Gardner-Webb University
Digital Commons @ Gardner-Webb University

Education Theses, Dissertations and Projects | School of Education

2009

An Analysis of the Connection Between a Principal Development Program and Executive Leadership

David (Jay) Jones
Gardner-Webb University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.gardner-webb.edu/education_etd

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons, Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, and the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation
Jones, David (Jay), "An Analysis of the Connection Between a Principal Development Program and Executive Leadership" (2009). *Education Theses, Dissertations and Projects.* Paper 108.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at Digital Commons @ Gardner-Webb University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Theses, Dissertations and Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Gardner-Webb University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@gardner-webb.edu.

An Analysis of the Connection between a Principal Development Program and Executive Leadership

By
David “Jay” Jones

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Gardner-Webb University School of Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Gardner-Webb University
2009

Approval Page

This dissertation was submitted by David “Jay” Jones under the direction of the persons listed below. It was submitted to the Gardner-Webb University School of Education and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Gardner-Webb University.

_____	_____
Jack Kaufhold, Ed D Committee Chair	Date
_____	_____
Vicky Ratchford, Ed D Committee Member	Date
_____	_____
Connie Golden, Ed D Committee Member	Date
_____	_____
Jackson Rainer, Ph D Dean of Graduate School	Date

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Amanda Jones. She originally encouraged me to apply for the doctoral program at Gardner-Webb University. Through many days and nights of selfless devotion to our family, she maintained a structured and loving home for our children while I was away at class, studying at the library, or writing in my office. She was, and continues to be, my peace and my rock in a loud and hectic world. I am proud of this dissertation, but I am infinitely prouder of the fact that Amanda is my wife.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the professors who served on my doctoral committee. Dr. Jack Kaufhold, Dr. Vicky Ratchford, and Dr. Connie Golden contributed to the provision of guidance and insight that I needed to complete this monumental task. Dr. Kaufhold seemed to give me just the right balance of praise on the one hand, and challenges on the other. Dr. Ratchford inspired me to stay the course, even while she gracefully refused to allow physical illness to dictate her life. Dr. Golden offered me a link to my past at Marietta College. I hope that I have represented Marietta well.

I would also like to thank a wonderful friend, Bob Grimm. On a daily basis I knew, and continue to know, that I can count on Bob to assess the choices that I make honestly. Bob both makes me laugh and prompts me to think about the things in life that are truly important. He allows me to be completely honest. That is a rare characteristic in a person. I am deeply thankful for Bob's friendship.

Special gratitude is expressed to my children, Olivia and Ian. I did not understand the deep joy that comes with sacrifice and living for others until God granted me the blessing of responsibility for these two precious lives. I pray that the time and energy that I have devoted to "learning school" has, and will continue to, inspire my children to value education, hard work, goal setting, and perseverance. To me, this would be worth more than the title of doctor or the opportunities that such a title may present.

Most importantly, I thank my Father in Heaven for granting me the energy, knowledge, and circumstances to complete this work. I deeply hope that I have brought honor and praise unto him through this endeavor.

Abstract

An Analysis of the Connection between a Principal Development Program and Executive Leadership. Jones, David “Jay”, 2009: Dissertation, Gardner-Webb University, EdD Program in Educational Leadership. Executive Leadership/Professional Development/Principalship/North Carolina School Executive Standards

America faces the following problems related to the supply of school principals: shortage, poor understanding of the changed role, and inadequate training. In response to problems, the state of North Carolina has implemented the School Executive Standards to evaluate principals and drive the professional development of them. The purpose of this descriptive study was to report on the perceptions of principals and assistant principals regarding the connection between a district level principal development program and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". A sequential QUAN-QUAL analysis was applied to data collected through a survey and individual interviews. Measures of central tendency were utilized to analyze the survey, and theme coding was conducted to analyze the interviews. Ultimately, detailed reporting on program participant perceptions related to each of the "North Carolina School Executive Standards" is presented.

An analysis of the data revealed that participants in the principal development program generally agreed that the program helped prepare them to be effective leaders in accordance with the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". With the exception of one realm of executive leadership, external development leadership, data from both the survey and interview clearly show positive perceptions of the connection between the principal preparation program and the standards.

Table of Contents

Page
Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem Statement....1
Description and Discussion of Dissertation Setting....5
Objectives of the Study....7
Limitations and Delimitations....8
Definition of Key Terms....8
Organization of Dissertation....11
Chapter 2: Review of Literature....12
Introduction....12
Rationale for Principal Development....12
Movement Toward Development of Principals....13
Characteristics of Effective Principal Development Programs....13
Existing Principal Development Programs....14
Summary of Literature....27
Chapter 3: Methodology....28
Introduction....28
Research Design and Rationale....28
Research Methodology....30
Instruments and Data Collection Procedures....31
Participants....34
Data Analysis....34
Chapter 4: Results....37
Survey Participants....38
Survey Structure and Scoring....38
Survey Results for Strategic Leadership....39
Survey Results for Instructional Leadership....40
Survey Results for Cultural Leadership....40
Survey Results for Human Resource Leadership....41
Survey Results for Managerial Leadership....42
Survey Results for External Development Leadership....43
Survey Results for Micropolitical Leadership....44
Interview Participants....45
Interview Analysis....45
Interview Results for Strategic Leadership....46
Interview Results for Instructional Leadership....47
Interview Results for Cultural Leadership....48
Interview Results for Human Resource Leadership....48
Interview Results for Managerial Leadership....49
Interview Results for External Development Leadership....49
Interview Results for Micropolitical Leadership....50
Interview Item Eight....51
Themes Across Interview Questions....51
Conclusion....52
Chapter 5: Speculations, Recommendations, and Summary....54

Speculations 55
Recommendations 56
Future Studies 60
Summary 62
References 63
Appendixes
A SDEA Participant Survey 67
B SDEA Participant Interview Questions 72
Tables
1 Strategic Leadership 39
2 Instructional Leadership 40
3 Cultural Leadership 41
4 Human Resource Leadership 42
5 Managerial Leadership 43
6 External Development Leadership 44
7 Micropolitical Leadership 45

Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem Statement

Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, and Gundlach (2003) detailed three problems related to the supply of principals in America's schools. These are as follows: shortage of principals, poor understanding of the changed role of the school principal, and inadequate training for principals. Levine (2005) provided more insight into the aforementioned problems. He conducted his study in response to the shrinking number of principals that will be available in the next decade due to the retirement and departure of current principals (Dodd & Keller, 1998). Levine's concern about the shortage of principals is echoed in other studies. Research conducted for the National Association of Elementary School Principals revealed a 42% turnover for elementary school principals in the decade prior to the 1998 study (Educational Research Service (ERS), 1998). A related study for the National Association of Secondary School Principals found a 50% turnover for high school principals during the 1990's (ERS, 1998). The report predicted an increased turnover rate in the first decade of the twenty-first century.

Hertling (2001) asserts that today's principal is faced with a complex range of tasks, including creating a school-wide vision, being an instructional leader, planning for effective professional development, guiding teachers, handling discipline, attending events, coordinating buses, attending to external priorities, such as legislative mandates, and all the other minute details that come with supervising a school. This introduces the second factor that led Levine to his study, the changed role of school principals that has evolved over the last few years. According to Levine, the United States' drastic change from an industrial society to a global, technology-driven society has had a significant effect on the nature of schools and education. Whereas the focus in previous eras has

been upon the standardization of the structure of schooling, it is now on the standardization of accountability and outcome-based evaluations. Moreover, Levine points to the metamorphosis of the principal's role from being that of a supervisor to that of a change agent who is held responsible for goals, finances, staffing, curriculum, assessment, technology, and resource management. He essentially believes that most of the country's principals have been appointed to jobs for which they have not been adequately prepared. Levine's findings are similar to those found in a study conducted by Brooks, Giles, Jacobson, Johnson, and Ylimaki (2007) that concluded that successful principals meet the needs of their constituents by establishing nurturing environments that hold all stakeholders-staff, students, faculty, and parents-accountable to moving in particular directions and meeting high expectations.

The shortage and changed principal role issues take on more importance when coupled with the wide body of research supporting the assertion that principal leadership has a powerful impact upon student achievement in schools. Kaplan, Owings, and Nunnery (2005) examined the performance of randomly selected principals in Virginia. The researchers investigated the perceptions of two observers for every principal in the study regarding performance as gauged by ISLLC standards. Perceptions of strong principal performance were positively correlated with student achievement measures in their respective schools. O'Donnell (2005) examined middle school principals in an effort to identify relationships between instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. O'Donnell reported that teacher perceptions of principal behaviors that focused on strengthening the learning climate in schools were predictors of student success. Furthermore, O'Donnell's study found that in situations in which students

perceived that principals strongly defined the mission of the school, reading achievement was higher.

The potential influence that a principal has upon student achievement provides added relevance to another component of Levine's study. In his study, Levine (2005) examined and interviewed deans, faculty, and alumni of a variety of university and college leadership training programs as well as current school principals in an effort to gauge the overall effectiveness of America's school leadership preparation programs. Levine used nine criteria to guide his research. Based on his findings, he concluded that while a small number of programs may be categorized as strong, the overall quality of the country's school leadership preparation programs is poor. Levine's conclusions were paralleled in a study by the Wallace Foundation (2006). The study concluded that most states do not have university-level school leadership programs that develop the instructional leadership abilities that are essential for today's principals. Moreover, the study highlighted the fact that most preparation programs focus on law, finance, and evaluation rather than on concepts of academic improvement. Finally, the study asserted that most preparation programs lack quality in curricular coherence, clinical instruction, and admission standards.

Because of the need for enhanced principal preparation, several states have turned to specialized training programs for principal development. Archer (2006) summarizes a number of different principal development programs throughout the country. In Illinois, Alaska, Arizona, and Missouri, all new principals are required to be in a mentoring program. Particularly, in Missouri, all new principals are required to spend 66 hours in their first 24 months on the job with a veteran principal. This time is devoted to coaching,

observation, and feedback and has been in effect since the 2005-2006 school year. Specifically, in Illinois, beginning in 2007, principals are required to receive their mentoring in the areas of data analysis, classroom observation, planning teacher professional development, and sharing leadership responsibilities. The states of Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, and Pennsylvania all have contracts with the National Institute for School Leadership, which is a private group that trains principals through methods commonly seen in the military and the business world. Finally, as of September of 2006, the Wallace Foundation had doled out 43 million dollars in grants to 24 states in an effort to improve the working conditions of school leaders.

