Journal of Scholarship & Practice

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

BROUGHT TO YOU
AS AN AASA MEMBER
SERVICE

Stand Up
FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

Table of Contents

A Message From the Editor

Frederick L. Dembowski
Southeastern Louisiana University

In the first research article, Timothy F. Brown, Stuart H. Swenson, and Karl V. Hertz discuss the development of the Contextual Needs Assessment (CNA), created to assess the relative strengths of the five basic needs identified by William Glasser as major influences in behavior choices. The authors investigate the basic needs of school superintendents by comparing superintendents who have been recognized in their field with a random sample of Illinois superintendents by using the CNA. By assessing these basic needs as self-identified behavior choices, a better understanding of the characteristics of school superintendents may be possible. Recognized superintendents, as regarded by the American Association of School Administrators, were asked to complete the CNA instrument. As a result, characteristics of recognized superintendents were projected. These characteristics were compared to those of randomly selected superintendents from the State of Illinois. The results of this study cause the authors to conclude that recognized superintendents distinguish themselves in terms of Glasser's five basic needs and that those aspiring to become superintendents can profit from an analysis of these results. Significant interactions and differences were found between both groups and among the scores of recognized superintendents.

In the second research article, Carole A. Edmonds, Jerry L. Waddle, Carole H. Murphy, Osman Ozturgut, and Loyce E. Caruthers conducted focus groups with over 200 principals and assistant principals at a summer principals' academy in Missouri for the purpose of discovering what practicing school administrators thought about their preparation program. The questions posed to the focus groups for discussion centered on what they liked and what they disliked about their preparation programs as well as what they would change about their programs. The data gathered from the focus groups were analyzed using qualitative methods and reported out in this article with the idea that the findings could be used to encourage university faculty to address the concerns in making improvements to their educational leadership preparation programs.

In the third research article, Edward P. Cox examines the post-master's academic requirements necessary to receive certification for those aspiring to the superintendency. The University of South Carolina's requirements are met through the completion of a 33-hour program culminating in the educational specialist degree. A follow-up study of recent program graduates solicited feedback regarding academic and career progress and satisfaction with the program. Though the results regarding academic progress and program satisfaction were generally encouraging, concerns regarding connections between theory and practice and program timing were apparent.

In the first article of best practice, Michael Looney examines a program designed to increase student achievement in an Alabama school district. After years of struggling to raise student achievement, and with emboldened district and political leadership, Montgomery Public Schools implemented an Instruction Quality Toolkit in 2004. The toolkit provided a mechanism for teachers

and administrators to informed dialog relating to the intended curriculum and the taught one. What was discovered resulted in dramatic changes in planning, reflective practice, and student achievement.

In the second article of best practice, Rose Mary Newton and Noelle Witherspoon review selected recruitment research. Consistent with the tenets of job choice theory, the findings indicate that job attributes and organizational characteristics are the major factors influencing whether individuals are attracted to and motivated to pursue positions as teachers, principals, and superintendents. The findings have practical implications for organizational recruiters.

In the last article of the issue, Ann K. Nauman provides a review of Patricia Davenport's latest book, *Are We There Yet? Continuing to Close the Achievement Gap.* Nauman highlights the book's central themes and discusses the readability level.

Identifying the Relative Strength of Glasser's Five Basic Needs in School Superintendents

Timothy F. Brown, EdD
Associate Professor
Department of Leadership
Concordia University
River Forest, IL

Stuart H. Swenson, EdD
Clinical Psychologist
Dyer, IN

Karl V. Hertz, EdD
Past President, American Association of
    School Administrators
Retired Superintendent, Mequon-Thiensville
    School District
Thiensville, WI

The role of superintendent of schools has become a hotbed of political focus in recent years. No longer is it sufficient for the designated leader of a school district to be an accomplished educator and respected person. In a climate of high expectations and blame placing, superintendents are expected to be all things to all populations. From adept politicians to visionaries, superintendents are asked to quell the confusion of the here-and-now, while focusing on a future vision of sweeping success for all. Further, school leaders are expected to perform these functions in the context of institutional hierarchies that allow blame for failure to be placed squarely at the doorstep of the superintendent's office. In short, the role of the superintendent is at once complex, difficult, and fraught with potential for failure. The purpose of this article is to examine the personal traits of superintendents recognized by American Association of School Administrators (AASA).

The literature is replete with tracks of superintendents' pay schedules, benefit plans, and retirement enhancements. Some of the more complex literature makes connections between specific behaviors of leaders and the impact of those behaviors on constituents. Block (1993) wrote extensively about the relationships that must exist between leaders and followers for leadership to thrive. Dolan (1994) posited that organizations sustain themselves by the power of the relationships that exist within them. Others, such as Sergiovanni (1992) and, by extrapolation, Palmer (1998), wrote of relationships between leaders and followers melding into one set of followers pursuing a common vision.

In his work on leadership, Glasser (1994) wrote of the importance of building relationships as fundamental to earning respect as a leader. In his concept of lead management, leadership and management merge into

complex behavior sets that emerge from a fundamental relationship of respect and appreciation. Leaders, according to Glasser (1994), come to have influence, not control, over those with whom they work. According to Glasser, all human beings have five basic needs that influence the choices they make to behave in certain ways: Survival, Power, Freedom, Belonging, and Fun (Glasser, 1990). Glasser asserted that the five basic needs are so powerful in influencing behavior choices that all individuals choose behaviors that best attempt to meet their basic needs. The Contextual Needs Assessment (CNA) gives those who complete the instrument feedback concerning their capacity for each of the five basic needs, as well as input into where those needs are typically met (Brown & Swenson, 2005).

The CNA is intended to connect Glasser's Choice Theory with a self-reported assessment of behaviors in school superintendents recognized by AASA. The goal of this study is to give context to behaviors by linking leadership recognition with the basic needs of those leaders. According to Glasser, basic needs are primary drivers of human behavior; therefore the study of those individual needs is critical to understanding behavior choices. If behavior choices made by recognized superintendents characterize their effectiveness as school leaders, it serves researchers well to study the foundation of those choices in an attempt to understand leadership effectiveness.

