academy coordinators and her mentor. As Mrs. Reed incorporated these practices into her own leadership framework, staff morale improved. The researcher’s perception of the
connection between reflective practice and improved staff morale was substantiated by UJHS staff, the mentor, and the superintendent. What follows is a review of the research findings as they pertain to each of the four research questions that guided the study.

**Research Question 1:** To what extent and in what ways do EYP principals gain understanding of the ISLLC standards in the context of their role as instructional leaders?

The ISLLC school leadership self inventory provides one means to assess Mrs. Reed’s understanding of the ISLLC standards within the context of her role as instructional leader. The self inventory provides a personal profile of a person’s school leadership assets based on the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders (see Appendix A for a copy of the ISLLC self inventory). The complete inventory tool consists of 182 statements describing knowledge, dispositions, and performances represented across the ISLLC standards; however, the inventory design is such that a person can assess themselves across all six standards or focus in on any one standard.

Due to time limitations, Mrs. Reed completed the self inventory for standard two which states that “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.” Assessing Mrs. Reed’s understanding of this standard seemed most appropriate and potentially beneficial since her primary barrier to student learning involved a culture plagued with low staff morale. Thus, Mrs. Reed completed the self inventory for standard two at the beginning of the EYP in October, 2001, and again at the conclusion of the program in July, 2003.
Within the self inventory for standard two, there are 11 knowledge statements, 8 disposition statements, and 20 performance statements. The principal is asked to read each statement and circle the number that best reflects their leadership practice during the past 12 months, with 1 representing little, 2 representing some, 3 representing sufficient, and 4 representing exemplary. Mrs. Reed’s score at the beginning of the study period was 106 for the 39 indicators or an average of 2.7. After her two year participation with the Academy EYP her score was 122, an average of 3.1.

The area that saw the least change over the two year period was in the area of dispositions. This likely reflects the notion that by the time principals obtain their first leadership role, their beliefs, values, and commitments are already established and a significant change in this area is unlikely. The only two areas that increased for Mrs. Reed were her “personal commitment to student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling and life-long learning for self and others” (Collaborative Professional Development Process, 2000). This commitment was evident as Mrs. Reed continually focused and re-focused the teachers back to the task at hand, this being continuous improvement around student achievement. She modeled life-long learning through her participation in the Administrative Leadership Academy, as well as participation in other district professional development opportunities such as Baldridge training (a national program to enhance the quality and productivity of organizations) and Leaders in Technology (a program sponsored by the Bill and Linda Gates Foundation).

Mrs. Reed’s commitment to life-long learning was evident in the second area of the self inventory. With respect to knowledge indicators, her score increased by 18%. Her scores for 8 of the 11 statements moved from some to sufficient. Several of the
statements readily correspond to activities and ideas emphasized by Academy coordinators. For example, three of the statements showing improvement were “knowledge of curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement; measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies; and the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth” (Collaborative Professional Development Process, 2000). At several regional meetings, Academy participants engaged in reflective dialog around Bernhardt’s (2002) *The School Portfolio Toolkit*. The *Toolkit* is designed to guide comprehensive data analysis around building a plan for eliminating the gap between where the learning organization is and where it wants to be with respect to student achievement. The networking around this resource was invaluable as participants shared ways they utilized the ideas from the *Toolkit* in their own real life situations. In addition, Academy coordinators shared information and insight around the State Department of Education’s Academic Content Standards providing the participants with additional tools to use with their teachers as they develop and refine their building curricula.

Mrs. Reed experienced an 8% increase in the performance area of the self inventory. This area reflects her efforts around improving the low staff morale at UJHS. She moved from *some* to *sufficient* in such statements as “barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed; the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis; the school is organized and aligned for success; and students and staff feel valued and important” (Collaborative Professional Development Process, 2000). In addition, she increased her rating from *some* to *exemplary* with respect to the statement, “student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated” (Collaborative...
Professional Development Process, 2000). Self-reflection and reflection with others played a significant role in the implementation of numerous strategies that affected Mrs. Reed’s responses to these statements. As Mrs. Reed developed trusting relationships with her staff and engaged with them in group decision-making, she experienced an increased confidence in her leadership abilities. The increased trust and confidence, coupled with stakeholder involvement, provided the space for implementing ideas that had a positive impact on the school’s culture and climate.

Research Question 2: To what degree do they perceive ongoing reflection (within their mentor/protégé groups and by means of portfolio writing) as a viable tool of principal practice?

Data from this study revealed that Mrs. Reed engaged in three types of reflection during her leadership activities: self-reflection, reflection with others, and written reflection. While she saw the value in all three, she was most comfortable with self-reflection as it best fit her preferred style. Each of the three reflective practices proved valuable in differing ways.

Mrs. Reed described her self-reflection as a process that occurred on a somewhat constant and continuous basis. Such reflective thinking usually generated new ideas. Once she had established a foundation for the new ideas, she moved on in the direction of reflection with others. Early in her leadership position, Mr. Ryan, the mentor, provided the primary means for such reflection. As she became more confident in her leadership ability and built more trust in the relationships with her staff, the teachers at Unified
became the primary source of Mrs. Reed’s reflection with others. In each case, reflection with others provided Mrs. Reed with a means to validate and extend the ideas that were generated during self-reflection.

Finally, writing served as the third means of engaging in reflective practice. Although Mrs. Reed recognized the value of writing, she admitted that it was difficult for her. “Sometimes it’s good when you reflect to not only think about it, but to write about it. I don’t do it as often as I should because I don’t like to write – I’m not a natural writer. Writing is difficult for me, but once I’ve done it, everything just opens up.” She saw the value in reflective writing as a way “to think on a deeper level.” Thus, writing forced her to more closely scrutinize the ideas that were generated through self-reflection and expanded through reflection with others.

Research Question 3: In what ways are they applying the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of the ISLLC standards and the corresponding reflective skills within their schools?

Mrs. Reed applied numerous ISLLC standard indicators during her quest to improve the overall educational climate at Urbana Junior High School. With respect to Standard 1 (facilitating a vision of learning shared and supported by the school community), continuous school improvement ranked high on her priority list with the revised CIP serving as her guide. As was modeled by her mentor, the continuous improvement plan provided a map to guide the group strategic planning process. She and her faculty continually revisited the plan. Several types of monthly meetings provided the framework for including all members of the school community in the school improvement efforts. Likewise, these same meetings allowed the vision, mission, and
implementation plans to be regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised. Data collection and analysis provided the means to not only develop the school’s vision and goals around student learning, but also to communicate and reflect on progress toward meeting the desired goals. Teachers were given the opportunities to recognize colleagues for their contributions by nominating them for staff recognition awards. Despite this collaborative environment, Mrs. Reed maintained focus on her own values and was committed to examining and expressing her own assumptions and beliefs around the best practices for educating children.