The aforementioned study conducted by Portin et al. (2003) inspired the North Carolina State Board of Education to adopt a new set of standards focused on executive leadership to be used for principal and assistant principal evaluation and development, effective for the 2008-2009 school year (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), 2006). These standards are called the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". Principals and assistant principals in North Carolina must be adequately trained in order to clearly understand the standards, perform in accordance with the standards, and ultimately lead schools to higher performance levels. This descriptive study detailing the perceptions of participants of a principal development program has provided data that leadership program developers may use in the planning, creation, implementation, and evaluation of existing and future principal development programs. The data has the potential to be specifically beneficial to program developers in their efforts to align the activities of their respective leadership development programs with the "North Carolina School Executive Standards".

Description and Discussion of Dissertation Setting

The "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" (SDEA) is a professional development program for principals in a school district that serves a predominantly suburban population in the Piedmont region of North Carolina. SDEA is comprised of the following five learning components: Facilitative Leadership, Crucial Conversations, Crucial Confrontations, Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument Training, and Teachscape Training. The fundamental goal of the plan is to equip principals in the school district to meet the challenges faced by building-level leaders associated with promoting and maintaining high levels of student achievement. The plan is a component of the district's overall strategic plan. Specifically, the leadership development goal of SDEA is one piece of Priority #1 in the district's strategic plan, which addresses effective administrative leadership at the school level. The components of SDEA were originally established by the Leadership Academy, which is a group of district principals and central office personnel. The Leadership Academy, which was originally conceptualized in 2002, guides the development of relevant leadership development programs in the district (Bill Stegall, personal communication, April 30, 2008).

The five components of SDEA all have specific objectives and require commitments of several hours by the participants. According to Grace Ferris (personal communication, April 28, 2008), Facilitative Leadership is a 21-hour course which is designed to develop skills that allow participants to tap into the creativity and experiences of others in order to address challenges faced by an organization. Crucial Conversations is a 16-hour course that aims to equip principals with effective

communication skills that are proven to bring about improvements in productivity and quality (Union County, 2008a). Crucial Confrontations is also a 16-hour course, but course objectives are focused on hands-on solving of problems related to poor performance and motivation (Union County, 2008b). Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument Training is a course that certifies individuals to evaluate school personnel with the evaluation tool used in the state of North Carolina (NCDPI, 2008). Finally, Teachscape training is a 16-hour course that prepares building leaders to conduct brief classroom walkthroughs and utilize gathered information to drive improvement efforts in their schools (Teachscape, 2008). Ultimately, the five components of SDEA are designed to enhance the overall leadership capacity of the principals of the Union County Public Schools (B. Stegall, personal communication, April 30, 2008).

The researcher is an assistant principal in the school district that operates the program examined. The researcher has participated in four components of the SDEA and plans to participate in the remaining component in June, 2009. Therefore, the problem being examined was within the range of the researcher's influence concerning access to information obtained from principals and assistant principals who had already participated in each of the SDEA components. It should be noted that the researcher was not a subject in the study. Ultimately, the researcher will be able to share the findings of the study with the senior leadership team of the school district in which he is employed as well as leadership teams of other school districts. The descriptive data of the study may assist the senior leadership team in their quest to design, modify, and implement relevant development activities for principals.

Objectives of the Study

This study attempted to answer the following question: What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards"? This main research question was ultimately answered through seven supporting questions that are aligned with the seven "North Carolina School Executive Standards". The seven questions are as follows:

1. What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a strategic leader?

2. What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be an instructional leader?

3. What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a cultural leader?

4. What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a human resource leader?

5. What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a managerial leader?

6. What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be an external development leader?

7. What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a micropolitical leader?

The findings of the study may help principal development program designers in the design, evaluation, and reform efforts of their respective programs as they aim to align their program activities with the "North Carolina School Executive Standards".

Ultimately, information gained from the study may serve to help program designers to assist school principals in their mission to meet the standards for school executives by which they are evaluated.

Limitations

The research project has the following limitations:

1. The “Staff Development Expectations for Administrators” program had had only 25 participants who had completed each component of the program at the time of the study.

2. The degree of participant familiarity with the standards may have been a barrier to valid data.

3. The use of volunteer sampling in the study may have affected the validity of the data that was gathered.

4. Data gathered for the study were self-reported by SDEA participants.

5. The researcher and assistant conducted the interviews.

Delimitations

The research project has the following delimitations:

1. The descriptive study is not necessarily generalizable to principal development programs in other school districts.

2. All SDEA participants came from a single school district.

3. The amount of time between sample participation in SDEA activities and data collection may have been a barrier to complete information.

Definitions of Key Terms

Crucial Conversations: A 16-hour course that aims to equip principals with effective

communication skills that are proven to bring about improvements in productivity and quality (Union County, 2008a).

Crucial Confrontations: A 16-hour course with objectives that are focused on hands-on solving of problems related to poor performance and motivation (Union County, 2008a).

Facilitative Leadership: A 21-hour course with objectives that are focused on the development of tools that tap into the creativity and experience of others when addressing issues faced by an organization (G. Ferris, personal communication April 28, 2008).

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC): A program of the Council of Chief State School Officers designed to model standards of disposition, knowledge, and performance for school administrators that are linked to enhanced educational results. The standards were created by representatives from 24 state agencies and other professional associations, and were released in 1996 (Murphy, 2005).

Leadership Academy: A group of district principals and central office personnel that guides the development of relevant leadership development programs in the Union County Public Schools (B. Stegall, personal communication, April 30, 2008).

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI): The state agency that is responsible for the oversight of K-12 public education in the state of North Carolina (NCDPI, 2007).

North Carolina State Board of Education: The leadership body that is charged with supervising and administering the free, public education provided in the state of North Carolina. The board is also charged with the management of funds allocated to the state for the purpose of public education (NCDPI, 2007).

"North Carolina School Executive Standards": A set of standards designed by the North Carolina State Board of Education with the purpose of providing school leaders with a set of practices and competencies that reflect 21st century executive school leadership (NCDPI, 2006).

Staff Development Expectations for Administrators (SDEA): A plan consisting of the following principal development courses: Facilitative Leadership, Crucial Conversations, Crucial Confrontations, Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument, and Teachscape. The fundamental goal of the plan is to equip principals in the school district to meet the challenges faced by building-level leaders associated with promoting and maintaining high levels of student achievement (B. Stegall, personal communication, April 30, 2008).

Teachers Performance Appraisal Instrument (TPAI) Training: A course that equips participants with a thorough understanding of the appraisal system that has been adopted by Union County Public Schools to facilitate the professional growth of teachers. The TPAI is divided into eight functions (Instructional Time, Student Behavior, Instructional Presentation, Instructional Monitoring, Instructional Feedback, Facilitating Instruction, Communicating with the Educational Environment, and Performing Non-Instructional Duties). Participants who

complete the course become certified to evaluate teachers using the TPAI tool (NCDPI, 2008).

Teachscape Training: A 12-hour course that prepares participants to conduct brief, data-gathering classroom visits, using research-based tools and data collection software on a handheld device. Participants are trained to use collected data to drive reflective discussions that lead to planning for improved classroom practice (Teachscape, 2008).

Organization of Dissertation

The dissertation consists of four further chapters. Chapter Two provides a review of current literature and information related to principal development programs in North Carolina and other states and regions of the United States. Chapter Three presents an explanation of the research design, methodology, as well as data collection and analysis procedures. Chapter 4 reports on the results of the study, and in Chapter 5, the researcher puts forth speculations, recommendations, and suggestions for further research.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

Based on the problem, this literature review examines principal development programs in North Carolina and across the United States. The descriptions of the programs are preceded by information that speaks to the need for the creation of such programs. Literature used in the review was primarily accessed through the Academic Search Premier database. Various search engines were also used in gathering data for the review. Specifically, descriptors tied closely to the aforementioned topics of principal development programs in North Carolina and across the United States were used to narrow the search for appropriate literature.

Rationale for Principal Development

The demands and role of the 21st century school principal have changed dramatically since the 20th century. While principals are still expected to operate as building managers who oversee budgeting, public relations, personnel issues, safety, and transportation, the modern principal is also charged with being an instructional leader who facilitates increased student achievement through teacher leadership development, test data analysis, and staff professional development (Bingham & Gottfried, 2003; Hale & Moorman, 2003).

The changed role of the school principal is consistent with research that highlights the strong impact that school principals have on student achievement. In an extensive review of 5,000 studies over 30 years, Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) found that a substantial relationship exists between school leadership and student achievement. Furthermore, Bottoms, O'Neill, and Jacobson (2004), of the University of Toronto,

reported that approximately 20% of a school's impact on student achievement might be attributed to the school's principal.

Movement toward Development of Principals

Since the late 1980's, universities and school districts have been collaborating in the quest to develop effective principals. The Danforth Foundation helped to establish such efforts in their partnership with the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. The groups collectively underwrote programs for the training of aspiring principals. The partnership resulted in relationships between local school districts and universities in which the issues of principal recruitment, minority and gender representation in educational administration, and university principal preparation programs were addressed (Murphy, 1998).

Research attests to the stance that the assistant principalship alone is not adequate preparation to assume the role of school principal. Since assistant principals are often assigned to a predominantly managerial role, they are not appropriately trained as instructional leaders (Bottoms et al., 2004). Bartholomew and Fusarelli (2003) investigated the work lives of assistant principals. The study found that all 27 participants began the day with managerial tasks, did not perceive themselves to be instructional leaders, and viewed their primary responsibility as promoting a positive school climate.

Characteristics of Effective Principal Training Programs

Carr, Chenwith, and Ruhl (2003) cite a number of common threads by which effective principal training programs are characterized. Among them are the use of the cohort model, performance-based standards, individualized learning opportunities, opportunities for reflection, and continual review of program effectiveness. Moreover,

the curriculum for effective principal training programs should be closely aligned to individual school district goals. Characteristics of effective programs also include problem-based learning opportunities, small group work, role-play, simulations, case study, and action research. Furthermore, leadership development activities should be characterized by mentoring and coaching that is based on the individual needs of participants.

Existing Principal Development Programs

Since the dynamic leadership behaviors of principals are being evaluated by sets of formal standards, states, individual school districts, and other agencies have created a variety of programs that are used to develop principals. A collective examination of some of these programs reveals a number of commonalities that the programs share.

One of these programs is the New Leaders for New Schools program which exists in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C. (Hale & Moorman, 2003). The program is funded by both public funds and by private donors (New Leaders, 2008). Hale and Moorman describe this program as one that recruits talented individuals who possess high levels of leadership potential. The caliber of participant selections is reflected by the fact that only 6% of applicants are accepted into the program (New Leaders, 2008). Through a program consisting of an intense summer institute and a one-year internship, candidates are guided through learning experiences that equip them to lead urban public schools. Graduates of the program become certified by their respective states, receive ongoing leadership support after program participation, and are provided with job placement assistance. The success of the job placement aspect of the program is seen through the fact that at the conclusion of participation, 95% of

program participants assume leadership roles with 80% becoming principals. The success of the program may also be seen through data from 2004-2006 which shows that 100% of schools led by program participants showed notable increases in student achievement. Moreover, 83% of schools saw double digit gains in student achievement measures (New Leaders, 2008).