Design

The authors requested a list of recognized superintendents from the offices of the AASA. The list included the names and addresses of all school superintendents who had received state and national recognition in the year 2002. This recognition established the success of the superintendents studied. The list contained the names of 61 superintendents of schools.

Each superintendent was sent a letter describing the study and inviting the individual to participate in the study. To become part of the study, each recognized superintendent was asked to complete the CNA and return it for scoring. Superintendents were informed of the manner in which they were selected and guaranteed that the data would be considered in the aggregate, not individually. Thirty-one (51%) superintendents complied with the request. The instruments were scored and the data were assembled in the aggregate (See Table 1).

Table 1

CNA Subscale Scores for Recognized Superintendents (N=31)

Subscale

Situation: Survival		Power		Belonging		Fun		Freedom	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Extended Family:									
3.00	2.32	2.29	1.57	6.90	2.66	3.26	2.87	1.52	1.55
At Home:									
3.74	2.38	2.94	1.97	7.42	2.74	4.39	3.26	2.23	2.08
Friends:									
2.90	2.34	2.39	1.99	6.39	2.65	4.94	3.15	2.26	2.25
Work Peers:									
3.58	2.29	5.00	2.52	5.29	2.44	2.77	2.60	2.00	1.79
Work Superiors:									
3.34	2.36	3.58	2.79	3.26	2.56	1.06	1.59	1.35	1.96
Work Subordinates:									
3.26	2.05	5.29	3.00	5.52	2.67	1.94	2.00	1.32	1.89
Social Strangers:									
3.26	1.95	1.77	2.04	3.77	2.91	1.65	2.35	1.32	1.60
Strangers:									
3.48	1.71	3.42	3.09	3.94	2.58	1.16	1.63	1.81	1.99

To establish a control group, a stratified random sample of superintendents in the State of Illinois was compiled. These superintendents were also asked to take part in the study by completing the CNA. Of the 195 superintendents sampled, 87 (45%) responded.

These data were used as a basis of comparison to the superintendents identified as "recognized." A 5 x 8 x 2 (CNA Scale x Situations within Scales x Superintendent Type) design was used to test the hypothesis. (See Table 2).

Table 2

CNA Score Means for Random and Recognized Superintendents

	Random Superintendents		Recognized Superintendents	
	M	SD	M	SD
Survival	2.89	2.16	3.32***	2.17
Power	2.14	2.16	3.33***	2.67
Belonging	4.61	2.92	5.31***	2.99
Fun	2.75	2.84	2.65	2.82
Freedom	1.05	1.65	1.73***	1.94

***$\underline{P} < .001$, two-tailed

Results

For Superintendent Group Comparisons, a 5 x 8 x 2 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), with repeated measures on Scale (5) and Situation (8) was conducted. A significant main effect was found on Scale, df = 4, F = 109.78, p< .001, sphericity assumed, Situation, df = 7, F = 48.075, P< .001, sphericity assumed, and Superintendent type, df = 1, F = 4.3, P< .04. The p values were highly significant for Situation and Scale in three contexts: sphericity assumed, Greenhous-Geiser, and Huynh-Felt. Score x Superintendent Type interaction was significant, df = 4, F = 3.697, p< .006, sphericity assumed, and maintained that significance in Greenhous-Geiser and Huynh-

Felt contexts. Situation x Superintendent type interaction was also significant, but not meaningful in the context of this report. Situation x Scale x Superintendent interaction was not significant, df = 28, F = 1.336, p< .112.

Post-hoc analysis of Scale x Superintendent means, relying on t-tests, showed recognized superintendents scoring significantly higher than random superintendent on all scales but Fun.

Intra-Group Analysis of Recognized Superintendents

Each subscale has a maximum score of 10. The responses show the strongest need of recognized superintendents is Belonging (See

Table 1).The mean Belonging Score (M=5.31, SD=2.12) was higher than the next highest score, Power (M=3.32, SD=1.73), t (30) = 5.23, p < .001. However, the data strongly show the need for Belonging as a factor of context.

The Belonging mean score analysis shows a significant interaction among the scores, F (7, 240) = 10.46, p < .001. The recognized superintendents tend to focus their Belonging needs on relationships with extended and immediate families (M=6.90, SD=2.66 and M=7.42, SD=2.94, respectively) and with friends outside the workplace (M=6.39, SD=2.65) rather than the work environment, namely relationships with superiors (M=3.26, SD=2.56), with social strangers (M=3.77, SD=2.91), and with strangers in the work environment (M=3.94, SD=2.58).

The second strongest mean raw score for recognized superintendents is in the area of Power in which a significant interaction among the scores is shown, F (7, 240) = 8.452, p < .001. While Power ranked a distant second to the need for Belonging, the behaviors demonstrating Power were more compartmentalized than those for Belonging. It is in working with subordinates (M = 5.29, SD = 3.00) and peers (M = 5.00, SD = 2.52) that recognized superintendents are most likely to demonstrate behaviors that are identified with Power. A distant third in the locus for demonstrating Power behaviors is at work with superiors (M = 3.58, SD = 2.79) and strangers at work (M = 3.42, SD = 3.09). Recognized superintendents evidence lower Power behaviors when they are with extended family (M = 2.29, SD = 1.57), at home (M = 2.94, SD = 1.97), with friends (M = 2.39, SD = 1.99), or with strangers in social situations (M = 1.77, SD = 2.04.

Recognized superintendents' need for Power equals their need for Survival (M = 3.32, SD = 1.73). Almost identical in strength with

their need for Power (t (30) = .061, p > .05), the need to survive is different in terms of the locus of Survival need-satisfying behaviors. No matter where the behaviors are demonstrated, Survival needs among outstanding superintendents remain constant. No significant interaction was found between subscale scores on the Survival scale, F(7, 240) = .515, p<.822 (See Table 1).