Meeting regularly with teachers and teacher leaders also afforded Mrs. Reed the opportunity to apply Standard 2 (advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture conducive to student learning and staff professional growth) to her leadership practice. Mrs. Reed shared her own knowledge as a means of professional growth for her staff. She utilized technology to analyze and represent data in ways that addressed the appraisal and assessment of student learning. Such data contributed to the evaluation and refinement of curriculum design.

Barriers to student learning were identified and addressed. In the case of UJHS, low staff morale was the most significant barrier; and the monthly meetings provided the venue for regular assessment of the school culture and climate. Implementation of the “issue bin” provided teachers the opportunity to air concerns in an honest and open environment. As reflected in the answers to the focus group questions, many of the staff recognized Mrs. Reed’s commitment to treating people fairly, equitably, and with respect. Even though she inherited a staff whose values and opinions were highly
divided, she acknowledged and accepted their individuality. Recognizing and celebrating individual contributions to the learning organization also became a regular event at the monthly staff meeting.

Addressing concerns in an open and honest environment also contributed to Mrs. Reed’s application of Standard 3 (ensuring management of the organization for a safe, effective, and efficient learning environment). By modeling and implementing effective communication skills, conflict resolution, and group problem solving processes, Mrs. Reed established an environment where potential problems could be identified, confronted, and resolved in a timely manner. Her decision to offer one of the most resistant teachers a department chair position involved a tremendous risk; however, it was a risk that paid off toward the betterment of the school climate. A commitment to involve all stakeholders in the management process resulted in an improvement in the learning environment at UJHS.

Standard 4 (collaborating with families and community members) was important to Mrs. Reed’s leadership. Mrs. Reed appeared to value the community as an important resource for the learning environment. She and other teacher leaders in her building approached local businesses for financial support for students who were unable to pay for extra curricular activities, field trips, etc. She supported the Community Connections organization by regularly attending their monthly meetings and serving as the main liaison between the community and the junior and senior high schools. On a more personal note, Mrs. Reed had two children who were actively involved in sports and attended UCSD, and a husband who also taught in the same school district. Thus she was highly visible in the community, often seeing her colleagues, students and parents at
numerous school-related and community events. When asked in what ways Mrs. Reed served as a role model for parents or students, one parent responded with, “the biggest thing is, she makes herself visible. She is at a lot of functions where she can be scrutinized by parents and students and she presents herself well. She is the type of person I would want my children to look up to.”

As previously stated, results from the focus group interview, confirmed Mrs. Reed’s commitment to Standard 5 (acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner). She served as a role model demonstrating a professional code of ethics. She continuously refocused group conversation back to the task at hand, not allowing personal vendettas to monopolize the conversation. She willingly exposed her own professional values to public scrutiny, while at the same time acknowledging the diverse values of others.

Her willingness to participate in the Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program and be involved in this case study, affirms Mrs. Reed’s commitment to Standard 6 (understanding and influencing the larger context). She actively engaged in and valued the importance of reflective discourse with other early career and mentor principals who, like herself, were impacting education. She was aware of the important role the Academy participants were playing in shaping public policy with respect to principal licensure standards. To this end, she willingly met the demands of the researcher with respect to data gathering and even offered unsolicited insight whenever the opportunity arose.
Research Question 4: What is the evidence of impact on the organization?

Just as Stan’s extreme negativity affected other staff and students, so too did his improvement in this area. This is not to say that he made a complete turn around; however, he took his job as department chair seriously. At meetings, he was always the first, and sometimes the only one to produce work that Mrs. Reed requested. Other department chairs even began teasing him because, “Stan always did what he was suppose to do.” As an outsider observing his participation and performance at meetings, this researcher would not have guessed this was a person who was known district-wide for his negativity and rebellious nature. His continuous preparedness and engagement in discussion served as role model to other teachers who were challenged to keep up with Stan because “he made [them] look bad.”

By inviting Stan to become more involved in the decision-making process at Unified Junior High School, Mrs. Reed began building trust in her relationships with all teachers. As the faculty gained trust in her, they were more willing to become involved in committees and activities centered on improving the educational culture and climate of the school. As their involvement increased, so too did their ownership of proposed solutions to problems. Thus, they were less apt to resist implementing strategies they took part in designing.

The vehicle for involving the teachers in implementation strategies was the continuous improvement plan, with its improved format. Constantly revisiting CIP served to focus all stakeholders on the building goals related to the vision and mission, and to hold them accountable for their role in achieving these goals. Data provided the
impetus for discussion around the CIP. Such data-driven dialog clarified and reinforced the areas where improvement was occurring, as well as the areas that needed continued attention.

Mrs. Reed’s use of self-reflection and collaboration were highly indicative of expert, as opposed to novice problem solvers. As Mrs. Reed moved toward expert problem solving, she relied heavily on both of these practices, engaging her faculty in problem interpretation, and the search for relevant information. The ability to reflect is dependent on certain innate factors such as psychological type. Mrs. Reed was most comfortable with self-reflection, which usually built the foundation for further group reflection. In the first year of the study, she spent more time reflecting with her mentor than with anyone else. She valued the daily contact with him as a means to validate and/or expand upon her ideas. As she lessened her dependency on her mentor and gained confidence in her own leadership skills, she engaged in more group reflection with her teachers. While there is still room for improvement, and low staff morale remains a topic within next year’s continuous improvement plan, the educational climate at Unified Junior High School more resembles a school culture that is conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Limitations of the Study

The sheer presence of an outsider can influence people’s actions and behaviors; thus, the researcher’s involvement at Unified Junior High School likely affected behaviors of the teachers, as well as the principal. By making herself known through repeated visits, the researcher hoped to increase the comfort level of the faculty at UJHS. If it was common for the faculty to see the researcher at meetings, they would grow more
comfortable engaging in typical behavior. Toward this end, the researcher made approximately 20 visits to UJHS for the purposes of attending continuous improvement plan roundtables, building improvement council meetings, department head meetings, all staff meetings, professional development days, and shadowing Mrs. Reed. This amounted to approximately 65 hours of engagement with the teachers. In addition, as part of the larger evaluative study, the researcher had opportunity to spend an additional 90 hours with Mrs. Reed, participating in 5 mentor/protégé small group meetings and 10 Administrative Leadership Academy regional meetings. Such prolonged engagement by the researcher adds credibility to the findings of the study.

A second limitation of this dissertation study relates to the sample size. This researcher conducted a case study of one protégé and her mentor throughout their involvement with an Administrative Leadership Academy. Granted, the likelihood of transferring findings from this study to other educational settings is limited, if not impossible. Still, a great deal can be learned from studying the specifics of a purposefully selected case in a naturalistic setting. By collecting sufficient data, the researcher can explore and interpret significant findings of the case, construct viewpoints, and lay a theoretical foundation for future research which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Although they likely differ from Mrs. Reed’s situation, all schools confront specific barriers to student learning. All schools must engage in the reflective processes used by Mrs. Reed, including constantly revisiting the CIP plan, and using data to drive collaborative and participatory decision-making and problem solving. In addition,
because this case was situated within a larger evaluative study, findings from the other researchers serve to validate/negate the findings.