Another program, The Principal Residency Network, is described by Hale and Moorman (2003) as a program that is individualized to meet the needs of the program participants. Aspiring principals participate in a rigorous field experience through partnerships with small, personalized schools in an effort to provide the opportunity for participants to experience some of the rewards of leadership. The program, which is based upon the ISLLC standards, has its roots in deep reform work by a partnership between Northeastern University and the Fenway Institute for Urban Renewal. While in the program, participants are partnered with mentor principals who help the aspiring principals to develop individual learning plans and show evidence of progress in those plans through personalized portfolios. Ultimately, program participants may earn masters degree credits through participation (Institute for Professional Development and Graduate Studies, 2008).

Additionally, the National College for School Leadership is a head teacher (principal) development program in England that provides training both before and after individuals assume school leadership roles (Hale & Moorman, 2003). The program, which was developed in response to national policy developments, focuses on preparing participants to work beyond their current schools. This is accomplished through a program curriculum focused on networking, succession plans, business management

principles, and leadership of complex, challenging schools (National College, 2008). According to Hale and Moorman, the program is individualized and allows participants to choose modules based upon their individual needs and the needs of their schools. The essential goal of the program is to enable participants to make use of their skills in the most effective ways in serving their schools.

The Massachusetts Department of Education has endorsed another principal development program designed by the National Center on Education and the Economy, a Washington-based group that promotes standards in education. The two-year program utilizes lessons and strategies from the military and corporate worlds to train urban principals. Participating principals are grouped into cohorts and participate in activities focused on strategic planning, team building, and change management. Within the program and across cohorts, a uniform set of language and leadership skills are used. Learning opportunities, which are ultimately intended to influence school leaders to refocus schools toward results (e-lead, 2008), are delivered through computer simulations, seminars, online tutorials, and case studies of businesses, the military, and schools. Program participants are trained to deliver the program to other school leaders and actually receive doctoral credit for their participation. Ultimately, the program is intended to change participants' self-perceptions from managers to leaders of cost-effective student achievement (Archer, 2005). The program has received endorsements from former Massachusetts superintendent, David Driscoll, and Lesley University Professor Emeritus, Margaret McKenna, who have proclaimed the program to be one of rigorous breadth and one of the most innovative principal development programs in the nation, respectively (e-lead, 2008).

With the primary goal of enhanced leadership, the Union Pacific Railroad Foundation has established the Principals' Partnership. Through a program that utilizes successful leadership approaches used in business, 800 participants from 17 different states are engaged with activities that focus on reflection, studying, and collaborative planning in addressing relevant issues. The program, which provides participants with access to an extensive website of best practices, is unique in that the principals identify their professional development needs, and the program developers arrange a network of consultants and professional development sessions to meet those needs. These sessions often occur through a summer leadership institute. Through embedding leadership development activities directly in the actual work of program participants, the program essentially attempts to instill the leadership ideas of dignity, respect, and consideration as opposed to standardization and regulation (Hoffman & Johnston, 2005). Concerning the success of the program, one survey revealed that the vast majority of program participants agreed that at least one significant change related to issues such as dropout, literacy, and safety rates had occurred in their schools after participation in the program (Principals' Partnership, 2008).

The University of Kentucky has collaborated with the Pike County (Kentucky) school district to implement the Principals' Excellence Program. The program was established in 2002 through a three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The program uses the cohort model and consists of 15 teachers and assistant principals who are aspiring principals. The program participants, who are nominated by administrators, meet from January through December and attend a summer institute. Program activities consist of leadership seminars, action research, readings, web-based

assignments, shadowing of exemplary principals, and reflections. Moreover, program participants are led by tenure track professors through inquiry-based, action research projects that are centered on ideas of self-assessment and goal setting. The program also incorporates peer observations, conferences, and portfolio development (e-lead, 2008). Ultimately, the program is based on ISLLC standards and is designed to be practical for the aspiring principal. The district uses surveys, focus group interviews, and notebook reviews to judge the effectiveness of the program (U.S. Department of Education, 2004; Browne-Ferrigno, 2003; Hale & Moorman, 2003).

Other principal development strategies are implemented in a district level principal preparation program, the Duval County-SERVE partnership in Duval County, Florida. The program began in 1998 and is funded by the U.S. Department of Education. It aims to create a pipeline of qualified principals for the Duval County School District. Qualified teachers and assistant principals who aspire to be principals participate in seminars, role-plays, book studies, portfolio creation, journaling, and large and small group instruction. These activities are not conducted through the cohort philosophy. The foundational objective of the program is to reconstruct principal development by placing focus on leadership development rather than management development. Movement toward that end comes through a focus on visionary leadership, research-based practices, concepts of building human resource capital, and improving schools in spite of various regulatory issues. The program continually seeks participant input to ensure that program activities designers are sensitive to the individual participant needs related to time, professional development and unique schools (Bingham & Gottfried, 2003).

Additionally, the Socorro Independent School District of El Paso, Texas and the

University of Texas at El Paso collaborated to create the Assistant Principals Academy. The program, which began in 1998, also aimed to develop a pipeline of qualified principals (Miracle, 2006). According to Parra and Daresh (1997), the fundamental belief of the program was that the principal is the main change agent in any school, particularly in schools with high populations of poor and minority students. The program ran from September to May, and program activities were based on the "Learner-Centered Leadership Standards" that drive educational leadership in Texas. The standards are closely tied to the ISLLC standards. The staff of the Assistant Principals Academy was comprised of a district level administrator, a retired superintendent, and an educational leadership professor. Program participants met once a month to learn about fundamental issues of change through readings and discussions, but a cohort model was not used. Program participants expressed their individual needs and were then paired with mentors, who guided them through authentic school leadership tasks in which significant changes had recently occurred (Parra & Daresh, 1997). Ultimately, the program was discontinued in 2004 at the discretion of a new district superintendent (Miracle, 2006).

Georgia’s Leadership Institute for School Improvement conducts the GLISI’s Executive Development Training Series. The program, which uses principles derived from business models of improvement, is based on the Institute’s research that school improvement requires high-quality executive leaders. Specifically, the series focuses on development of mission, vision, and values as school leadership teams improve performance through planning, data assessment, partnerships, and effective communication. Furthermore, the Executive Development Training series provides participating school districts with the opportunity to visit school districts that have

implemented the principles of the program. Finally, the program offers participating districts consulting that is specific to the needs of the participating district. The Georgia Leadership Institute's impact upon the state of Georgia may be seen through the fact that since 2002, 92% of school districts have participated in GLISI activities. Within this number, 59 first year principals who participated in the program were shown to have performed at proficiency levels equivalent to third year principals. Moreover, in the 2006-2007 school year, schools led by GLISI principals outperformed non-GLISI principals at the elementary, middle, and high school levels (Georgia's Leadership, 2008).

In Rhode Island, the Providence schools have modified and applied research ideas from the original effective schools research. The school district has also maintained a relationship with a consulting firm from which leadership development centered on student achievement is received (School Leadership, 2008). The Providence program provides principals with a slue of contemporary school leadership topics such as mission/vision, high expectations, assessment, instructional monitoring, safety and order, parent communication, professional development, school culture, and ethics. Learning opportunities are facilitated through work groups and designed through input from climate surveys (Providence Schools, 2008). Uniquely, the relationship that the school district has with the consulting firm provides for training for school board members so that the governing body of the school district is kept abreast on the leadership development to which building principals are being exposed (School Leadership, 2008).

The Principals' Executive Program, conducted by the University of North Carolina Center for School Leadership Development, focuses on leadership development

for both new and experienced principals. Various leadership programs and short-term institutes are facilitated in response to indicated needs of program clients. While the program director names responsiveness to clients, low expense, and intense program evaluation as the main strengths of the Principal's Executive Program, she identifies 21st century instructional tools, differentiation for secondary school principals, and delivery of services at regional sites as areas for development and improvement (N. Farmer, personal communication, September 19, 2008).

Principal training delivered through a summer leadership development series is currently conducted by the Lancaster County Schools of Lancaster County, South Carolina. Building-level administrators as well as administrators at the district level participate in the program. The summer experience attempts to provide district leaders with learning opportunities centered on a number of leadership concepts that are relevant to everyday, practical challenges (School Leadership, 2008). Learning opportunities are in the form of mini-lectures, discussions, simulations, and case studies. The program ultimately aims to equip principals to establish healthy school climates within their school buildings (L. Coble, personal communication, October 19, 2008).

In the Guilford County Schools of North Carolina, a focus has been placed upon principal development. This is evidenced by the district's commitment to strengthening the impact of school principals through leadership development. The principal development program in the Guilford County schools utilizes the cohort model in a series of leadership development opportunities that is spread over 12 days throughout an academic year. Up to 30 principals comprise the cohorts which are exposed to leadership-based themes focusing on culture, change management, focus, applying leadership

concepts learned from experience, conflict, utilization of data-driven decision-making, communication, organizational professional development, and team leadership (School Leadership, 2008). These concepts are tied directly to practical techniques designed to avoid career derailment and meet twenty-first century leadership challenges. On a personal level, participants engage in embedded assessment instrument completion in order to provide personal frames of reference to guide individual development (Coble, 2008). Program participants actually have the opportunity to work directly with schools that have been targeted as having needs for improved cultures and higher student performance (School Leadership, 2008).

In the Cleveland Heights-University Heights city schools in Cleveland, Ohio, a program of district- and building-level administrative leadership development is centered on sessions that focus on the text *The Hidden Leader*. Program activities deliver insights and applicable strategies on leadership of high performing teams, administration and effective use of an organizational culture survey, utilization of common organizational language and principles of facilitative leadership (School Leadership, 2008). Program participants are exposed to the fundamental idea that leadership development is personal development (Coble, 2008).

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina have implemented a leadership development program that gives principals the opportunity to self-select topics that are relevant to personal and building needs. Specific leadership themes such as change management, high performance teams, and conflict management are provided to selected principals throughout the academic year. Perhaps the keystone of the program is the opportunity for participants to reflect upon their current work

experiences, with a focus on future application of learning and growth (School Leadership, 2008).