The fourth highest need capacity among recognized superintendents is the need for Fun (M = 2.65, SD = 1.91). This need is less than the need for Power and Survival F (7,240) = 10.47, p < .001. The locus of Fun need satisfying behavior is limited to outside the workplace, namely with extended family (M = 3.26, SD = 2.87), in the home (M = 4.94, SD = 3.15) and with friends (M = 4.94, SD = 3.15; (See Table 1).

Finally, recognized superintendents demonstrate the lowest capacity in their need for Freedom, with Freedom (M=1.73, SD =1.6) falling below Fun, t (30) = 2.922, p<.007. The Freedom subscales failed to show significant interaction (F (7, 240) = 1.376, p<.216), demonstrating the generally low need for freedom in all measured areas (See Table 1).

Discussion

The superintendents studied are members of a group who are recognized by AASA. Only those who were recognized by their professional organization at the state or national level were considered for the study. Therefore, the need profile for this group may well speak to the behaviors they have chosen that make them appealing to their professional peers. The fact that the recognized group scored significantly higher than the randomly chosen group is consistent with Glasser's notion that people actively choose activities in order to satisfy needs and that needs and ways of satisfying needs vary with individuals. It appears that recognized superintendents view

themselves as being open and sensitive to a broader range of options, excluding behaviors related to Fun. Aside from that, the two groups conform to roughly the same profile. In the interests of space, we have focused on the dynamics of the recognized group.

Belonging

The need for Belonging, which distinguishes this group, is the same need that encourages behaviors that are nurturing to the institution. Leaders who demonstrate high Belonging needs are well received by various populations for being likeable and supportive of the needs of others. Well-developed political skills are an important dimension in the behaviors of superintendents who were recognized by AASA. Further, skills at supporting and nurturing others, especially peers and subordinates at work, are important for successful superintendents. The behavior strengths that serve to meet the needs of the school leader match well to the needs of those individuals working within the school district. However, as Block (1993) cautioned, there is a downside to this scenario that may not be apparent at first review.

Individuals in leadership positions with strong Belonging needs may exhibit behaviors that are paternalistic and patronizing to individuals within the institution. Block cautioned that such behaviors run the risk of demeaning the power of subordinates by encouraging them to become dependent upon the leader for protection, direction, and livelihood. Without recognizing this phenomenon as debilitating to the organization, leaders, and subordinates alike succumb to the tempting comfort of paternalistic relationships that feel good to both parent and child.

Superintendents should be caring individuals who are passionate about carrying out a mission of nurture and support for the students in their charge. They should be

individuals with a strong commitment to the well being of others and a firm sensitivity to the wishes of the community in which they work. The recognized superintendents have the need profile to make these behavior choices. However, this group also has a profile that can serve to diminish, rather than encourage, growth and leadership in their organizations. By allowing their Belonging need satisfying behaviors to be paternalistic, they run the risk of limiting the leadership and creativity extant in those they supervise, thereby creating an organization that is limited in its potential to succeed long-term.

Power

The need for Power among recognized superintendents should not be surprising. Power behaviors are critical to the successful management of any organization. The planning, organizing, growth, maintenance, evaluation, and change that are critical to the success of any organization require power-type behaviors in its leadership team. Recognized superintendents subordinate their Power needs to their Belonging needs. They want to organize and supervise and grow and change their organizations, but all of those activities must be balanced by a strong need to do so in a caring, empathetic, supportive manner.

Survival

The rank order of Survival needs in recognized superintendents is virtually tied with that of Power needs. The connection between the need to have control and the need for self-preservation helps superintendents appreciate the need for political savvy. Recognized superintendents choose behaviors that are safe and acceptable. They are sensitive to their communities as well as to the needs of individuals within their organizations. They are climate testers who go about their work with an eye to their own security and a commitment to leading in a manner that is sensitive to all stakeholders in their organization.

The behavior choices of survival conscious leaders are critical to their success. They are individuals who are predictable in their decisions and inclusive in the processes they use for decision making. They are individuals with firm commitments to their communities and to those individuals who work within their organizations. They are individuals who make a commitment to live and work in the community they serve for an extended period of time and form close bonds of social and working relationships within that community.

Fun

While the need for Fun is frequently supported by the need for Belonging, the superintendents studied do an effective job of compartmentalizing fun satisfying behaviors. By focusing fun behaviors with friends, immediate family, and extended family, superintendents present much more stayed and structured to their superiors and subordinates at work. They report behaviors that are more formal and distant in relationship to strangers, wherever they meet them.

The effectiveness of this compartmentalization is important to the success of recognized leaders and reflects the process of creating and maintaining boundaries that lead to stability and engender functional relationship building. These behaviors coincide with the need for Survival and help explain recognized superintendents' success at achieving control in the public venue.

Freedom

Leaders who are expected to function in such a public venue as the community schools do not present high needs for Freedom. The nature of the position of superintendent of schools is extremely public, highly scrutinized, and time demanding. Individuals with high Freedom

needs would be unwilling to abide by the schedule necessary for success in this position. Further, high Freedom needs individuals would be unwilling to accept the public scrutiny and lack of privacy inherent in the job. For the successful superintendent of schools, Fun and Freedom clearly are behaviors that have to be tempered by the demands for the position and the public scrutiny that is relentless and omnipresent.

Summary of Findings

Glasser's Choice Theory gives the student of behavior valuable insights into the choices of individuals and groups. By focusing on a group of school superintendents recognized by the AASA, the authors were able to connect a theory of human behavior with the self-reported behaviors of recognized leaders. While recognized and random superintendents demonstrate similar profiles, recognized school leaders demonstrate stronger need profiles in the areas of survival, power, belonging, and freedom. These differences may be indicative of more sensitivity and self-reflection on the part of recognized superintendents. They may be more aware of their behavior choices and the impact those choices have on others. They may be leaders who see all behavior as somehow related to their responsibility to lead by example. The researchers conclude that the combination of needs extant in the group of recognized leaders accounts for their success and warrants more study.

Additional research efforts should focus on comparisons between school leaders and business leaders in other public and private sectors. By comparing recognized superintendents with outstanding chief executive officers of public and private institutions, valuable insight could be gained into the differences and effectiveness of the institutions they lead.