The timeline for the study constitutes its final limitation. Although the researcher spent two years of engagement with the Administrative Leadership Academy and the participants from UCSD, educational change most often happens incrementally. Gathering evidence of impact on the organization and on student achievement requires long term study. Mrs. Reed was faced with three barriers to learning as she began her principal career at Unified. The biggest barrier was low staff morale. Building trust and changing school culture takes time. While data supported growth and improvement in this area, an additional year or two of data would further validate the findings.

With respect to the other two barriers – gaps in curriculum and lack of short cycle assessments – this past year provided only a foundation for addressing these barriers. Mrs. Reed projects that curriculum mapping will address the gaps and redundancies in curriculum, but that it will take several years to realize results. For the 2002-03 school year teachers focused on department level mapping. The next step will be to focus their attention on grade-level to grade-level curriculum mapping, with building to building mapping representing the final phase.

Likewise, extended response questions were used to address the area of short cycle assessments. Still, much of this year involved increasing the faculty’s awareness of how to write an appropriate extended response question and how to assess extended response answers. Future plans include engaging students in extended response short cycle assessments on a quarterly basis. The effects of either of these improvement efforts
are not likely to surface for several years. For as Fullen (1991) suggests, “even moderately complex changes take from three to five years, while major restructuring efforts can take five to ten years” (p. 49).

Triangulation of data collection methods and sources were the primary means of addressing the three limitations described above. Observations, interviews, and document analysis provided the researcher three different means of collecting information. In addition, the researcher’s perception was validated by multiple sources including, Academy participants, teachers, parents, and the superintendent.

The Future the Administrative Leadership Academy Entry-Year Program

At the beginning of this dissertation study, the Administrative Leadership Academy functioned somewhat autonomously outside the bureaucracy of the State Department of Education under the Leadership of a statewide Academy director. During this 4 year pilot phase, the program received funding from the State Department of Education. Early in 2003, the Department of Education began transitioning the program back within the internal structure of the state agency, hiring a full-time person to serve as consultant of School Leadership Entry-Year Programs. Although the position was offered to the former statewide director, he declined, agreeing to continue on as advisor during this transition phase. His leadership role terminated as of June 30, 2003.

From its inception, the Administrative Leadership Academy was charged with informing policy around professional development for principals. The State Department of Education continues to be responsible for developing policy regarding the continued professional development and licensure of school leaders. Thus, as the program moves from pilot to implementation stage, it made sense to bring such an entry year program
back within the structure of the state agency. Further, continuation of an entry year program is vital as the current standards for principal professional licensure require the completion of a performance-based assessment under the guidance of a mentor. However, future funding to support the program stands in question.

For the upcoming biennium budget, Department of Education officials requested continued support for early career principals. Subsequent cuts in both House and Senate versions of the budget leave program leaders unsure as to actual funding, as well as how best to allocate the dollars they eventually receive. The state director has suggested a budget of $250,000 to be divided equally among the five regions of the state. He further advised that the funds be used to pay a coordinator for each region, and provide each region a small operating budget.

Amidst this uncertainty, officials continue to provide assurances that principals beginning their professional leadership career in the 2003-04 school year will be provided some form of professional development similar to the program developed by the Administrative Leadership Academy. They will be provided mentoring support and complete some form of performance-based assessment such as the standards-based portfolio used by the Administrative Leadership Academy.

With the hiring of a State Department of Education consultant, the two state level principal professional associations entered the policy discussion in a much more formal and active manner. As discussed earlier in Chapter 4, these groups raised questions about the appropriateness of the administrator portfolio as a vehicle for early career principal professional development. In response, they each are designing alternative entry year programs and performance-based assessment frameworks. Thus, principals will now be
provided a choice of three paths to follow with regard to the performance-based assessment: the State Department of Education portfolio and program, a program being developed by the elementary administrator’s association, and one being designed by the secondary administrator’s association. Because of its six year history and continued financial support, the State Department of Education program is more fully developed than these other two options; however, the consultant for the State Department continues to provide guidance as the other two options develop.

State Department of Education officials maintain they are committed to ongoing engagement in all three licensure options to assure that they remain consistent with the design qualities previously established for principal professional development programs. Based largely on the history of the Administrative Leadership Academy, the State Department of Education maintains that principal professional development experiences should be:

1. Job embedded
   a. Must align with the real work experience
   b. Must align to building/district Continuous Improvement Plans

2. Standards-Based
   a. Must be framed by the ISLLC Standards
   b. Must place the [State] Academic Content Standards front and center

3. Performance-Based
   a. Must be product-oriented

4. Organized in small learning communities
   a. Mentor relationships
   b. Small cluster
   c. Regional format

5. A sustained commitment
   a. Must be a multi-year engagement
If all three options do not involve a similar caliber of work and a similar commitment of
time and energy, it is likely that overwhelmed early career principals may choose the
option that is easiest or quickest as opposed to the option that provides the most potent
professional development opportunities.

Directions for Future Research

Having three available options to achieve professional principal licensure
suggests an important focus for future research. A comparative study across the three
programs could provide the State Department of Education and policy makers with
important information as to the best use of limited professional development dollars.
Having three
options that are performance-based provides for the possibility of comparing participant
results on the various product-oriented, performance-based assessments against their
building’s student outcome data.

In the age of standards-based reform, the State Department of Education is
mandated to define accountability measures in more consistent and predictable ways.
Development of the Academic Content Standards and corresponding annual assessments
more closely define content and performance standards across all grade levels. Thus,
future studies may consider student outcomes within the context of this more cohesive,
consistent, and closely aligned accountability system.

In addition, as the completion of a product-oriented, performance-based
assessment moves from a voluntary program to a mandatory licensure requirement for all
entry year principals, the number of participants will greatly increase. The larger sample
size should allow for the possibility of incorporating quantitative data analyses. Still,
while such quantitative analyses of data will be both feasible and desirable, the dynamic
environment of education still lends itself to complimentary methods. Unpredictable
changes at all levels characterize an educational research setting. Locally, principals
change buildings and/or school districts frequently, the state continues to raise the bar for
student achievement outcomes, and federal mandates and federal dollars prove
unpredictable. Thus, qualitative studies similar to the one described here, add important
context, enriching our understanding of the constructs and dynamics under study.

While the options presented by the two state level administrator associations may
survive without financial backing, the State Department of Education program option is
dependent on the state budget for survival. Under current principal licensure standards,
school districts are required to provide mentors to all new principals. Finding quality
mentors may prove difficult in the early years of this mandatory licensure requirement.
Questions related to mentoring present opportunity for continuing research. What should
be included in mentor training across the three entry year professional development
options? What are the benefits and limitations of mentors from the same school
district/school building as the novice principal? What are the benefits and limitations of
employing retired principals as mentors?

Issues surrounding the specifics of this dissertation study also invite future
research possibilities. For example, the more consistent and cohesive state accountability
system lends itself to a study surrounding the continuing growth of Mrs. Reed and the
possible relationship of such growth to student achievement. In addition, a follow-up
study of high versus low scoring portfolio finishers and their connection to student
achievement could further advance the notion set forth is this study that the skills needed to create a standards-based portfolio carry over into leadership practice.