In yet another program, the New York City Schools Leadership Academy has teamed with New Visions for Public Schools to deliver a mentoring program for new principals. Participants in the mentoring program include new principals, experienced principal mentors, local instructional superintendents, and regional liaisons. New principals meet with successful, veteran principals who are either active in school leadership or recently retired. Activities such as professional growth plan development, school goal assessment, observations of mentees, role-play, joint problem solving, shadowing, and research are conducted in an effort to promote successful principal induction. Concepts within these themes are based upon the idea that true change may be achieved only after a set of common goals and language is used between leadership teams whose performance is based upon a systematic way of thinking (New Visions, 2008).

The state of Illinois also offers a new principal mentoring program, the Illinois New Principal Mentoring Program. The program meets the "Illinois Professional School Leader Standards" and the "Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards". First year principals in the state are paired with experienced principals in an effort to promote supportive professional relationships. Mentor/mentee relationships are established by considering the dynamics of location, school level, and various needs. The mentors are charged with facilitating growth of mentees' instructional leadership skills through a minimum of 50 logged contact hours. The mentor/mentee relationship consists of coaching, observation, and constructive feedback. Ultimately, mentors assist mentees with the identification of problems that act as barriers to success in the schools of the new

principals. These problems are identified through extensive surveys of principal needs. Moreover, the two work as a team to conceive and implement effective solutions to these problems. Finally, the mentor oversees structured opportunities that allow the principal to reflect upon his professional practice (Illinois New Principal, 2008).

Another state, Ohio, implements the Quality Entry Year Principal Program. The program was designed around the "Ohio Administrative Code", which dictates the specifics of entry year principal development programs in the state. Program participants include principals or assistant principals who hold a two-year provisional license and are employed full-time. The multi-year program is based on current leadership research and spans two school years. The program utilizes a cohort model and requires participants to attend five face-to-face institutes, a legal seminar, a teacher observation and evaluation seminar, and a professional conference. They are also required to complete specific online professional development modules, the "360 Leadership Assessment" and the "Principal Performance Assessment", and to document professional growth in a personal learning plan (Ohio Department, 2008).

The state of West Virginia conducts the Principals' Leadership Academy for Experienced Principals as well as the Principal's Leadership Academy for New Principals. Since 1991, the program has influenced over 2,600 school leaders in the state. The Principals' Leadership Academy Advisory Council plans and implements the leadership development opportunities presented to principals. Participants are permitted to choose from a variety of topics that are relevant to personal professional development as well as to the needs of their particular schools. The program for experienced principals spans a six-day period in which principals are exposed to 45 hours of activities that are

aligned with a minimum of four of the six standards of leadership as outlined by West Virginia State Board of Education policy. For new principals, the program delivers six total days of programming in which leaders participate in developmental sessions on school law, school finance, change leadership, and a 360 degree leadership inventory.

Moreover, ideas of vision, culture, and effective communication are cornerstones of the program. Participants are partnered with colleagues, and they are required to keep journals of their developmental experiences. The New Principal's Academy results in action plans that are developed and implemented at each participant's school. Examples of key points within these plans include conferencing with and professional development for experienced teachers (West Virginia, 2008).

The Maryland Principals' Academy runs a one-year program and includes a residential summer institute. The program is based on the "Maryland Instructional Leadership Framework" and is primarily focused on building instructional leadership capacity in practicing principals. Principals with one to five years of administrative experience work collaboratively to analyze and facilitate leadership theories and research, utilizing practical tools and strategies aimed at school improvement. Principals with eight or more years of experience have the opportunity to participate in a one-year academy experience. Superintendents nominate participants, and a focus is placed on key leadership techniques associated with networking, collaboration, and continuous improvement (Maryland State, 2008).

The Texas Principals' Excellence Program is overseen by the Texas Education Agency and the University of Houston-Victoria School of Business. The program's intent is to integrate business and management training models into educational leadership

situations. The program gauges effectiveness through both pre- and post-program assessments based on the "Secondary School Principal 21st Century Principal Instrument". Other program activities include individualized learning plans, cohorts comprised of principals with similar professional development needs, one-on-one monthly coaching for participants, book studies, and research projects. Participants keep journals of program activities and create individual growth plans. Ultimately, the program curriculum is focused on application of concepts for both new and experienced principals (Texas Principal, 2008).

Finally, the Arkansas Leadership Academy conducts the Principal Institute. Program participation ultimately leads to Master Principal certification in the state. The three-year program is a voluntary program that provides bonuses to practicing principals who complete the program. Program application is open to principals who work full-time and hold a state principal certificate. Program activities focus on concepts of culture, change management, teaching and learning, and accountability (Arkansas Leadership, 2008).

Several characteristics of the aforementioned principal development programs are shared between two or more of the programs. Concerning design, the following commonalities exist: partnerships with universities, consultation with outside leadership agencies, activity alignment with school leadership standards, and activities centered on leadership strategies gleaned from the business world. Other program components found in two or more programs include the individualization of development activities, computer and Web-based activities, mentoring, goal analysis, joint problem solving, action research, facilitative leadership, and summer institutes. Finally, at least two

programs share the components of specific reading activities, team performance, effective communication, data assessment, culture building, visits to other schools, opportunities for reflection and/or journaling, and structured seminars to share ideas.

Summary of Literature

This literature review examined various principal development programs as well as the rationale for and characteristics of effective principal development programs. The aforementioned themes within the literature helped to guide the proposed descriptive study for which a rationale is provided in the review of literature. During the research project, a focus was placed upon the research-based characteristics of effective principal development programs. The researcher had the opportunity to make comparisons between the leadership activities being examined and other programs that are currently used to cultivate principals.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

Once again, schools and society are faced with critical problems related to the supply of school principals in America. Not only is there a shortage of principals, but there exists a poor understanding of the role of the principal coupled with inadequate principal training programs (Portin et al., 2003). In response to these issues, the state of North Carolina implemented a new set of standards, the "School Executive Standards" (SES), as an evaluation and growth tool for its principals beginning in the 2008-2009 school year (NCDPI, 2006). Principals and assistant principals in North Carolina require unique training if they are to perform in accordance with these standards. This descriptive study examined a principal development program, the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" (SDEA), in a predominantly suburban school district in the Piedmont region of North Carolina in an effort to answer the following key question: What are the perceptions of SDEA participants regarding the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards"? This chapter provides a description of and rationale for the research design. The chapter goes on to describe study participants, data collection instruments, study procedures, and limitations of the study.

Research Design and Rationale

The researcher used a mixed methods approach with a sequential Quantitative-Qualitative (QUAN-QUAL) emphasis in the research project. To answer the research questions, the researcher used a Likert scale survey to gather preliminary information and used individual interviews to gather data that are more detailed. The researcher has

essentially described program participant perceptions of the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the SES through the interpretation of the data obtained from the aforementioned data collection tools.

Kaufhold (2007) describes characteristics of quantitative research that made it appropriate to utilize in the research project. He notes that quantitative research data is relatively simple to gather, is objective in nature, and can be easily understood in reporting. Kaufhold goes on to state that policy makers in education often prefer the factual data associated with quantitative research. This concept is consistent with the idea that the study has produced valuable information for the leadership team of the school district that was studied in their development and reform of principal development activities. In summary, the numerical data obtained from the quantitative research in the project were useful in answering the research questions.

Two essential truths of qualitative research provided a rationale for the researcher to use a partially qualitative approach to the research project. First, qualitative research requires the researcher to place his focus upon human interaction and the complexities of the contexts in which the interaction takes place (Custer, 1996). In order to gain a clear understanding of the effects of SDEA activities upon program participants, it was essential to gain an understanding of the participant interactions with the SDEA activities. Another foundation of qualitative research that justifies the use of it in this study is the idea presented by Janesick (1998) which asserts that qualitative research provides the researcher with an opportunity to explore gray areas of a topic which essentially present opportunities for the researcher to gain and present a flexible understanding of truth. In exploring the connections between SDEA activities and the

"North Carolina School Executive Standards", the researcher presented information that relied partially upon interpretations and descriptions by the researcher. Ultimately, the use of qualitative research in this descriptive study provided an opportunity to conduct what Sutton (1993) calls a “three way communication process amongst human subjects, the researcher, and the…audience” (p. 426).

Byrne and Humble (2006) present a number of different points that serve as a rationale for the use of a mixed methods approach with a sequential QUAN-QUAL emphasis in the study. First, a multiple methods approach facilitates the neutralization of potential disadvantages in particular methods. In the study reporting, the researcher has presented both numerical data as well as data in more of a narrative form. Secondly, because the principal development program and its participants interact in complex ways, different methods were needed to understand such complexities. Finally, the research design allowed the researcher to both construct and confirm theory in the same study. While the quantitative portion of the study provided the construction, the qualitative piece provided the confirmation.

Research Methodology

The researcher conducted a descriptive study in order to report on the perceived effects of SDEA upon participants concerning preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". The study was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. Information was initially gathered in a quantitative form through a Likert scale survey. Through survey questions built around the specific competencies of the "North Carolina School Executive Standards", the researcher gauged the perceived impact of SDEA activities upon participants. After the survey was conducted, qualitative research in the

form of individual interviews with SDEA participants were administered in an attempt to reveal further detailed information. The interview questions were formulated to reflect the competencies of the "School Executive Standards”. Ultimately, the survey and individual interviews provided data to detail SDEA participant perceptions of the impact of SDEA activities upon preparedness to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards".

Several characteristics of the descriptive study methodology made it appropriate for the research project. Kaufhold (2007) characterizes descriptive research as an opportunity to provide a description of a situation in a way that reports on the current condition of a group of subjects. Descriptive research provides the researcher with the opportunity to investigate the form, actions, and changes of a specific, man-made phenomenon (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). The researcher attempted to investigate and report on the current perceptions of a group of subjects concerning their interaction with a specific set of experiences, the SDEA.

Instruments and Data Collection Procedures

The researcher utilized guidelines presented by Gall et al. (2007) in designing the survey. The guidelines promote the reader to avoid confusing jargon, make the survey attractive, create survey items that are easy to read, provide clear instructions, use a logical sequence of questions, have a rationale for all survey items, avoid ambiguous statements, avoid double-barreled questions, and be cautious of bias in the creation of the survey items. Each of the aforementioned concepts was utilized in the creation of the survey.

To ensure instrument validity, the researcher constructed survey questions that

were directly correlated to the seven "School Executive Standards". Moreover, in coordination with the recommendation of Kaufhold (2007), the researcher created multiple questions that were designed to elicit the same information, but through differently worded questions. Furthermore, acquiescence response bias was addressed through the recommendation of Tuckman (1999) to reverse the direction of some survey items. Some of the aforementioned check items were written so that disagreement with the item was consistent with agreement with its corresponding survey item. Additionally, validity was strengthened through the recommendation of Kaufhold (2007) to provide opportunities for survey participants to include written comments.