Author Biographies

Timothy Brown is an associate professor of leadership at Concordia University, Chicago. Prior to his work at the university, he held a variety of public school administrative positions for over 25 years. During that time he served as high school principal, associate superintendent of schools and superintendent of schools.

Stuart Swenson is a psychologist in private practice. In educational settings, he served as a teacher, school psychologist and administrator in student services and program assessment. In clinical settings he has served as the psychologist on a hospital medical staff.

Karl Hertz is a retired superintendent of the Mequon-Thiensville (WI) School District. He is a past president of the American Association of School Administrators. Currently he consults in school matters while serving as president of the village of Thiensville,

References

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Brown, T., & Swenson, S. (2005). Identifying Basic Needs: The Contextual Needs Assessment. *Journal of Reality Therapy*, 24 (2), 7-10.

Dolan, W. P. (1994). *Restructuring Our Schools*. Leawood, KS: Systems & Organization.

Glasser, W. & Dotson, K. (1986). *Choice theory in the Classroom.* New York: HarperCollins.

Glasser, W. (1990). *Choice Theory.* New York: Harper & Row.

Glasser, W. (1994). *The Control Theory Manager*. New York: HarperCollins.

Glasser, W., & Glasser, C. (1999). *The Language of Choice Theory*. New York: HarperCollins.

Palmer, P. (1998). *The Courage to Teach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral Leadership*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leading the Learning: What Missouri Principals Say About Their Preparation Programs

Carole A. Edmonds, EdD
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
Northwest Missouri State University
Maryville, MO

Jerry L. Waddle, EdD
Associate Professor
Educational Administration and Counseling
Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, MO

Carole H. Murphy, PhD
Associate Professor and Chair
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
University of Missouri, St. Louis
St. Louis, MO

Osman Ozturgut, PhD
Doctoral Research Assistant
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
University of Missouri, St. Louis
St. Louis, MO

Loyce E. Caruthers, PhD
Assistant Professor
Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in
    Education
University of Missouri, Kansas City
Kansas City, MO

Introduction

Two reports have recently been published that are critical of higher education and its preparation of school leaders. One of these reports entitled "Educating School Leaders" by Arthur Levine (2005) offered a 9-point template for judging the quality of school leadership programs. The other by Hess and Kelly (2005) entitled "Learning to Lead? What Gets Taught in Principal Preparation Programs" examined the content of instruction through syllabi and textbooks. Conclusions from these reports support the idea that leadership preparation programs need to be more receptive to the concerns of students regarding the delivery and content of these program.

In an attempt to get at the root of what needs to be done in preparation programs in

Missouri, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Satellite Leadership Academy (Academy) joined hands with four representatives from institutions of higher education in Missouri to canvass principals on their opinions. This research is an attempt to determine what graduates of principal preparation programs in Missouri think of their programs and compare those findings with those of Levine, Hess, and Kelly.

History of the Leadership Academy

The Academy was started in 1985 and was based on the work of Roland Barth. The mission of the Academy is to positively impact student performance by inspiring and developing highly effective school leaders. In July 2005, the Academy began its twenty-first year of existence. The vision of the

Academy is to collaboratively create opportunities for members of the educational communities to seek high levels of learning and performance for all.

The Academy is a statewide, year-long program where administrators meet a minimum of 18 days per year. Regional meetings are held throughout the year at each of the nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC). Approximately 200 participants come together four times a year in statewide meetings to share experiences and participate in learning communities.

Data Gathering

At the June state-wide meeting of the 2005 Academy at the Lake of the Ozarks, higher education faculty from four Missouri universities collected data from the Academy participants about their perceptions of their preparation programs. The Levine (2005) and Hess and Kelly (2005) reports were used as a basis for the discussion. Participants were divided into two groups: aspiring principals and

practicing principals. Practicing principals included assistant principals as well as currently serving principals. Three questions were posed to the approximately 200 participants.

The questions were:

1. What are some of the things you liked about the classes you have taken in your principal preparation program?
2. What are some of the things you disliked about the classes you have taken in your principal preparation program?
3. If you could change one thing about your principal preparation program, what would it be?

Participants were asked to work in focus groups, posting their responses on chart paper. A general discussion followed with all groups reporting out to the whole group. Table 1 summarizes their responses:

Table 1

Participant Responses to Principal Preparation Program Questions

	ASPIRING PRINCIPALS	PRACTICING PRINCIPALS
Likes	Knowledgeable and experienced instructors and effective interactive instruction	Collaboration in small groups with classmates and cohort model
	Networking opportunities	Practical direct application
	Practical applications	Professional with recent experiences taught the classes (practical knowledge, expertise)
	Useful content	Flexibility (class schedules, course offering, and time)
	Course offering flexibility	Networking opportunities
Dislikes	Too much theory with too little application	Irrelevant content
	Irrelevant content	Too much theory, not enough practical application
	Unqualified professors	Professor being out of touch
		Time commitment
		Cost
		Easy admission
What would you change?	Internships (hands-on experience)	Hands on experience/internships
	Mentoring (first year)	Networking
	Course content (for specific areas)	Flexible scheduling
	Balance between theory and practice	Up-to-date information
	Training on evaluation and coaching	Collaboration with local school districts
		Relevant curriculum and content

As indicated in Table 1, when evaluating what they liked about their own university preparation programs, respondents centered on the value of knowledgeable professors (current and/or former practitioners) who provide practical application. They also emphasized appreciation for universities offering flexible class schedules. Another positive response was the ability to network with their classmates and work in small group settings.

When asked to list dislikes about their own university preparation programs, respondents centered on irrelevant content that contained too much theory and was not linked to practice. Respondents also were of the opinion that faculty were unqualified if they did not have public school experience. In addition, they expressed that standards were too low, costs were too high, and the time commitment too great. The statement that admission standards were too low agreed with the Levine report. Levine (2005) states that even at the more selective education schools, admissions standards for school leadership programs tended to be lower than the standards for many other professional programs.