The State Department of Education in this Midwestern state has moved toward providing early career principals with quality professional development, that is, sustained, standards-based, performance-based, product-oriented professional development supported by a mentoring relationship. Performance-based assessment of principals will assist in linking leadership performance to student outcomes. This link, coupled with a larger number of participants, affords future research options that cut across program options, across regions of the state, and across school district types (urban, suburban, and rural). Establishing baseline data in the first year of the mandatory principal licensure requirements could feed a variety of longitudinal studies around effective professional development for school leaders.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter began with a brief overview of the dissertation study following by a summary of findings related to each of the four research questions. Next the study limitations were reviewed. Finally, the researcher presented a discussion of future research possibilities posed as a result of this study.

This dissertation study was part of a larger evaluative study of an Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program in a large Midwestern state. For purposes of this dissertation, the researcher conducted a case study of one mentor and one protégé throughout their involvement with the Academy. Data was collected at all regional Academy functions, as well as on site at the junior high school where the protégé served as principal.
Results of the data collection and analysis support the benefits of sustained reflection on the professional growth of an early career principal. Mentoring and portfolio writing were the means used by Academy coordinators to encourage novice principals to engage in such reflection. Self-reflection, reflection with others, and written reflection provided guidance to this novice principal as she attempted to improve the climate of the school by establishing trust, building confidence in her leadership abilities, and engaging teachers in collaborative decision-making and problem-solving processes. These findings lay the theoretical foundations for future research.
APPENDIX A

ISLLC Standards
STANDARDS BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT 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.

To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL MASTERY of the following Knowledge indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge indicators</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning goals in a pluralistic society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective consensus-building and negotiation skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL BELIEF, VALUE AND COMMITMENT in the following Disposition indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition indicators</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the educability of all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a school vision of high standards and learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuous school improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the inclusion of all members of the school community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- a willingness to continuously examine one’s own assumptions, beliefs, and practices
- doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance

**To what extent do I CURRENTLY FACILITATE PROCESSES AND ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES ensuring the following Performance indicators?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the vision and mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the vision is developed with and among stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school community is involved in school improvement efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment data related to student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
learning are used to develop the school vision and goals

- relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals

- barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed

- needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission and goals

- existing resources are used in support of school vision and goals

- the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised

Standard 1. Average = Total/28  Average = ________

♦ STANDARDS BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL LEADERS ♦

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.

To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL MASTERY of the following Knowledge indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Indicators</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student growth and development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied learning theories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied motivational theories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles of effective instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies  
 1 2 3 4
• diversity and its meaning for educational programs  
 1 2 3 4
• adult learning and professional development models  
 1 2 3 4
• the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals  
 1 2 3 4
• the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth  
 1 2 3 4
• school cultures  
 1 2 3 4

To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL BELIEF, VALUE AND COMMITMENT in the following Disposition indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the proposition that all students can learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the variety of ways in which students can learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life-long learning for self and others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development as an integral part of school improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the benefits that diversity brings to the school community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a safe and supportive learning environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparing students to be contributing members of society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do I CURRENTLY FACILITATE PROCESSES AND ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES ensuring the following Performance indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals
• students and staff feel valued and important
• the responsibilities and contributions of each individual are acknowledged
• barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed
• diversity is considered in developing learning experiences
• life-long learning is encouraged and modeled
• there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance
• technologies are used in teaching and learning
• student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated
• multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students
• the school is organized and aligned for success
• curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined
• curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies
• the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis
• a variety of sources of information is used to make decisions
• student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques
• multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students
• a variety of supervisory and evaluation models is employed
pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families

Standard 2. Average = Total/39  Average = ________

STANDARDS BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

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.

To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL MASTERY of the following Knowledge indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Indicators</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational procedures at the school and district level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles and issues relating to school safety and security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human resources management and development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal issues impacting school operations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current technologies that support management functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do I have a *CURRENT PERSONAL BELIEF, VALUE AND COMMITMENT* in the following *Disposition* indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>making management decisions to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance learning and teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking risks to improve schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusting people and their judgment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-quality standards, expectations,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and performances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involving stakeholders in management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a safe environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do I *CURRENTLY FACILITATE PROCESSES AND ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES* ensuring the following *Performance* indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of learning, teaching and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student development is used to inform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational procedures are designed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and managed to maximize opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for successful learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emerging trends are recognized,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studied, and applied as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational plans and procedures to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve the vision and goals of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school are in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collective bargaining and other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contractual agreements related to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school are effectively managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school plant, equipment, and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support systems operate safely,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiently, and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals
- potential problems and opportunities are identified
- problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner
- financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of the school
- the school acts entrepreneurially to support continuous improvement
- organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed
- stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting the school
- responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability
- effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used
- effective conflict resolution skills are used
- effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used
- effective communication skills are used
- there is effective use of technology to manage school operations
- fiscal resources of the school are managed responsibly, efficiently, and effectively
- a safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained
- human resource functions support the attainment of school goals
- confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3. Average = Total/38</th>
<th>Average = __________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

To what extent do I have a *CURRENT PERSONAL MASTERY* of the following *Knowledge* indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community relations and marketing strategies and processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful models of school, family, business, community, government, and higher education partnerships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do I have a *CURRENT PERSONAL BELIEF, VALUE AND COMMITMENT* in the following *Disposition* indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>schools operating as an integral part of the larger community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration and communication with families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the proposition that diversity enriches the school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• families as partners in the education of their children
• the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind
• resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students
• an informed public

To what extent do I currently facilitate processes and engage in activities ensuring the following performance indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships with community leaders are identified and nurtured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school and community serve one another as resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support school goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• community youth family services are integrated with school programs
• community stakeholders are treated equitably
• diversity is recognized and valued
• effective media relations are developed and maintained
• a comprehensive program of community relations is established
• public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely
• community collaboration is modeled for staff
• opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided

Standard 4. Average = Total/29  Average = ________

♦ STANDARDS BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL LEADERS ♦

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.

To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL MASTERY of the following Knowledge indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the values of the diverse school community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional codes of ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the philosophy and history of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do I have a *CURRENT PERSONAL BELIEF, VALUE AND COMMITMENT* in the following *Disposition* indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the ideal of the common good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the principles in the Bill of Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the right of every student to a free, quality education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinating one’s own interest to the good of the school community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepting the consequences for upholding one’s principles and actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using the influence of one’s office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of a caring school community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do I *CURRENTLY FACILITATE PROCESSES AND ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES* ensuring the following *Performance* indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>examines personal and professional values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serves as a role model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accepts responsibility for school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• considers the impact of one’s administrative practices on others
• uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain
• treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect
• protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff
• demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community
• recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others
• examines and considers the prevailing values of the diverse school community
• expects that others in the school community will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior
• opens the school to public scrutiny
• fulfills legal and contractual obligations
• applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerably

Standard 5. Average = Total/29  Average = ________
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.