Validity protection was also provided through the recommendation of Gall et al. (2007) to field test a non-standardized survey. The field test led to revisions that ultimately made the survey more valid. The researcher determined that individuals from the study sample had sufficient knowledge and understanding to express truthful opinions about the topic. The field test was administered to individuals who were a part of the test population but who were not part of the study sample. Correlations for the survey were run to determine whether items measure intended information. Individuals who helped to field test the survey also conducted an analysis of the clarity, bias, ambiguity, and connectedness to the SES of survey items.

In creating the interview questions, the researcher followed the recommendations of Kaufhold (2007) and McNamara (1999). Kaufhold promotes face-to-face interviews that allow the researcher to ask in-depth questions. In such interviews, Kaufhold suggests that the researcher strive to maintain validity through calling for clarity in the case of any potential misunderstandings. Moreover, Kaufhold suggests that the interviewer should

remain impartial and maintain a high degree of eye contact throughout the interview. To maintain descriptive validity, McNamara states that interviews should be audio taped and transcribed so that interviewees may check transcriptions for accuracy. Finally, he asserts that the researcher should analyze the interview transcripts by highlighting key words that reveal themes within the interview. To ensure validity of this information, he promotes that the coding should be conducted by a second person.

The researcher maintained interview validity protection through the recommendations of Key (1997). These suggestions recommend focusing on the following areas while conducting research: listening rather than speaking, recording information accurately, establishing a detailed plan prior to collecting data, being candid in data reporting, seeking constant feedback during the data collecting process, attempting to achieve balance between perceived importance and actual importance of information, and writing accurately in reporting of findings. Finally, to ensure interpretive validity, the researcher requested participant feedback regarding the transcription of the interviews.

As recommended by Gall et al. (1997), the researcher paid careful attention to strengthening validity through maintaining the confidentiality of all study participant data obtained through survey and interview participant responses. In conducting the interviews, the researcher first obtained signed consent from all participants. In staying consistent with McNamara's suggestions, the researcher recorded and transcribed the interviews, highlighted key words, categorized themes, and used a trained research assistant to highlight and categorize, as well. Ultimately, the researcher has reported on the positive and negative trends that arose from the themes gleaned from the interviews.

Finally, as recommended by Patten (2000), the researcher engaged in reflexivity, active self-reflection upon potential researcher biases, throughout the research process.

Participants

Volunteer sampling was utilized in the study as the researcher gathered data from SDEA participants who were willing to participate in the study. Each principal and assistant principal who had participated in all five components of SDEA and could be located was invited to complete the survey. At the onset of the study, there were 25 such principals and assistant principals. Of the 25 leaders who had completed the program, 10 were white males, 12 were white females, and three were black females. Ages of the participants ranged from late twenties to late fifties. SDEA participants were located using a school district administrator directory and were contacted by district email. An assistant superintendent in the school district in which the study was conducted encouraged SDEA participants to participate in the survey through email correspondence that she sent via school district email. After obtaining and interpreting survey results, SDEA participants were invited to participate in individual interviews. Through a Likert scale survey and individual interviews, the researcher has reported the perceived effects of SDEA activities upon participants about preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards".

Data Analysis

To answer the research questions, the researcher used a Likert scale survey to gather preliminary information and used individual interviews to gather more detailed data. The researcher essentially attempted to describe program participant perceptions of the connection between the SDEA activities and preparation to meet the SES through the

interpretation of the data obtained from the aforementioned data collection tools.

Once again, the researcher utilized a Likert scale survey to gather preliminary information. The survey provided numerical data that had the potential to be analyzed quickly and accurately (Kaufhold, 2007) so that the interview questions could be created in an efficient manner. The interview questions were created after themes had been identified from the survey data. While the interview questions were designed to gather data which expanded survey data, the questions were essentially focused on the perceptions of SDEA participants concerning the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the SES.

Gall et al. (2007) state that interviews allow the researcher to control the interview to make it appropriate for the circumstances of the situation. They go on to say that interviews give a skilled interviewer the opportunity to build trust and rapport which leads to the possibility of interviewees revealing information that they may not reveal in any other mode of data collection. Ultimately, Gall et al. characterize interviews by describing them as opportunities to gather responses that are in the unique words of the respondents.

In reference to data analysis, Kaufhold (2007) states that measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) may be used to present a picture of what is average, and what are the equal measurements above and below the norm. According to Patten (2000), these figures are rather simple to determine. Such measures of central tendency derived from the survey were used to create a quantitative description of the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards”. SPSS software was utilized to

compute accurate data. Obtained information provided preliminary data on participant perceptions. Once the central tendency of the sample was determined for each survey item, the researcher attempted to identify themes that helped to drive the creation of the interview questions.

Chapter 4: Results

The Union County Public Schools has strategically examined the importance of strong principal leadership at the school level. This is evidenced by the school system's plan to provide adequate professional development for its principals. The major component of this plan has been the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" (SDEA). Since 2002, approximately twenty-five principals and assistant principals have completed all five components of SDEA. The fundamental goal of the program is to equip principals in the school district to meet the challenges faced by building-level leaders associated with promoting and maintaining high levels of student achievement.

The major research question for this study was as follows: What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards"? A mixed methods approach with a sequential QUAN-QUAL analysis was used to answer the research question. A survey was conducted with district principals and assistant principals who had completed all five components of the SDEA. Individual interviews were conducted with principals and assistant principals who had been invited to complete the survey. The survey revealed general information about participant perceptions regarding the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". The interviews provided more specific data about these perceptions.

This chapter reports the findings of this mixed methods study. The chapter is divided into two major sections. The first presents the survey results, which are

accompanied by tables to clarify the data. The second provides descriptions of interviewee responses. In this component, an analysis of the interviews is also provided with themes that emerged from the interviews.

Survey Participants

Survey participants consisted of Union County principals and assistant principals who had completed all five components of the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" (SDEA). The researcher initially contacted all Union County principals and assistant principals by district email and determined that twenty-five of them had completed all five components of the SDEA. Potential participants were then invited to participate in the survey through an Internet-based survey program called K12 Insight. The survey was electronically attached to the survey invitation, and all survey data were returned electronically through K12 Insight to the researcher. Of the twenty-five potential survey participants, 22 individuals completed the survey. This amounted to an 88% response rate.

Survey Structure and Scoring

Survey responses were collected and analyzed through the K12 Insight program. At the conclusion of the survey, the researcher scored participant responses by assigning scores to responses. In responding to the survey items, participants had the following choices: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and no opinion. The researcher assigned the following scores to each response: strongly agree: 2, agree: 1, disagree: -1, strongly disagree: -2, no opinion: 0. Reversed survey questions, which were used to increase the validity of survey results, were assigned the following reversed order of scoring: strongly agree: -2, agree: -1, disagree: 1, strongly disagree: 2, no opinion: 0.

In cases in which a survey participant did not respond to a particular item, the item was not counted in the calculation of mean, median, mode, and standard deviation. The survey was designed in a way as to have at least three questions gauging the same general information. There were essentially seven categories of questions with each category corresponding to one of the seven "North Carolina School Executive Standards".

Strategic Leadership

In the survey, five questions were designed to gauge the collective perception of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a strategic leader. This subgroup of questions revealed the following mean scores: 0.91, 0.86, 1.09, 0.86, and 0.76 with a collective mean of 0.90. The following modes were calculated: 1, 1, 1, 1, 1. Additionally, the following standard deviations were calculated: 1.15, 0.89, 0.97, 0.94, 1.04. Finally, the following medians were calculated: 1, 1, 1, 1, 1. All survey data for strategic leadership are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Survey Results for Strategic Leadership

Survey Item	*M*	*Mdn*	Mode	*SD*
2	0.91	1	1	1.15
9	0.86	1	1	0.89
16	1.09	1	1	0.97
24	0.86	1	1	0.94
25	0.76	1	1	1.04

Instructional Leadership

In the survey, four questions were designed to gauge the collective perception of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be an instructional leader. This subgroup of questions revealed the following mean scores: 0.77, 0.77, 1.09, and 0.95 with a collective mean of 0.90. The following modes were calculated: 1, 1, (1, 2), 1. Additionally, the following standard deviations were calculated: 1.11, 1.02, 1.02, 1.00. Finally, the following medians were calculated: 1, 1, 1, 1. All survey data for instructional leadership are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2

Survey Results for Instructional Leadership

Survey Item	*M*	*Mdn*	Mode	*SD*
3	0.77	1	1	1.11
10	0.77	1	1	1.02
17	1.09	1, 2	1	1.02
23	0.95	1	1	1.00

Cultural Leadership

In the survey, three questions were designed to gauge the collective perception of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a cultural leader. This subgroup of questions revealed the following mean scores: 1.00, 0.90, and 0.59 with a collective mean of 0.83. The following modes were calculated: 1, 1, 1. Additionally, the following standard deviations were calculated: 0.82, 1.00, 1.22.

Finally, the following medians were calculated: 1, 1, 1. All survey data for cultural leadership are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Survey Results for Cultural Leadership

Survey Item	*M*	*Mdn*	Mode	*SD*
4	1.00	1	1	0.82
11	0.90	1	1	1.00
18	0.59	1	1	1.22

Human Resource Leadership

In the survey, five questions were designed to gauge the collective perception of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a human resource leader. This subgroup of questions revealed the following mean scores: 0.91, 1.14, 0.90, 0.86, and 0.27 with a collective mean of 0.82. The following modes were calculated: 1, 1, 1, 1, 1. Additionally, the following standard deviations were calculated: 0.87, 0.71, 0.89, 0.94. 1.20. Finally, the following medians were calculated: 1, 1, 1, 1, 0.5. All survey data for human resource leadership are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Survey Results for Human Resource Leadership

Survey Item	*M*	*Mdn*	Mode	*SD*
5	0.91	1	1	0.87
12	1.14	1	1	0.71
19	0.90	1	1	0.89
26	0.86	1	1	0.94
27	0.27	0.5	1	1.20

Managerial Leadership

In the survey, three questions were designed to gauge the collective perception of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a managerial leader. This subgroup of questions revealed the following mean scores: 0.95, 0.86, 1.14 with a collective mean of 0.98. The following modes were calculated: 1, 1, 1. Additionally, the following standard deviations were calculated: 0.84, 1.04, 0.73. Finally, the following medians were calculated: 1, 1, 1. All survey data for managerial leadership are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

Survey Results for Managerial Leadership

Survey Item	*M*	*Mdn*	Mode	*SD*
6	0.95	1	1	0.84
13	0.86	1	1	1.04
20	1.14	1	1	0.73

External Development Leadership

In the survey, three questions were designed to gauge the collective perception of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be an external development leader. This subgroup of questions revealed the following mean scores: 0.50, 0.05, 0.45 with a collective mean of 0.33. The following modes were calculated: 1, -1, 1. Additionally, the following standard deviations were calculated: 1.19, 1.13, 1.06. Finally, the following medians were calculated: 1, 0, 0.5. All survey data for external development leadership are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6

Survey Results for External Development Leadership

Survey Item	*M*	*Mdn*	Mode	*SD*
7	0.50	1	1	1.19
14	0.05	0	-1	1.13
21	0.45	0.5	1	1.06

Micropolitical Leadership

In the survey, three questions were designed to gauge the collective perception of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to be a micropolitical leader. This subgroup of questions revealed the following mean scores: 1.18, 1.18, 0.41 with a collective mean of 0.92. The following modes were calculated: 1, 1, 1. Additionally, the following standard deviations were calculated: 0.91, 0.73, 1.05. Finally, the following medians were calculated: 1, 1, 1. All survey data for micropolitical leadership are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7

Survey Results for Micropolitical Leadership

Survey Item	*M*	*Mdn*	Mode	*SD*
8	1.18	1	1	0.91
15	1.18	1	1	0.73
22	0.41	1	1	1.05

Interview Participants

Seventeen individuals participated in the interviews of the study. Within this number, the breakdown of positions of the interviewees was as follows: eight elementary principals, one middle school principal, three high school principals, three elementary assistant principals, and two middle school assistant principals. The researcher contacted potential interviewees via district email to arrange times and places in which the interviews were to take place.