When evaluating how they would change their preparation programs, the responses mirrored the dislikes. If given the chance, they would incorporate more hands-on internships, more relevant curriculum, and a balance between theory and practice. They also recommended more mentoring and more information on evaluation and coaching. Brown (2005) is of the opinion that it should be the responsibility of successful principals to mentor newer colleagues and "to offer them the support and assistance they need to be successful" (p. 24).

Narrative Data

After reviewing comments from participants in the 2005 Academy, it was decided to ask certain groups of participants in the class of 2006 about their perceptions of their own university preparation programs. Participants were asked to write a narrative about their perceptions of their preparation programs.

Again, participants were asked to comment on their likes, dislikes, and how they would change their programs to best meet their own needs. Fifty participants from four geographic areas in Missouri responded. The areas were Southeast Missouri, Northwest Missouri, Kansas City, and St. Louis. Below are some of the participants' comments about their preparation programs and what the experts had to say about the topic.

One student commented that he had graduated from a master's degree program in 1999 in which initial certification was included in the program. In his first five core classes, all the materials were the same. The textbooks were (in his opinion) outdated, and the professor's notes yellow with age. Norton (2002) addressed this issue when he wrote:

> The need for high-quality curriculum materials and performance assessments that align with adopted standards and frameworks is urgent. Developing materials to support an integrated, problem based curriculum that emphasizes what school leaders need to know and be able to do to change the school culture, provide professional development that helps teachers adopt more effective instructional practices, and build collaborative leadership teams is very different from constructing teaching plans and materials for the textbook-driven program offered in many universities (p.19).

Furthermore, "if university leadership programs expect to prosper in education's high stakes environment, they have to convince skeptical

school systems that they can produce graduates who can lead schools to greater levels of achievement" (Norton, 2002, p. 6).

One student expressed his discontent by saying that he would have liked to see more use of case studies and commented that he "felt like I had more training in the nuts & bolts of administration." Most students were of the opinion that "there wasn't really a life-changing event" and "the only thing that changed from class to class was the name of the course." Therefore, "Educational Leadership program gets a grade of C-!" This dissatisfaction is mostly because the "majority of the classes were designed in a lecture format with limited group activities and interaction with other classmates was not common practice" and "current practices supported by current research and laced with real examples are more helpful."

In terms of the quality of the professors most students expressed that "the professors were using the same information they used 15, 20, or 30 years ago. For some students, "professors who allowed time for make-up and family situations" and "advisors who planned your schedule for completion" were needed in the principal preparation programs. One student said he had to do his internship with his current principal and he didn't feel like his university advisor stayed in close contact with his principal to ensure his experience was beneficial.

On the other hand, many students expressed that their preparation programs were meeting their needs and that they were getting the training necessary to fulfill their responsibilities as first year principals. Some of their positive comments included:

"I feel that the classes that I had were relevant to the issues my school and all schools face today. I cannot think of

one class that did not provide me with new insights into the educational process."

"Great experience with graduate work. Hands-on learning, group discussions, relevant learning to today's schools."

"The cohort group was a neat experience. It really taught me how to work with a diverse group of people, all with different wants and needs."

"Real administrators currently in the job were excellent professors."

"The program I went through to obtain my degree blended itself well to a person with a full-time employment and family obligations."

Conclusions

Through analysis of the focus group responses and the narratives, the researchers were able to hear the voices of more than 200 practicing and aspiring principals. Based on the responses of this research, the university preparation programs in Missouri must provide faculty who are up to date with their knowledge and course content and who provide a good balance between theory and practice. Preparation programs that have sufficient opportunities for networking and a good deal of flexibility in the scheduling of courses must be provided. Curriculum that is not redundant from one course to another must also be provided and there must be hands-on meaningful internship experiences that are well coordinated between the university and the local school where the intern is working. In addition, there was a good deal of sentiment for increasing the requirements for admission to the leadership preparation programs.

The needs of Missouri principals are representative of the needs of principals

throughout the United States as indicated by the literature. Now it is up to the universities to join hands with state departments, professional organizations, and school leaders to make the changes necessary to provide relevant preparation programs and meaningful professional development for educational leaders.

Author Biographies

Carole Edmonds served as a teacher and administrator in the pubic schools of Missouri for 23 years. She also served as director of the Horace Mann Laboratory School on the campus of Northwest Missouri State University for seven years. She currently serves as director of field experiences in the College of Education and assistant professor in educational leadership at Northwest Missouri State University.

Jerry Waddle is a thirty-one year veteran of the Missouri public school system where he served as a science teacher, principal and 19 years as superintendent. He is currently an associate professor of educational leadership at Southeast Missouri State University and serves as coordinator for the cooperative doctor of education degree program with the University of Missouri at Columbia, MO. His primary research interests are school improvement and professional development.

Carole Murphy is a twenty-year veteran of the Texas public school system where she has served in a variety of teaching and administrative positions. In addition, she has worked as an administrator in the American International School of Johannesburg, South Africa. For the past seven years, she has been the chair of the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and holds the rank of associate professor with tenure at the University of Missouri at St. Louis.

Osman Özturgut has just completed his PhD in educational leadership and policy studies at the University of Missouri, St. Louis. His research interests include comparative and international education, multicultural education, and organizational leadership. Dr. Özturgut is an expert in the area of Sino and U.S. education, program development, and project management.

Loyce Caruthers is an assistant professor in Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education at the University of Missouri in Kansas City, MO where she teaches in the education administration program. Dr. Caruthers has over 25 years of experience in urban schools and writes extensively in the areas of professional development, reculturing schools, and the education of poor and disenfranchised students.

References

Brown, F. (2005). Leveling the playing field for new principals. *Principal, 84*(5), 22-24.

Hess, F. M. & Kelly A. P. (2005). *Learning to lead? What gets taught in principal preparation programs.* American Enterprise Institute PEPG 05-02. Washington, D. C.

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

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders: Executive summary*. The Education School Project. Washington, D. C.