To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL MASTERY of the following Knowledge indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the law as related to education and schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do I have a CURRENT PERSONAL BELIEF, VALUE AND COMMITMENT in the following Disposition indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education as a key to opportunity and social mobility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognizing a variety of ideas, values and cultures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do I CURRENTLY FACILITATE PROCESSES AND ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES ensuring the following Performance indicators?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>SUFFICIENT</th>
<th>EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students and their families</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication occurs within the school community on trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students

• lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community

Standard 6. Average = Total/19  Average = ________
APPENDIX B

ETS Portfolio Questions
COMPONENT A1 – FACILITATING THE VISION OF LEARNING WITHIN THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

1. THE COMMUNITY

What would you identify as the most significant features of the community in which your school or district exists? How do these features affect student learning? How do these features help shape your decision-making and your activities as a school leader?

2. THE STUDENTS

What are the defining characteristics of the students in the school or district? How do these characteristics affect student learning? How do these defining characteristics help shape your decision-making and your activities as a school leader?

3. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

What is the organizational structure of the school or district? How does this structure influence your decision-making and your activities as a school leader?

4. CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND ASSESSMENT

What are the most significant aspects of the school's or district's curriculum, instruction, and assessment? How do these identified aspects affect student learning? How do these aspects affect your decision-making and your activities as a school leader?

5. REFLECTION

What do you consider to be the greatest strengths of the system in which you work, and what do you consider to be the greatest challenges posed by the system? How do you hope to draw on these strengths and address these challenges in order to promote the success of all students?
COMPONENT A2 – SUSTAINING A CULTURE CONducive TO STUDENT LEARNING

1. THREE BARRIERS TO LEARNING

Identify and describe three significant barriers to learning for either all students or subsets of students in your school or district. Why are these barriers significant? What is their impact on student learning?

2. THE STUDENTS

Choose one of the three barriers that you have worked to remove or reduce. Describe the students most affected by the barrier. What were the learning needs of these students, and how did this barrier keep these needs from being met?

3. THE STAKEHOLDERS

Identify the other stakeholders (i.e., parents, teachers, community members, other students) that you considered in addressing the barrier. What role did they play with respect to the barrier? How did you involve them in understanding and addressing the barrier?

4. STRATEGY FOR ADDRESSING THE BARRIER

Describe the strategy that was used to address this barrier. Why was this strategy selected?

5. REFLECTION

Reflect on your experience addressing this barrier by explaining what worked well, and what you would do differently if given the opportunity. What have you learned from this experience that you can apply to other barriers you may face in the future?
COMPONENT B1 – UNDERSTANDING AND RESPONDING TO THE LARGER CONTEXT

1. IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION

Identify and describe a statewide, multi-state, or national issue/trend that impacts student learning in your school or district.

2. IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING

Describe how student learning in your school or district is impacted by this issue/trend. Explain two specific examples of this negative impact.

3. LOCAL RESPONSE

Explain how you and your staff responded to this issue/trend. What was the impact of this response to student learning?

4. WIDESPREAD COLLABORATION

Explain how one collaborator from outside your school or district helped you understand and/or respond to this issue/trend.

5. REFLECTION

What have you learned from your experience addressing this issue/trend that has shaped your school leadership practices? How will you use this knowledge to anticipate and respond to statewide, multi-state, or national issues/trends in the future?
COMPONENT B2 – COLLABORATING WITH FAMILIES AND COMMUNITY

1. COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

Describe one partnership that you, either individually or as a part of a team, have developed between your school/district and area businesses, institutions of higher education, and/or other community groups and leaders that had a significant impact on student learning in your school or district. Explain and evaluate the specific impacts that this partnership had on student learning.

2. PARTNERSHIP WITH A FAMILY

Describe and explain the ways in which you worked with one student's family in an ongoing way to help the student with a specific learning challenge or to help the student excel in an area of strength. Explain and evaluate how working with this family focused on the learning needs of the student and the specific impact that this partnership had on this student's learning.

3. PARTNERSHIP WITH A GROUP OF FAMILIES

Describe and explain the ways in which you worked with a group of families to help students with a specific learning challenge or to help students excel in an area of strength. Explain and evaluate the specific impacts that this partnership had on the students' learning.

4. ESTABLISHING A CULTURE THAT PROMOTES COLLABORATION

Explain how you have established or facilitated a culture among school/district staff that encourages and promotes effective collaboration with the surrounding community. Give an example of how and when communication and collaboration between your staff and the community have advanced student learning. (The focus of this question is on the collaborative activities engaged in by your staff and how you supported these efforts - do not repeat the partnerships discussed in questions 1-3.)

5. REFLECTION

Based on the collaborative work you have undertaken in developing this Component, evaluate your strengths and weaknesses as a communicator and collaborator.
COMPONENT C1 – SUPPORTING PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

1. SETTING GOALS FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Describe the collaborative process that led to the establishment of two goals for a specific staff member in your school or district.

2. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Explain how the overall approach to professional development for this staff member focused on student learning. Describe one specific professional development activity that this staff member engaged in. Why was this activity chosen? Explain how this particular professional development activity focused on student learning.

3. MONITORING PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

To what extent did this professional development plan impact the staff member's performance and student learning?

4. DEVELOPMENT OF STAFF COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION SKILLS

Focus on the entire teaching staff or a significant subgroup, such as teachers at a grade level, a subject matter department, or an interdisciplinary team. For the group you have selected, describe one specific instance that shows how you developed effective communication and collaboration regarding teaching and learning issues.

5. REFLECTION

What have you learned from your experiences working with the individual staff member and with the larger group of staff that will help you in the future promote staff professional growth and to create a positive learning environment so that student learning is enhanced?
COMPONENT C2 – ORGANIZING RESOURCES FOR AN EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

1. IDENTIFICATION AND DEFINITION OF THE ISSUE

Identify two or more opposing individuals, groups, or factions who have competing claims over the allocation of resources. What was the claim regarding the allocation of resources in which they were involved? What were the potential educational impacts of allocating the resources in the various ways advocated by the contending parties?

2. SETTING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

What were the educational goals and/or objectives for student learning that influenced the conflict resolution process? How were these goals and/or objectives identified?

3. IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL AND/OR ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES

In beginning to address this issue, what were all of the potential resources that were available? How were these potential resources identified? Why were these resources considered? If applicable, make sure that your response explores the full range of financial, human, and material resources available to you.

4. CONFLICT RESOLUTION

What process was used to move the competing parties toward resolution? Explain how you facilitated the negotiation and collaboration of those involved in the conflict.