Interview Analysis

The interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed. The researcher emailed transcripts to all interviewees so that the interviewees had the opportunity to review and potentially correct the transcripts. There were no requests for transcripts to be changed. The interviews were analyzed according to recommendations of McNamara (1999). Key words in the interview transcripts were highlighted with the use of three colors. Green indicated a positive response, pink indicated a negative response, and blue indicated a response that was better connected to another interview item. Information that was coded

in blue was accompanied by notes that referred to the more appropriate interview item. The researcher identified themes for each interview item through identifying responses that appeared more than once and from more than one interview participant. Finally, the researcher identified common responses that emerged across different questions multiple times in order to identify the themes across research questions. To enhance the validity of the coding and theme identification, a trained research assistant also highlighted transcripts and identified themes within questions and across questions. There were no significant differences between the analysis of the researcher and the analysis of the assistant.

Themes found through the interview analysis are discussed in the following section. Reporting is arranged and titled according to each of the "North Carolina School Executive Standards" since the interview questions were arranged in the same fashion. Reporting of themes that emerged across various interview questions is presented after the reporting for each standard.

Strategic Leadership

The first interview item asked participants to comment on whether they agreed or disagreed that the Staff Development Expectations for Administrators activities helped to prepare them to be strategic leaders. Program participants responded with a high degree of agreement concerning each of the five components of the SDEA. Facilitative Leadership and Crucial Conversations had the highest frequency of positive responses. Specifically, interviewees indicated that Crucial Conversations aided them in their work and responsibilities related to mission, vision, and alignment of employees. They also indicated that this particular component aided them in their work with parents as it related

to strategic leadership. With Facilitative Leadership, interviewees again spoke of the positive impact upon mission, vision, and goals, but more specifically, they cited the benefit of Facilitative Leadership related to being able to gather collective input effectively from their respective staffs. Additionally, interviewees indicated that Crucial Conversations, TPAI, and Teachscape were effective in improving their abilities to be strategic leaders. Of these three components, only one was tied to a specific theme that emerged from the feedback. This was Crucial Conversations and its favorable impact upon vision, mission, goals, and alignment of individuals.

Instructional Leadership

The second interview item asked participants to comment on whether they agreed or disagreed that the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" activities helped to prepare them to be instructional leaders. In this realm of leadership, favorable themes emerged regarding four of the five SDEA components. Regarding TPAI, participants responded with a very high frequency that TPAI gave them a tool with which to identify and look for parameters of good teaching. Participants also favorably spoke of Crucial Conversations. A theme that emerged was that Crucial Conversations provided them with a safe way to talk with teachers about areas in which they were lacking or needed help. The same theme emerged in response to Crucial Confrontations. With Teachscape, both positive and negative themes emerged. While interviewees expressed on one hand that Teachscape was a benefit to their abilities as instructional leaders, they also responded negatively to Teachscape. Such negativity emerged through responses that seemed to be centered on the rigidity of the program, the lack of need for the program, and the lack of practice with data that may be derived from the program.

Cultural Leadership

The third interview item asked participants to comment on whether they agreed or disagreed that the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" activities helped to prepare them to be cultural leaders. Participants revealed only one significant area of commonality in this leadership realm. The identified area was Facilitative Leadership. Participants revealed their opinion that Facilitative Leadership assisted them in understanding techniques to promote consensus, collaboration, empowerment, and ownership in school decision-making. However, a strong negative theme also emerged. Several participants voiced the idea that the SDEA components provided them with no support of their performance as cultural leaders.

Human Resource Leadership

The fourth interview item asked participants to comment on whether they agreed or disagreed that the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" activities helped to prepare them to be human resource leaders. Participants produced very favorable responses in this realm of leadership, but one theme of uncertainty evolved, as well. All five SDEA components were touched upon in great frequency in response to this particular interview question. For TPAI, a theme emerged that the training helped participants as leaders to assess teachers and provide them with help to grow. With Crucial Conversations as well as Crucial Confrontations, participants expressed the idea that they learned how to talk with individuals properly in their quest to improve the performance of those individuals. Regarding Teachscape, SDEA participants identified the training as a vital one for teacher improvement. Participants also characterized Teachscape as a tool with which to provide teachers leadership opportunities. Although

participants revealed these positive themes about Teachscape, they also expressed the opinion that there is insufficient data and application of what they had learned to conclude that Teachscape had improved their abilities as human resource leaders. Concerning Facilitative Leadership, a theme emerged that it helped participants to create ownership and involvement in the quest to provide professional growth for teachers.

Managerial Leadership

The fifth interview item asked participants to comment on whether they agreed or disagreed that the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" activities helped to prepare them to be managerial leaders. For this standard, a number of both positive and negative themes emerged. Specifically, participants voiced a favorable opinion of Facilitative Leadership. Multiple favorable responses for this SDEA component included references to the following areas: faculty meeting procedures, scheduling, staffing, and delegation. With Crucial Conversations and Crucial Confrontations, participants revealed the theme that those components helped them with techniques to overcome disagreements. Teachscape also received multiple favorable responses concerning growth in managerial leadership. Negative responses in this area that surfaced multiple times included the idea that the SDEA components did not help participants with scheduling, budgeting, or as overall managerial leaders.

External Development Leadership

The sixth interview item asked participants to comment on whether they agreed or disagreed that the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" activities helped to prepare them to be external development leaders. Again, in this realm, results were mixed. With Crucial Conversations and Crucial Confrontations, SDEA participants

expressed the idea that the activities improved their skills with creating consensus and buy-in with groups of stakeholders. About Facilitative Leadership, interviewees revealed the theme that the training improved their skills with creating strong relationships with stakeholders as well as their skills with creating buy-in and win-win situations. The final positive theme that emerged was the idea that TPAI afforded leaders the opportunity to show others specific things that the school staff was doing in their daily duties. Negatively, participants revealed their feelings that TPAI, Teachscape, Crucial Conversations, Facilitative Leadership, and all of the SDEA components collectively did not improve their abilities as external development leaders. They voiced the idea that collectively, the components did not help them to develop skills to garner community engagement and support.

Micropolitical Leadership

The seventh interview item asked participants to comment on whether they agreed or disagreed that the "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" activities helped to prepare them to be micropolitical leaders. Once again, participants revealed mixed reactions to this interview item. They revealed feelings that TPAI was helpful and that Teachscape helped to promote relationships and cohesion amongst their staffs. Facilitative Leadership was spoken of positively, and Crucial Conversations was referenced as helping to promote a community within the school. Crucial Conversations was the SDEA component that was referenced the most in response to this interview item. The main theme that emerged from this interview item was that this component improved social cohesion among their school staffs. Negatively, SDEA participants expressed the idea that SDEA activities collectively did not prepare participants to

understand the politics of parents and external stakeholders. Interviewees also expressed the idea that TPAI, Teachscape, nor Crucial Conversations helped in their preparation to become micropolitical leaders.

Interview Item Eight

The eighth interview item asked participants if they had any additional comments. No themes emerged in response to this interview item.

Themes Across Interview Questions

A number of different themes evolved across interview questions. Concerning Crucial Conversations, the idea that the component helped SDEA participants in their quest to improve teacher performance emerged across numerous questions. Another theme related to Crucial Conversations that emerged across questions was the idea that it helped participants to develop and use safe ways in talking with different individuals. The same theme regarding safe ways to talk with individuals evolved in connection with Crucial Confrontations. The next theme that evolved was tied to Facilitative Leadership. Across questions, the idea that Facilitative Leadership helped participants to promote collaboration and ownership emerged. While nothing specifically evolved regarding TPAI that could be classified as a theme, the general feeling that the component was helpful across different standards did evolve over different questions. The final positive themes that evolved were related to Teachscape. Participants revealed the theme that Teachscape prompted them to get into classrooms frequently. They also indicated that Teachscape aided them in their role in improving teacher performance. One negative theme did evolve across multiple questions. The theme was that Teachscape was not helpful because of a lack of knowledge and practice with analyzing data derived from the

Teachscape system.

Conclusion

Survey results collectively present the idea that SDEA participants generally agree that the SDEA activities helped to prepare them to be effective leaders according to the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". Means, medians, and modes, which are presented in this chapter show that, with the exception of standard six, external development leadership, participants generally felt that the SDEA activities helped to prepare them to be more effective school executives.

In comparison to the number of negative themes that emerged from the interviews, a high number of positive themes emerged from the analysis of interviews with SDEA participants. The number of positive themes outnumbered the negative themes in the areas of strategic leadership, instructional leadership, cultural leadership, human resource leadership, and managerial leadership, but there were equal numbers of positive and negative themes for both external development leadership and micropolitical leadership. The high number of positive themes throughout interview questions supports the reliability of the positive responses gleaned from the survey. Furthermore, a high number of positive themes emerged across interview questions. This was not the case regarding negative themes. Positive themes touched on each of the five SDEA components, and once again, most of these themes were of a positive nature.