Norton, J. (2002). *Southern Regional Education Board Leadership Newsletter*. Preparing school leaders: It's time to face the facts. Retrieved from http://www.sreb.org/main/Leadership/pubs/Leadership_newsletter_F2002.pdf

Assessing the Relevance of the Educational Specialist Program

Edward P. Cox, EdD
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership and Policies
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC

Introduction of Problem and Context

In most states, those aspiring to become superintendents must satisfy a series of post-master's degree academic requirements to receive the necessary certification. At the University of South Carolina, these academic requirements can be met through the completion of a 33 credit hour program culminating in an educational specialist's degree. The Educational Specialist degree can be a terminal degree or be embedded in the PhD program. No culminating paper, comprehensive final, or residency is required to complete the Educational Specialist degree and receive the corresponding superintendent level certification.

Specialist level classes are generally taught by the three full-time tenure track professors in the K-12 program area of the Educational Leadership and Policies Department. Part-time and full-time clinical faculties are periodically utilized to teach specific classes. Each student is assigned an advisor from the tenure track group to provide program guidance. Upon completion of the program, the department recommends to the state department of education that the superintendent's certificate be issued.

Keeping the program relevant in the eyes of the students is an ongoing challenge. State and local demands for accountability and the development of national performance standards have resulted in a reexamination of the role of the superintendent and superintendent preparation programs. Job responsibilities are changing, expectations are increasing, and the number of qualified applicants is declining (Fusarelli, 2003). A common set of standards is gradually emerging as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards become embedded into state certification requirements and university preparation programs.

The educational landscape is changing. Some argue that so much has changed that substantial reform of educational leadership preparation programs is warranted. Others contend ongoing assessment coupled with more modest, targeted changes in select program components are required. All agree that university preparation programs must be diligent in assessing the relevancy of their programs or risk being labeled as "dated" by students and/or discarded by state agencies.

How can those involved in superintendent preparation programs measure the program's relevance? Multiple measures are warranted but one rather accessible measure, student feedback, can provide an early indication of problems.

How has the specialist's degree impacted graduates' academic and professional careers? How satisfied are they with the program and its core courses? Do graduates see

the relevancy of educational leadership program standards in their work? These questions were addressed in a survey of the recent graduates of the educational specialist program at the University of South Carolina.

Relevancy of Preparation Debated

Recent highly publicized reports have been particularly critical of educational leadership preparation programs. The Education Schools Project Report, "Educating School Leaders," surveyed college deans, school leaders, and gathered case study data from 28 universities before concluding that a major overhaul of doctoral level programs is needed (Levine, 2005). The Southern Regional Educational Board concluded after its review of the research that major reform of master's level principal preparation programs is also required (Bottoms, 2001).

Others from academia have been more targeted in their criticism focusing on specific societal issues. Tilman (2001) noted the need to rethink what and how we teach in preparation programs as a result of the changing demographics in our public schools. Goodlad (2004) pointed to the lack of sustained inquiry regarding the relationship of schools and democracy.

Relevancy is an ongoing concern. Fusarelli (2001) has recently focused on the continuing problem of making research relevant to practice. Practitioners have also been critical of aspects of preparation programs. The absence of data-driven decision making courses and lack of practical applications in statistics classes has been noted (Creighton, 2001). Others have pointed to the limited attention given to some of the most critical superintendent tasks, namely, managing the relationship with the school board and communicating with parents (Kaufhold, 2003).

Fusarelli (2001) has looked at the issue in depth and does not concur with the calls for radical reform. He notes that throughout the 1990's many universities reformed their preparation programs placing greater emphasis on instructional issues, university school collaboration, effective internship experiences, and problem-based learning activities. Upcoming studies including one from the Carnegie Foundation will further address the issue.

Methodology

To conduct the research, a list of names and addresses of all University of South Carolina educational specialist graduates from the fall of 1999 through the fall of 2004 was assembled. A list of questions was developed, then critiqued by university colleagues with expertise in survey design. Following editing and revision, the survey was mailed to the graduates.

The survey included four sections. Section I sought information regarding the graduates academic and career progress since completion of the specialist program. The next two sections asked about graduate satisfaction with aspects of the program (Section II) and each of the required core courses (Section III). Section IV solicited feedback regarding graduate satisfaction with the ISLLC leadership standards embedded in the program. Space was also provided for open-ended comments. Thirty-nine of fifty-six surveys (70 %) were returned.

An Analysis of Variance between Groups (ANOVA) test was used to indicate there was variation in the responses. Individual t-tests were used to identify individual items whose mean scores were different than the others. All tests of significance were at .05 significance level. A separate spreadsheet was created to categorize the open-ended responses.

The researcher reviewed the comments seeking common phrases, patterns, and repetition of words. All the returned surveys contained sufficient responses to warrant inclusion in the analysis.

Academic and Career Progress

Slightly over half of the graduates (52%) had changed positions since completing the specialist degree. Forty percent had changed jobs within the first year of receiving the degree. The most common move was from assistant principal to principal. Thirty-three percent of the graduates who changed positions moved to the principalship, 20% to an assistant superintendent position, 20% to other district level positions, 20% to an assistant principal position, and 7% had left the field. They all had gained the necessary certification, but none of the responding graduates had moved into the superintendency.

A majority of respondents also indicated progress in their academic careers after receiving the specialist degree. Eighty-five percent had initiated work in a PhD program, all in educational leadership. The majority (62%) was currently enrolled in the PhD program, but a substantial number of students (23%) had completed their doctorate. Considering the survey included the most recent five years (1999-2004), the number of students who had already completed the doctorate was impressive.

Evaluation of Program and Required Courses

The second section of the survey sought feedback regarding graduates' satisfaction with the overall program, particularly its relevancy to their current work. Table I summarizes the results for those questions.