5. REFLECTION

Recalling what were, in your opinion, the keys for the eventual outcome, what did you learn from this experience that you could apply to future, similar situations?
APPENDIX C

Mentor/Protégé Interview Guide
Administrative Leadership Academy

Protégé/ Mentor Interview Guide

Introductory Statements:
The Administrative Leadership Academy (ALA) Entry Year Program (EYP) intends to provide meaningful professional development so that quality educational leaders will enter and remain in the principalship, finding acceptable levels of satisfaction within the job and performing it effectively. Ongoing evaluation of these professional development activities is essential in order that Academy planners might determine the effectiveness of the various EYP interventions. How do Academy learning experiences support entry year principals within their new leadership roles? Does consistent mentoring and coaching, with the accompanying reflective dialogue, provide meaningful support to principals in their early years of practice? To what degree are these activities and interventions, particularly the development of administrative portfolios, capable of directing and improving administrator practice?

In order to answer these questions, a two-year qualitative evaluation study of the Entry Year Program is being conducted. The study will focus on the work of veteran/protégé principal groups, the nature of the mentorship process, and the development of necessary skills for administrator portfolio writing. Further, the study will consider questions regarding the application of these skills to administrator practice. The study will result in a descriptive analysis of Academy interventions, entry year principal activities, and the application of knowledge gained to leadership practice within schools and school districts.

Background
1. How long have you been an administrator? Include prior administrative experiences.

2. How long did you teach before becoming an administrator?
   a. Grade level?
   b. Content area?
   c. In addition to or instead of teaching, tell me about other professional positions you have held.

3. How did you become involved in ALA?
   a. What is your prior knowledge of ALA?
   b. Talk to me about your feelings regarding ALA and your involvement. Probe: Fears, anxieties, excitement?
4. Describe your administrator preparation program.

Probe: What do you believe to be its strengths and weaknesses?

5. How would you define professional development?

a. Describe your own professional development experiences.

b. Tell me about one that was particularly helpful.

c. To what degree have these past experiences: coincided with the real challenges confronting your school, emphasized teaching and learning, been continuous?

6. What or who influenced your decision to become an administrator?

Probe: Particular person, experience, former job responsibilities?

7. List and then describe the important domains of your job. Which do you feel consumes the majority of your time? Why?

8. ISLLC Standards for School Leadership are relatively new to the field. Are you familiar with the ISLLC standards? (Please elaborate)

**Practice: These next questions involve your own practice as a school leader.**

1. Tell me about the mission of your school.

a. When developed?

b. By whom?

c. Through what process?

d. What vision of education (or values) does the mission of your school reflect?

e. How is it communicated to school community and beyond?

2. What is your understanding of reflective practice?

   Probes: Thinking, questioning, seeking information, deliberating, pondering, assessing, recreating, rehearsing, evaluating, touch basing, consulting.

   a. Tell me a time when you reflected about a school problem or a need.
   b. If I had been with you, what would I have observed?
c. Did you reflect with another person, other people?

d. What was the outcome?

3. To what degree you value such reflection?

4. Name some tools you might apply as you reflect.

5. Can you tell me about a time reflection helped you as a leader?

6. What are indicators that reflection happens at your school?

Probes:

Curriculum
Funding
Programs
Across grade levels
On a system level
Cross person probing/ ask teachers about students, administrators about teachers, teachers about administrators, etc.

7. What are the barriers to reflection at your school?

a. How did/do you break down these barriers?

8. How would you describe the current culture of your school?

Probes: Norms, values, beliefs, myths, stories

9. Research has shown that school culture (norms, values, beliefs, and traditions that develop over time and influence individual and organizational behavior) plays a significant role in determining student motivation and achievement. If, as the research suggests, "the challenge for leaders is to develop a consensus around values that constitute an effective culture" (Stolp & Smith, p. 160), then what values, norms, and beliefs would you strive to develop so as to foster a culture conducive to student learning and achievement?

   a. How steps would you take to change an ineffective culture to an effective culture?

   b. Once changed, talk about how you would continue to nurture and sustain that culture.

   c. What do you believe about staff development?
- What is its purpose?

- What is its relationship to student learning?

10. What particular ethical principles/values do you employ when engaged in decision making?

11. What mechanisms are in place to evaluate school programs, policies and procedures? (i.e. advisory groups, leadership teams)

a. What tangible results can you name?

12. What sorts of specific data do you collect at your school?

Probes:
Student outcomes
Teacher outcomes
Parent involvement
Administrator decision making
Policy development

a. Now let’s consider your response regarding _______________.
Tell me about some of the specific ways you use this information.

13. In what ways do you engage the community in decision making?

14. In what ways do you perceive of yourself as a role model and for whom?
15. Talk for a bit about what you perceive to be your role as instructional leader of the school.

a. Define instructional leader.

b. What would be your level of involvement?

c. How do you define the principles of effective instruction?

d. What is the impact of diversity on educational programs?

e. What are your thoughts on evaluation and assessment?

f. How might you go about ensuring the success of all student learners?

g. What about the other learners within your school community?

h. Given the capacity, what role do you see for technology in promoting student learning?
16. School administrators are both leaders and managers of their school organizations. As such, principals are charged with managing the organization, its operations and resources so as to ensure a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. What experience or knowledge base do you think you have that will help you in your role as manager?

a. What other knowledge would increase your effectiveness as manager?

b. What factors currently in place help ensure a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment?

c. What, if any, barriers exist to your work as an effective manager?

d. Talk about what you will do to improve the management of your school operations.

**Mentorship:** These next questions refer to your ALA mentoring experiences.

1. What is your understanding of a mentor’s role.

a. What are the qualifications of a good mentor?

b. What makes a good mentor?

c. What are the responsibilities of a mentor?

2. Research suggests direct mentor/protégé matching enhances such relationships. What factors might be important to consider in making such matching decisions?

3. Prior to ALA, what sorts of mentoring experiences have you had. Please describe.

4. Recall a conversation you had with your mentor/protégé that was particularly helpful/noteworthy.

5. What sorts of activities do you and your mentor/protégé engage in together?

   a. How often have you met?

   b. Was the usual duration of these meetings?

   c. Talk to me about your sense of the adequacy of this sort of schedule.

6. Describe a specific strategy you have gained or improved upon as a result of your work with your mentor, within your mentor/protégé group, as a mentor?
7. Take me through a day in the life of an entry year/mentor principal at ..... Highs Lows Supports

8. Describe the most useful part of your mentoring experiences within ALA thus far.

9. Least useful part. What would you change?

Portfolio: This last set of questions involves the administrator portfolio.
1. What is your understanding of the portfolio process? What are the purposes of an administrator portfolio?

2. Prior to ALA, what sorts of portfolio related experiences have you had. Please describe.

3. What do you expect to be your biggest challenge in writing the portfolio?

Your biggest strength?