The main research question of this study was as follows: What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards"? Survey and interview data indicate that SDEA participants generally agree that SDEA activities enabled them to

lead more effectively in accordance with the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". Positive responses were evident for all of the "North Carolina School Executive Standards" with the exceptions of standard six, external development leadership, and standard seven, micropolitical leadership. In both of these areas, survey results indicate that participants felt positively about the connections between SDEA activities and preparation to be leaders in these areas. However, the equal number of positive and negative themes that emerged from interview questions regarding these areas contradicts the survey results. Speculations and recommendations in response to study results will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 5: Speculations, Recommendations, and Summary

The North Carolina State Board of Education adopted a new set of standards on executive leadership to be used to develop and evaluate principals and assistant principals beginning in the 2008-2009 school year. These standards, on which principals and assistant principals are expected to base their performance of professional duties, include the following seven areas of executive leadership: strategic leadership, instructional leadership, cultural leadership, human resource leadership, managerial leadership, external development leadership, and micropolitical leadership. The creation of these standards, the "North Carolina School Executive Standards", was driven by the results of a study by Portin et al. (2003). The study detailed the problems of principal shortage, poor understanding of the changed role of the principal, and inadequate training for principals. More specifically, the study revealed a prediction that the turnover rate for principals in the first decade of the twenty-first century would increase. Regarding the changed role of the school principal, the study detailed the change for school leadership from being based upon standardization of structure to being based upon accountability for outcomes. The final area of concern, inadequate training for principals, was strengthened by studies by Levine (2005) and the Wallace Foundation (2006) that determined that the overall effectiveness of America’s principal preparation programs was not high.

The "Staff Development Expectations for Administrators" (SDEA) is a professional development plan for principals and assistant principals in Union County, North Carolina. The SDEA includes the following five components: Facilitative Leadership, Crucial Conversations, Crucial Confrontations, Teachscape, and Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument Training (TPAI). The overall goal of the plan is to

equip principals and assistant principals to meet the building-level challenges that are potential barriers to promoting and maintaining high levels of student achievement.

The researcher utilized a mixed methods approach to research with a QUAN-QUAL emphasis in order to answer the following main research question: What are the perceptions of SDEA participants about the connection between SDEA activities and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards"? A Likert scale survey was used to gather preliminary data, and individual interview were conducted with SDEA participants to gather further information.

Survey and interview results show that SDEA participants generally agree that SDEA activities helped to prepare them to be school executives. Positive responses emerged from the survey for each of the standards with the exception of one standard, external development leadership. Similarly, positive themes evolved from each interview question as well as across interview questions. The only exceptions are that equal numbers of positive and negative themes emerged about two standards, external development leadership and micropolitical leadership.

Speculations

There are a number of explanations for the results of the survey. Since an assistant superintendent from the district being studied encouraged potential survey participants via email to participate in the survey, it is possible that survey participants felt pressured to participate and possibly even pressured to respond to the survey in a particular way. Even though survey participants were assured by the researcher that their responses would remain completely confidential, it still seems logical that participants may have felt somewhat skeptical about this claim because of the communication from the assistant

superintendent.

Specifically regarding the survey, it seemed that there was not a great deal of variation in survey responses. This may potentially be a result of the fact that survey participants did not have a great deal of exposure to and experience with the particular details of the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". Their limited notions of the standards as experienced through activities specific to their particular school district may have had an impact on their survey responses. Another potential scenario regarding the survey is that since the survey did not require face-to-face interaction with a researcher, it is possible that survey participants displayed a greater degree of honesty in responses to survey items than they did for the interview questions.

Regarding the interviews, a number of different factors potentially explain interview participant responses. Since the interviews were of a face-to-face nature with the researcher, it is possible that in order to be self-serving and avoid negative comments about their employers, interviewees provided responses that were skewed toward being more positive than truthful. Another possibility regarding interviewee responses was that the interview influenced interviewees to be more divergent in their responses. They had the flexibility and opportunity to shape their responses in ways that went deeper and were more complex than the survey response choices. Finally, the researcher used his own knowledge of the "School Executive Standards" to answer interviewee questions regarding the nature of the standards. These descriptions of the standards by the researcher may have influenced the responses of the interview participants.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the study, the researcher has a number of

recommendations for the school system in which the study was conducted. First, it is recommended that Crucial Conversations, Crucial Confrontations, and Facilitative Leadership remain as foundational pieces of the Union County plan for principal and assistant principal development. Throughout the study, SDEA participants expressed their satisfaction with the effectiveness of each of these three professional development components. Each component received expressions of value across various standards.

Another recommendation for the school system is tied to human resource leadership. Considering the current condition of education funding in North Carolina, the school system would be wise to place an emphasis upon leadership efforts in developing high performing school staffs and establishing strong professional learning communities within its schools. With uncertainty regarding staffing allotments, such an emphasis would ensure that the district could face staffing cuts with the confidence of knowing that they had trained their principals to equip their staffs with the knowledge and skills necessary to maintain high performing classes in spite of increased student-teacher ratios. This recommendation comes with the consideration that the study revealed that Union County principals and assistant principals perceive that the school district adequately prepares them to be human resource leaders. The school district would be building upon a strength that already exists.

Again speaking of the uncertain state of school funding in North Carolina, another recommendation focuses on managerial leadership. The School Executive Standards refer to school budgeting in the list of competencies by which principals are expected to base their performance. While operating in times of budget restrictions, leaders need to adept at managing budgets in order to maximize the spending decisions that they face. Once

again, since the principals and assistant principals in Union County already perceive that they are well prepared as managerial leaders, the district would be building upon an existing strength if they decided to implement professional development plans in this realm of executive leadership. Perhaps the school district could creatively connect human resource leadership with managerial leadership, specifically budgeting, through professional development opportunities that would afford school leaders the opportunity to gain an understanding of efficient and unique practices related to staffing and salary issues.

It is also recommended that the school system design their training and their institution plan for the new teacher appraisal instrument with much thought. Since the state of North Carolina is moving to a new teacher evaluation tool in the 2009-2010 school year, Union County will have to implement a plan to train its principals and assistant principals in the use of this tool. With such a positive response regarding the TPAI tool and its importance to executive leaders, the school district would be well served to examine the most beneficial outcomes that TPAI provided, so that principals and assistant principals will still be able to utilize such powerful instructional tools.

Another recommendation for the Union County Public Schools is to place a focus on the adjustment of the Teachscape program. SDEA participants expressed some dissatisfaction with the implementation of this program. Considering the significant financial investment that the system has made in this program, it would be wise to examine the principal and assistant principal concerns and perceived benefits associated with Teachscape closely. Specifically, the leadership team of the district would be well served by focusing on the perceived rigidity of the program as well as the perceived need

for more practice with data derived from the program. Through the focus on rigidity, principals and assistant principals could be presented with opportunities to express their opinions regarding the lack of flexibility with the Teachscape program so that program developers could alter the program to make it more appropriate for the needs of the schools of Union County. In regard to the focus on data derived from the program, it is recommended that principals and assistant principals are exposed to more follow-up training in addition to the initial two Teachscape training sessions. Follow-up sessions could provide Teachscape users with knowledge of techniques used to disaggregate data and ways to use that data to drive leadership and professional development decisions.

Additionally, it is recommended that the district examines its plan of developing cultural leadership skills in its principals and assistant principals. The study revealed a theme of a disconnection between SDEA activities and preparation of cultural leaders. Since two main tenants of cultural leadership, according to the School Executive Standards, are staff cohesion and creating reshaped visions for the cultures of schools, these are two areas on which the school district could focus in their aim to improve cultural leadership. Such development efforts regarding staff cohesion could be facilitated by principals who have had success with creating strong school cultures within buildings that they have been charged with leading. Similarly, principals who have experienced success with creating new and improved cultures within schools could assist in the facilitation of development efforts aimed at the cultural leadership skill of cultural reshaping.

Finally, it is recommended that the county specifically address external development leadership. SDEA participants clearly expressed the feeling that they were

ill equipped to be effective external development leaders. This is particularly concerning when considering the unstable state of school funding in North Carolina. Since the "North Carolina School Executive Standards" provide a framework for the competencies of external development leadership, Union County could create a plan for this element of leadership based directly from the Executive Standards competencies list. The focus of the plan could be on establishing relationships with external stakeholders in the school community so that those stakeholders could assist the school leaders in their meeting of funding and budgeting challenges. This particular focus could be coupled with a focus on the development of abilities of principals and assistant principals to understand and effectively work within and through the politics of external stakeholders. Since the study revealed a theme that SDEA participants do not feel as if they have a firm grasp on the understanding of the politics of external stakeholders, leadership development planners within the district could provide principals and assistant principals with training and opportunities for practice related to communication and conversation skills with external stakeholders. Once again, since the district is already seemingly providing very effective training through Crucial Conversations and Crucial Confrontations, this would again be an area of strength on which the district would be building.

Future Studies

One potential study would be a replication study of this study. The same research questions and data collection tools could be utilized to report on the perceptions of the same and/or different SDEA participants. Since the SDEA participants have only recently become familiar with the "North Carolina School Executive Standards", a future study may reveal different data when participants are more familiar and comfortable with the

standards. Ultimately, the study may provide the Union County Public Schools with more detailed and valuable data.

Another related study could replicate the mixed methods approach with a QUAN-QUAL focus. While the study could utilize the same methodology, it could be conducted in a different school district in North Carolina. While the standards would be aligned for both districts, the professional development activities for principals and assistant principals would inevitably have differences between the two districts. The questions of both the survey and the interviews would need to be adjusted in order to be consistent with the activities of the particular school district in which the study would take place. The results of that research could be compared to the results of the present study in order to determine the worth of professional development activities in preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". A comparison of the studies could also provide valuable information to each of the districts about what is effective in the other school district.

Yet another similar study could focus on teacher perceptions of the performance of SDEA participants. The survey and interview questions of the study could be adapted in order to gather data that would detail the perceptions of the teachers who work under the supervision and leadership of SDEA participants. To extend the study, a comparison between the results of this study and the proposed study could be made. Ultimately, obtained data may provide some insights into principal performance according to the "North Carolina School Executive Standards" as perceived by teachers.

Since external development leadership was an area in which SDEA participants expressed a perception of lack of preparation from SDEA activities, then a worthwhile

study could be one focused on external development leadership. Through a qualitative approach, the study could explore the connections between external development leadership and obstacles that prevent competent performance in the area of external development leadership. The study could be conducted across school districts in order to examine the scope of the problem in a particular geographic region of North Carolina.

Summary

It is clear that the development of principals in Union County and across the state of North Carolina is of paramount importance. In the rapidly changing landscape of school leadership, it is critical that the principals who lead schools understand the changed roles and expectations by which they are expected to operate. School districts cannot afford to depend solely on university preparation program to prepare their leaders. School district leadership teams must design and implement leadership development programs that prepare their principals and assistant principals to be executive leaders. The findings of this study may help the Union County Public Schools to reflect upon their current program of principal development and may serve a role in the design of future leadership programs in the district. Moreover, results of this study may be of worth to other school districts across the state of North Carolina because of the expectation for school districts to provide executive leadership in every school building.