Table 1

Graduate Satisfaction with Program

Question	Mean Score
I am glad I pursued a Specialist Degree.	3.88
I had a clear picture of how I would use the degree.	3.70
I would recommend this degree to other educational leaders.	3.70
The practicum provided the necessary skills.	3.30
The program applied theory to workplace situations.	3.30
The coursework prepared me for my current position.	3.08*

*P<.05   1- no satisfaction   4-complete satisfaction

The three questions, which sought feedback regarding general satisfaction, ranked the highest with perhaps the most general question receiving the highest ranking. Students were very pleased that they completed the program (3.88), knew how they would use it (3.70), and would recommend it to others (3.70). The three questions concerning application and relevancy of skills to their current job were rated lower. Questions regarding the clinical experience (3.30), application of theory (3.30), and relevance to current assignment (3.08) were viewed less favorably. The mean score for the final question in this section regarding relevance to current position produced a significantly lower score.

The questions regarding graduate satisfaction with the required core courses in the Educational Specialist Program are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Graduate Satisfaction with Required Core Classes

Course	Mean Score
The Superintendent in Practice	3.68
Superintendency	3.67
Advanced Instructional Supervision	3.65
Educational Policy	3.65
School Business Planning	3.61
Educational Finance	3.14*

*P<.05   1- no satisfaction   4-complete satisfaction

Regardless of the course, students were generally satisfied with the required core courses. Except for the finance class which received a substantially lower rating, graduates did not differentiate satisfaction levels among the required classes.

Relevance of Standards

The next section of the survey asked the graduates to rate their level of satisfaction with the ISLLC district level standards imbedded in the educational specialist program. Table 3 summarizes those results.

Table 3

Satisfaction with Embedded ISLLC Standards

Standard	Mean Score
Understanding the larger context	3.72*
Acting with integrity	3.44
School Culture	3.41
Organizing Management Activities	3.41
Educational Vision	3.15
Collaboration and Communication	3.15

*P<.05   1- no satisfaction   4-complete satisfaction

Regardless of the standard, students were generally satisfied that the standards embedded in the program were appropriate for an educational specialist program. One standard, understanding the larger context, had a significantly higher mean than the other questions. Two of the standards, vision (3.14) and communication and collaboration (3.13) were rated somewhat lower than the other standards indicating students were less satisfied with the way these standards were being covered in the program.

The open-ended questions asked for recommendations regarding program improvements. Two themes emerged in the comment section. First, the desire for convenience in the delivery of coursework was noted on 12 surveys. More online courses, more frequent offerings of each course, and many graduates recommended more work-friendly scheduling hours. The failure to consistently link theory to practice was noted on eight surveys. Both strands of concern, however, involved a clear minority of respondents.

Conclusions

Soliciting graduate feedback regarding program satisfaction and relevance of the academic experience is an important component of a comprehensive program assessment. It is particularly important for programs like educational leadership, which are receiving significant scrutiny and criticism. Authentic feedback requires going beyond questions of general satisfaction into specific issues of relevance, individual course assessment, appropriateness of the standards, and synchronization of program with academic and career development.

The results of this survey, at least on the surface level, are encouraging. They are also consistent with other recent surveys of practicing superintendents, which indicate that they are generally pleased with their preparation programs (Glass, 2001). Whether evaluated by academic or career progress, total program, individual course, or satisfaction with embedded standards, the feedback did not identify significant discontent among recent graduates regarding the relevancy of the program. Within the generally positive results though are lingering concerns that need to be addressed.

Two issues identified by Cooper (2002) in his analysis seem relevant to a discussion of these results. First, issues regarding connecting theory to practice continue to be an area of concern for recent graduates. Those items focusing on relevancy issues were typically rated lower by respondents. The fact that this concern continues to surface, even after a department wide emphasis on practicum experiences, problem-based learning, and case study methodology indicates that additional effort is needed to close the gap between theory and practice. Other very recent changes, not experienced by respondents may help. The most recent hires in the department, both tenure track and clinical, all have extensive school district experience. Specialist level internship experiences have been updated and site based supervisor support has been increased. Specialist level cohorts have been initiated. Perhaps, over time these additional changes may reduce the concerns of some graduates regarding the gap between theory and practice.

Second, the timing of educational specialist level preparation programs is not synchronized with the assumption of the superintendency. The gap between training and job assumption raises additional questions regarding admission, relevancy of course content, and certificate requirements. None of the respondents had assumed the superintendency since obtaining the specialist

degree. While career progress was apparent, ascending to the superintendency occurs long after certification. Those preparing leaders must be particularly cognizant of the gap between superintendent preparation and job assumption and continually project their content and methodology forward. Future tense thinking by faculty takes on added significance. The knowledge base for educational leadership is rapidly expanding. Skills can get stale and curriculum emphasis can become obsolete before job assumption. Cooper (2001) makes a strong case for life-long learning initiatives and required university based continuing education units for superintendents. Minimally, a refresher course linking the superintendent's

preparation program to job assumption seems warranted in South Carolina.

Fusarelli (2001) noted that incremental reform of educational leadership programs has been occurring for several years. That is indeed the case for the program under discussion here. Survey feedback supports continuation of this incremental approach to development of the educational specialist program. As one respondent indicated, "a solid university reputation and the right mix of theory and practice in the program can take a person a long way." Finding that right mix and connecting content and skills to job assumption continues to be a challenge.

Author Biography

Edward Cox is a former Illinois superintendent and is currently an assistant professor at the University of South Carolina. His most recent publications concerned superintendent contracts in *ERS Spectrum* and principal preparation standards in *Connections: Journal of Principal Preparation and Standards*. He is an active member of the South Carolina Association of School Administrator, the American Association of School Administrators, and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.

References

Bottoms, G., & O'Neil, K. (2001). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Educational Board.

Cooper, B., Fusarelli, D., Jackson, B., & Poster, J. (2002). Superintendent's preparation, an oxymoron? Analyzing changes in programs, certification and control. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *3*, 242-255.

Creighton, J. (2001). Analysis in administrators' hands: An oxymoron. *School Administrator*, *58*(4), 16-17.

Creighton, T., MacNeil, A., Busch, S., & Waxman, H. (2005). Establishing the knowledge base to narrow the disconnect existing between university education administration preparation programs and practicing school leaders. *Education Leadership Review*, *6*(1), 1-8.

Fusarelli, L. (2001). Administrator preparation programs: Reforming again, again, and again. *UCEA Review*, *62*(1), 12-15.