4. How does the portfolio relate to the ISLLC standards?

5. What sorts of knowledge do you predict that you will draw upon/ have drawn upon in writing your portfolio?

6. Do you think that the portfolio will benefit your work as a school leader? If so, how?

7. Given that this will be policy, in what ways, if any, do you think that the portfolio process can be improved?

Usefulness to practice

As a problem solving tool

8. How do you foresee your mentor being of assistance in the completion of the portfolio.

Summary
1. Is there anything you’d like to add regarding your own personal/professional experiences-

a. as an entry year principal.

b. as a mentor.

c. within the Academy.
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Teacher Interview Guide
Administrative Leadership Academy

Teacher Interview Guide

Introductory Statements:
The Administrative Leadership Academy (ALA) Entry Year Program (EYP) intends to provide meaningful professional development so that quality educational leaders will enter and remain in the principalship, finding acceptable levels of satisfaction within the job and performing it effectively. Ongoing evaluation of these professional development activities is essential in order that Academy planners might determine the effectiveness of the various EYP interventions. How do Academy learning experiences support entry year principals within their new leadership roles? Does consistent mentoring and coaching, with the accompanying reflective dialogue, provide meaningful support to principals in their early years of practice? To what degree are these activities and interventions, particularly the development of administrative portfolios, capable of directing and improving administrator practice?

In order to answer these questions, a two-year qualitative evaluation study of the Entry Year Program is being conducted. The study will focus on the work of veteran/protégé principal triads, the nature of the mentorship process, and the development of necessary skills for administrator portfolio writing. Further, the study will consider questions regarding the application of these skills to administrator practice. The study will result in a descriptive analysis of Academy interventions, entry year principal activities, and the application of knowledge gained to leadership practice within schools and school districts.

The following questions are to obtain teacher background information:

1. Race/gender/age
2. How many years and what grades have you taught?
3. What is your educational background?
4. What is your current position?
5. What if any school organizations are you active with (e.g. leadership team, PTA, etc.)
6. How long have you served under your current principal?

The following questions relate to teacher practice under your current principal:

1. To what extent were you involved with the development of the school’s mission? --How effectively was the mission communicated to the staff?
2. How would you describe the current culture of your school?
3. How would you describe your prior involvement with professional development? Please describe those experiences. (Principal involvement?)

4. To what extent do you feel that the school community is involved with school improvement efforts?

5. Describe the way(s) in which life long learning is encouraged and modeled in this school?

6. Describe the way(s) in which students and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated.

7. To what extent is faculty expertise sought for curriculum decisions?

8. What kinds of data are collected at your school?  
   --Who collects it?  
   --How is it used?

9. Who are the stakeholders involved in decision making affecting this school?

10. How are problems confronted/resolved among staff, students, and stakeholders in this school? (Principal involvement?)

11. What do you believe to be the role/function of an instructional leader?  
    --How does the way in which your principal leads fit with your understanding of this?

12. In what ways does your principal demonstrate him/herself to be an instructional leader?

13. Describe the way(s) in which your principal models community collaboration.

14. What, if any, outreach efforts have been made to agencies and outside organizations?

15. To what extent has your principal facilitated or influenced parent involvement at your school?
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Administrative Leadership Academy

Parent Interview Guide

Introductory Statements:
The Administrative Leadership Academy (ALA) Entry Year Program (EYP) intends to provide meaningful professional development so that quality educational leaders will enter and remain in the principalship, finding acceptable levels of satisfaction within the job and performing it effectively. Ongoing evaluation of these professional development activities is essential in order that Academy planners might determine the effectiveness of the various EYP interventions. How do Academy learning experiences support entry year principals within their new leadership roles? Does consistent mentoring and coaching, with the accompanying reflective dialogue, provide meaningful support to principals in their early years of practice? To what degree are these activities and interventions, particularly the development of administrative portfolios, capable of directing and improving administrator practice?

In order to answer these questions, a two-year qualitative evaluation study of the Entry Year Program is being conducted. The study will focus on the work of veteran/protégé principal triads, the nature of the mentorship process, and the development of necessary skills for administrator portfolio writing. Further, the study will consider questions regarding the application of these skills to administrator practice. The study will result in a descriptive analysis of Academy interventions, entry year principal activities, and the application of knowledge gained to leadership practice within schools and school districts.

1. Talk about your involvement with your school.

Probes: number of years, children attending, activities you are engaged in

2. Talk to me the ways you are involved with your child’s overall educational experience.

Probes: At home, at school, in the community

3. Are you familiar with the school’s vision and if so, how have you been made aware of it?

4. As a parent, in what ways do you have opportunities to provide input and/or evaluate the effectiveness of the learning environment?

5. Do you believe the principal values ____________, and if so, how does he/she show it? (inserting three different scenarios: educability for all; high standards of learning; and continuous improvement

6. Tell me about the learning opportunities at this school.
(diversity is considered, multiplicity of opportunities)

7. How are student and staff accomplishments recognized and celebrated?

8. How do you feel about safety at your school?

9. What has the principal done to make this school a safe learning environment?

10. In what ways have you had the opportunity to observe the principal’s problem solving skills in action? (are problems and opportunities identified; are problems confronted and resolved in a timely manner)

11. What efforts at collaboration has this principal made with families? with the community?

12. How has the principal taken advantage of community resources?

13. In what ways has the principal served as a role model?

14. How has the principal demonstrated an appreciation for and sensitivity to diversity in the school community?

15. Schools are front and center within the news of late, with much attention paid to school funding, proficiency testing, school safety.
   a. What evidence do you see of your principal understanding and addressing these concerns within your school?
   b. How has this affected teaching and learning in the classroom?
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Superintendent Interview Guide
Administrative Leadership Academy

Superintendent Interview Guide

Introductory Statements:
The Administrative Leadership Academy (ALA) Entry Year Program (EYP) intends to provide meaningful professional development so that quality educational leaders will enter and remain in the principalship, finding acceptable levels of satisfaction within the job and performing it effectively. Ongoing evaluation of these professional development activities is essential in order that Academy planners might determine the effectiveness of the various EYP interventions. How do Academy learning experiences support entry year principals within their new leadership roles? Does consistent mentoring and coaching, with the accompanying reflective dialogue, provide meaningful support to principals in their early years of practice? To what degree are these activities and interventions, particularly the development of administrative portfolios, capable of directing and improving administrator practice?

In order to answer these questions, a two-year qualitative evaluation study of the Entry Year Program is being conducted. The study will focus on the work of veteran/protégé principal triads, the nature of the mentorship process, and the development of necessary skills for administrator portfolio writing. Further, the study will consider questions regarding the application of these skills to administrator practice. The study will result in a descriptive analysis of Academy interventions, entry year principal activities, and the application of knowledge gained to leadership practice within schools and school districts.

1. What is your understanding of ALA’s purposes and goals?
   a. Why did you select ____________ for participation in the ALA?
   b. What are this ____________’s strengths/weaknesses?
   c. What changes do you hope to see in ______________ as a result of their participation in ALA?

2. Talk to me about how you are currently evaluating the effectiveness of principals.

3. To what degree is mentorship important in the process of?
   a. Evaluation.
   b. Professional development.

4. To what degree do you see portfolios in the scheme of?
   a. Professional development.
   b. Evaluation.
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Focus Group Interview Questions
Focus Group Interview Questions

1. Do you perceive Mrs. Reed as an instructional leader, and if so, what are some of the things she does that conveys such a perception?