References

Archer, J. (2005). Group offers executive training for principals. *Education Week, 24*(43).

Archer, J. (2006). Mentoring for new principals gains policy attention. *Education Week, 26*(3).

Arkansas Leadership Academy. (2008). *Master principal program.* Retrieved September 15, 2008, from http://www.arkansasleadershipacademy.org/index.htm.

Bartholomew, S. K., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2003). Reconnecting preparation and practice through the work lives of assistant principals. In F. C. Lunenburg & C. S. Carr (Eds.), *Shaping the future: Policy, partnerships, and emerging perspectives* (pp. 291-300). Lanham, MC: Scarecrow Press.

Bingham, C. S., & Gottfried, S. (2003). *Leading change in principal development: Notes from the field.* Greensboro, NC: SERVE.

Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., & Jacobson, A. (2004). *Progress being made in getting a quality leader in every school.* Retrieved from http://www.sreb.org.

Brooks, S., Giles, C., Jacobson, S. Johnson, L., & Ylimaki, R. (2007). Successful leadership in three high-poverty urban elementary schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*(4).

Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003). Principal's excellence program: Advanced professional development for administrator-certified leaders. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Portland, OR (November 12-16, 2003).

Byrne, J. & Humble, A. (2006). *An introduction to mixed method research.* Halifax, Nova Scotia: Atlantic Research Center for Family-Work Issues.

Carr, C. S., Chenoweth, T., & Ruhl, T. (2003). Best practice in educational leadership preparation programs. In F. C. Lunenburg & C. S. Carr (Eds.), *Shaping the future: Policy, partnerships, and emerging perspectives* (pp. 204-223). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Custer, R. L. (1996). Qualitative research methodologies. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 34*(2), 3-6.

Dodd, J., & Keller, E. (1998) *The K-8 principal in 1998, a ten-year study.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

e-lead. (2008a). *National Institute for School Leadership.* Retrieved December 18, 2008, from http://www.e-lead.org/programs/nisl/summary.asp.

e-lead. (2008b). *Principals' Excellence Program.* Retrieved December 18, 2008, from http://www.e-lead.org/programs/pep/summary.asp.

Educational Research Service. (1998). Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship? An exploratory study. Prepared for NASSP and NAESP.

Gall, M., Gall, J., & Borg, W. (2007). *Educational research.* New York: Pearson.

Georgia's Leadership Institute. (2008). *Executive development.* Retrieved September 13, 2008, from http://www.glisi.org/site/default.htm.

Hale, E., & Moorman, H. (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations.* Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hertling, E. (2001). *Retaining principals*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest147.html.

Hoffman, F., & Johnston, J. (2005 May/June). Professional development for principals, by principals. *Leadership*.

Illinois New Principal Mentoring Program. (2008). *New principals.* Retrieved September 15, 2008, from http://www.ilprincipalmentoring.org/.

Institute for Professional Development and Graduate Studies in Education. *Principal residency network.* Retrieved December 22, 2008, from http://www.ace.neu.edu/pdp/programs/prn.

Janesick, V. (1998). *"Stretching" exercises for qualitative researchers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kaplan, L., Owings, W., & Nunnery, J. (2005). Principal quality: A Virginia study connecting interstate school leaders licensure consortium standards with student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 89*(643), 28-44.

Kaufhold, J. (2007). *Basic statistics for educational research.* New York: iUniverse, Inc.

Key, J. (1997). *Research design in occupational education.* Retrieved July 18, 2007, from http://www.okstate.edu/ag/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/newpage21.htm.

Levine, A. (2005). Educating school leaders. The Education Schools Project. Retrieved April 12, 2009, from http://www.woodrow.org/images/pdf/newsitem/EdTeachers_report_0906.pdf.

Maryland State Department of Education. (2008). *Maryland principals' academy.* Retrieved September 15, 2008, from http://www.marylandpublicschools.org.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association of School Administrators.

McNamara, C. (1999). Basics of conducting focus groups. Retrieved from http://www.mapnp.org/library/evaluatn/focusgrp.htm.

Miracle, T. (2003). An analysis of a district level aspiring principals training program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Charlotte.

Murphy, J. (1998). Preparation for the school principalship: The United States' story. *School Leadership & Management 18*(3). 359-373.

Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 41*(1), 154-191.

National College for School Leadership. *F*ind a programme. Retrieved December 19, 2008, from http://www.ncsl.org.uk/programmes-index.

New Visions for Public Schools. (2008). *Leadership.* Retrieved September 13, 2008, from http://www.newvisions.org/leadership/downloads/expectations.pdf.

New Leaders for New Schools. (2008). *The program.* Retrieved December 12, 2008, from www.nlns.org.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2006). *North Carolina standards for school administrators.* Retrieved April 15, 2007, from www.dpi.state.nc.nc.us/evalpsemployees/ncstandardsexec.pdf.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2007). *Organization.* Retrieved November 10, 2007, from www.dpi.state.nc.nc.us/evalpsemployees/ncstandardsexec.pdf.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2008). *TPAI-Revised training schedule and training notes.* Retrieved April 3, 2008, from http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/fbs/personnel/evaluation/trnschedule.pdf.

O'Donnell, R. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin 89*(645), 56-71.

Ohio Department of Education. (2008). *Ohio entry year program for principals.* Retrieved September 15, 2008, from http://www.ode.state.oh.us.

Patten, M. (2000). *Understanding research methods.* Los Angeles: Pyrczak Publishing.

Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach, L. (2003). Making sense of leading schools. Washington DC: Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs.

Principals' Partnership. (2008). *The Principals' Partnership.* Retrieved December 17, 2008 from http://www.principalspartnership.com/aboutus.html.

Providence Schools. (2008). *Providence schools corrective action plan.* Retrieved December 23, 2008 from http://www.providenceschools.org/files/pdf.

School Leadership Services. (2008). *Selected current programs.* Retrieved September 18, 2008, from www.schoolleadershipservices.com.

Sutton, B. (1993). The rationale for qualitative research: A review of principles and theoretical foundations. *Library Quarterly*, *63*(4).

Teachscape. (2008). *Classroom walkthough.* Retrieved April 5, 2008, from http://www.teachscape.com/html/ts/nps/classroom_walkthrough.html.

Texas Principal Excellence Program. (2008). *General information.* Retrieved September15, 2008, from http://txpep.org/.

Tuckman, B. (1999). *Conducting educational research.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Union County Public Schools. (2008a). *Crucial conversations.* Retrieved April 2, 2008, from www.ucps.k12.nc.us/workshops/crucialconversations.

Union County Public Schools. (2008b). *Crucial confrontations.* Retrieved April 3, 2008, from www.ucps.k12.nc.us/workshops/crucialconfrontations.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Innovation and Improvement. (2004). *Innovative pathways to school improvement.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

The Wallace Foundation. (2006). Leadership for learning: Making the connections among state, district, and school policies and practices. *A Wallace Perspective*.

West Virginia Center for Professional Development. (2008). *WVCPD programs.* Retrieved September 15, 2008, from http://www.wvcpd.org.

Appendix A

SDEA Participant Survey

SDEA Participant Survey

This survey is a component of a case study examining the perceptions of principals and assistant principals concerning the connection between the Union County Staff Development Expectations for Administrators and preparation to meet the "North Carolina School Executive Standards". The Staff Development Expectations for Administrators refers to the following five components: **TPAI, Teachscape, Facilitative Leadership, Crucial Conversations, and Crucial Confrontations**. In the survey, the Staff Development Expectations for Administrators are referred to as "the program." For each item, please circle the response that most accurately reflects your opinion. Thank you for your participation in this study.

1. In what role do you currently serve?

   PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

2. The program helped to prepare me to be a principal who can implement a school vision, mission, and goals that a learning community can embrace.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

3. The program helped to prepare me to be a principal who can implement a program of instruction that is highly relevant to 21st century learners.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

4. The program helped to prepare me to be a principal who can establish a school culture that promotes student and adult learning.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

5. The program helped to prepare me to be a principal who can establish a system that ensures a high performing staff.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

6. The program helped to prepare me to be a principal who can ensure that work routines in my school building are organized to meet the everyday needs of every classroom.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

7. The program helped to prepare me to be a principal who can implement processes that result in community engagement and support.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

8. The program helped to prepare me to be a principal who can facilitate distributed governance and shared decision-making.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

9. Program activities enhanced my ability to lead a school community toward a set of shared goals.

   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

10. Program activities enhanced my ability to lead 21st century instruction and assessment.

    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

11. Program activities enhanced my ability to lead a culture of student and adult learning.

    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

12. Program activities enhanced my ability to lead the continuous development of staff members.

    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

13. Program activities enhanced my ability to lead the everyday work operations of my school.

    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

14. Program activities enhanced my ability to elicit external community support for my
    School.

    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

15. Program activities enhanced my ability to lead an organization characterized by shared leadership.

    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

16. The program did not prepare me to be a more effective strategic leader.

    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

17. The program did not prepare me to be a more effective instructional leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

18. The program did not prepare me to be a more effective cultural leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

19. The program did not prepare me to be a more effective human resource leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

20. The program did not prepare me to be a more effective managerial leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

21. The program did not prepare me to be a more effective external development leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

22. The program did not prepare me to be a more effective micropolitical leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

23. TPAI-R Training improved my ability to be an instructional leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

24. Crucial Conversations improved my ability to be a visionary leader.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

25. Crucial Confrontations improved my ability to develop and maintain shared values, beliefs, and vision.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

26. Facilitative Leadership improved my ability to ensure that my school is a professional learning community.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

27. Teachscape Training improved my ability to lead staff development efforts in my school.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE NO OPINION

COMMENTS

Appendix B

SDEA Participant Interview Questions

SDEA Participant Interview Questions

-The Staff Development Expectations for Administrators (SDEA) refers to the following five components: Crucial Conversations, Crucial Confrontations, Facilitative Leadership, TPAI Training, and Teachscape.

1. Comment as to why you agree or disagree that SDEA activities helped to prepare you to be a strategic leader.

2. Comment as to why you agree or disagree that SDEA activities helped to prepare you to be an instructional leader.

3. Comment as to why you agree or disagree that SDEA activities helped to prepare you to be a cultural leader.

4. Comment as to why you agree or disagree that SDEA activities helped to prepare you to be a human resource leader.

5. Comment as to why you agree or disagree that SDEA activities helped to prepare you to be a managerial leader.

6. Comment as to why you agree or disagree that SDEA activities helped to prepare you to be an external development leader.

7. Comment as to why you agree or disagree that SDEA activities helped to prepare you to be a micropolitical leader.

8. Do you have any additional comments?