2. What changes, if any, have you observed about Mrs. Reed’s leadership style/qualities from last year to present?

3. What significant changes, if any, have you observed at UJHS since Mrs. Reed has been principal?
APPENDIX H

Contact Summary Form
ALA Contact Summary Form

Contact type:
Contact site:
Contact date:
Written by:

In attendance:

Detailed Observations:

Salient Points

Themes/Aspects
APPENDIX I

Emerging Codes/Themes
## Data Analysis
### Emerging Codes/Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instruct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>Define</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(2)</td>
<td>Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(3)</td>
<td>BarSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(4)</td>
<td>StuAch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(5)</td>
<td>ProData</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(6)</td>
<td>ISLLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(7)</td>
<td>BestPrac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(8)</td>
<td>SchCult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(9)</td>
<td>ManPrac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)</td>
<td>RefPrac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)1</td>
<td>BarRef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)2</td>
<td>DefRef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)3</td>
<td>IndRef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)4</td>
<td>EthPrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)5</td>
<td>Affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)6</td>
<td>RefPrac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)7</td>
<td>RefMent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)8</td>
<td>RefWrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(10)9</td>
<td>Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(11)</td>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>PrefQual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(2)</td>
<td>Pairing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(3)</td>
<td>NatRel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(4)</td>
<td>FormInform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(5)</td>
<td>PriMenExp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(6)</td>
<td>MenProDev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(7)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(8)</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(9)</td>
<td>EY Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(10)</td>
<td>Problem Solv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PortDev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(1)</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>RefTool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(3)</td>
<td>ISLLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>Strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(5)</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(6)</td>
<td>MentAsst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(7)</td>
<td>StuAch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(8)</td>
<td>PorProDev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(9)</td>
<td>SugImprov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(10)</td>
<td>LinkLeadPr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(10)1</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(10)2</td>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(10)3</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(10)4</td>
<td>Delib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(11)</td>
<td>EvalTool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ProfDev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(1)</td>
<td>Defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>AdltLearn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(3)</td>
<td>CommPrac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(4)</td>
<td>Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(5)</td>
<td>KSAVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(6)</td>
<td>CritFrnds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(7)</td>
<td>OPLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(8)</td>
<td>RelwOthrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(9)</td>
<td>UnivPrep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>CommInvol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EarlyCareer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SchDis Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EYP Devel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(1)</td>
<td>StakeInvolv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(2)</td>
<td>PolicyOpt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Participant Information Letter
PURPOSE:
The Administrative Leadership Academy Entry Year Program intends to provide meaningful professional development so that quality educational leaders will enter and remain in the principalship, finding acceptable levels of satisfaction within the job and performing it effectively. Ongoing study of these professional development activities is essential in order that Academy planners might determine the effectiveness of the various EYP interventions. How do Academy learning experiences support entry year principals within their new leadership roles? Does consistent mentoring and coaching, with the accompanying reflective dialogue, provide meaningful support to principals in their early years of practice? To what degree are these activities and interventions, particularly the development of administrative portfolios, capable of directing and improving administrator practice?

In order to answer these questions, a two-year study of the Entry Year Program is being conducted. The study will focus on the work of veteran/protégé principal mentor groups, the nature of the mentorship process, and the development of necessary skills for administrator portfolio writing. Further, the study will consider questions regarding the application of these skills to administrator practice. The study will result in a descriptive analysis of Academy interventions, entry year principal activities, and the application of knowledge gained to leadership practice within schools and school districts.

In addition, the study will explore the state’s emerging school administrator licensure standards and corresponding policies. The language of the licensure standards stipulate that principals must complete the EYP in order to be licensed by the state department of education. This study will investigate policy compliance attitudes related to ALA and emerging licensure standards in the state, considering the policy that regulates the actions of principals by way of the ALA. Complimentary qualitative and quantitative methods will be employed within this research.

PROCEDURES
- The case study team will consist of five educational researchers from , two faculty members and three graduate research assistants from the College of Education.

- Information for the individual case studies will be gathered between November 2001 and June 2003 using a variety of methods that the case study team selects as
appropriate for the particular context and objectives (e.g., individual interviews, school site observations, survey questionnaires, informal discussion, focus groups).

- Interviews will be audio taped and interviewees may be contacted for clarification or for further study.

- Interviews will last approximately one hour and will take place at the school site or at the site of regional ALA meetings. Early career principals will be interviewed three times over the course of the study.

**BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS**

Benefits from participation in the case study project will accrue mainly to school and school district personnel closely associated with the Academy efforts. These benefits include:

- opportunity for school staff to network and share with other schools;
- consultative assistance to school staff on school improvement from university partners;
- professional development activities for participating principals related to school improvement;
- opportunity for new learning about the process of improving schools.

**RIGHTS OF PARTICIPANTS**

- Participation is voluntary. You are free to ask questions, to clarify statements, to not answer particular questions, and to withdraw from this project at any time without penalty or adverse effect, at which point interview and observation data pertaining to you will be destroyed.

- Researchers will respect the confidentiality of individuals participating in interviews, observations, surveys, or named in case study documentary data (e.g., local reports, meeting minutes, etc.). No data will be reported beyond the case study and project-level research teams in a manner that could identify individuals without prior consent of those individuals.

- Researchers will describe issues and events in ways that are not evaluative of individual performance and which do not attribute blame to any individuals or groups. All data gathered will be used solely for analytical purposes by the case study team.

- The principal investigator will hold raw data (transcripts, observation notes, questionnaires, etc.) in a secure location, other than school premises. Only case study team members will have access to the data. No data will be released in raw form.
Raw data will be destroyed within three years after the conclusion of the project in August, 2006.

- Each individual participant interviewed (e.g., principals, teachers, administrators, parents, policy makers) will be asked to review preliminary analysis of his or her interview data (a) to provide feedback to the case study research team on the accuracy, (b) to provide alternative interpretations to case study findings with which they disagree, (c) to request exclusion of personally or politically sensitive information, or information that may identify them, before any papers or reports circulate to a wider audience.

PROJECT CONTACT:
APPENDIX K

Consent Form
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

Protocol title: Academy Entry Year Program Research Study

Protocol number: ______

Principal Investigator:

I consent to my participation in research being conducted by of and his/her assistants and associates.

The investigator(s) has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures that will be followed, and the amount of time it will take. I understand the possible benefits, if any, of my participation. I know that I can choose not to participate without penalty to me. If I agree to participate, I withdraw from the study at any time, and there will be no penalty.

- I consent to the use of audiotapes. I understand how the tapes will be used for this study.

- I consent to the use of the following information records: components from my administrative portfolio.

I have had a chance to ask questions and to obtain answers to my questions. I can contact the investigators at ______. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I can call the Office of Research Risks Protection at ______.

I have read this form or I have had it read to me. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Print the name of the participant: ______________________________________________________

Date: _________________________________ Signed: _________________________________

(Participant)

Signed: ________________________________ Signed: _________________________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative) (Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)

Witness: ________________________________

(When required)

HS-027 (Rev. 05/01) (To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
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