Fusarelli, L., Cooper, B., & Corella, V. (2003). Who will serve? An analysis of superintendent occupational perception, career satisfaction and mobility. *Journal of School Leadership*, *13*(2), 304-326.

Glass, T., Bjork, L., Brumer, C. (2001). *The Study of the American Superintendency 2000*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Goodlad, J. I. (2004). Success for all children: Implications for leadership preparation programs *UCEA Review*, *62*(1), 10-12.

Kaufhold, J. (2003). Lessons not taught in superintendent school. *School Administrato*r, *60*(5), 36-27.

Tillman, L. D. (2001). *Educating school leaders*. Education School Project. Retrieved August 5, 2005, from http://www.edschools.org.

Employing Data to Measure Effective Instruction

Michael Looney, EdS
Superintendent
Butler County School District
Greenville, AL

The national push for educational accountability has focused attention on the need for effective teachers and high-quality instruction. The problem is that even among certified teachers, the meaning of "high-quality instruction" often varies significantly from one teacher to the next, and one school to the next.

Furthermore, several authors (Marzano, 2003; Porter & Smithson, 2001) state that educators must deal with many versions of their curricula: the intended curriculum, which is content officially designated for a course or grade level; the implemented curriculum, the content actually delivered; the assessed curriculum, the content of high-stakes tests; and the attained curriculum or the content students actually learn.

Obviously, a lack of alignment between the intended curriculum and the assessed curriculum is a source of trouble, so states and districts expend a great deal of effort linking their official curricula to established standards or assessments. What is not so obvious is the potential discrepancy between the intended curriculum and the implemented curriculum. In fact, many people are surprised that there could be a difference (Marzano, 2003).

In my former position as assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction at Montgomery Public Schools (MPS) in Alabama, one of the district's goals was to improve student achievement. This article recounts the author's past experiences while instituting new measures and data-based professional development for 13 schools that failed to meet adequate yearly progress requirements in the 2002-03 school year.

Assessment Data

MPS enrolls approximately 33,000 students across 61 schools and, like other urban districts, its size generates reams of data. In order to understand how students were progressing, the district used assessments such as the State Technical Assistance Resources (STAR) reading evaluation from Renaissance Learning for grades 1 through 12 and the Alabama Reading and Math Test, and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) for grades K-6 The tests helped to indicate areas of weaknesses. For example, the Fall 2003 DIBELS assessment indicated that about only 36 % of assessed elementary students were reading at grade level.

However, as Shavelson, Webb, and Burstein (1986) point out, large-scale assessments such as state evaluations do not provide valid measures of teacher effectiveness. Not only are large-scale tests

poorly aligned with the specific curricular goals of any one district, but they also are not informed or derived from a teacher's ongoing weekly and monthly efforts (Schmoker, 1996). Therefore they do not provide the information that individual teachers need in order to assess and possibly modify their instructional strategies (Popham, 2005).

So while the assessments indicated a need for intervention, there was no way to know what type of intervention would be effective. Exactly where was the learning breakdown occurring? Was the cause indeed a disparity between the set curriculum and the instruction teachers delivered? MPS needed clear, objective data to guide instructional decisions or else student performance would remain inconsistent, and students would never learn as well as they might (Carr & Harris, 2001).

Measuring Instructional Quality

In January 2004, MPS implemented a new program, called the Instructional Quality Toolkit (IQT), to measure and improve the quality of both learning *and* teaching in our classrooms. As Shavelson, Webb, and Burstein (1986) assert, the primary basis for judging teacher effectiveness is evaluating actions that affect the accomplishment of academic work.

Due to budgetary and time constraints, only the 13 schools already mentioned used the IQT. Since they had failed to make adequate yearly progress, the district decided that those schools were most in need of help.

Multiple data sources optimize the credibility of results (Gold, 2005) and the IQT consists of three diagnostic tools. One is the Evidence of Quality Teaching (EQT) classroom walkthrough and observation tool. Designed around 44 research-based indicators of instructional quality such as the physical learning environment and use of instructional

tools, the EQT contains guidelines for classroom observations as well as building and district level audits. Matsumura, Garnier, Pascal, and Valdes (2002) consider classroom observations to be the "most direct way to assess the quality of instruction" (p. 5).

Another tool is the Instructional Practices Survey (IPS) self-reporting survey on which teachers evaluate the importance of the different EQT indicators, the extent to which each is an area of strength in their own classrooms and the amount of support they receive in different areas. The IPS aligns with the EQT to build a picture of perceptual data versus observational data.

The kit's final component is the Evidence of Quality Work (EQW) student work analysis rubric. The EQW specifies four indicators of high-quality student work and provides guidelines for measuring proficiency levels for each indicator. Matsumura et al. (2002) advocate the use of such standardized rubrics for assessing student work.

The EQT and EQW required training for effective use. Building and district level leadership were to be responsible for classroom observations and so received two training sessions that were each four hours long on using the EQT, one at the beginning of the program's implementation and the other about a year later to reinforce the concepts. Teachers received a two hour training session on the EQW in which they practiced using the rubric on student work models and had their findings evaluated for consistency.

Identifying Barriers to Success

Teams of 8 to 10 observers consisting of central office, school leaders, and consultants for the IQT system performed monthly EQT assessments, comparing what was happening in each school with what should have been happening. Teachers completed the IPS at the

same time as classroom observations were conducted and evaluated student work with the EWQ rubric on a quarterly basis.

The raw data was compiled into reports summarizing the degrees to which different percentages of student work samples or classrooms complied with the indicators. The reports also included charts and bar graphs to help clarify patterns within the schools. EQT and IPS data were used in monthly data meetings that consisted of a school's teachers, their principal, and a central office supervisor. In more formal quarterly data meetings, an external consultant joined the meeting members to review EQW findings and other indicators such as nine-week grades.

The district found that teachers' perceptions of what they were doing differed greatly from the students' actual learning experience. For example, the EQW rubric contains proficiency classifications for higher-order thinking, ranging from disjointed presentations with no evidence of analysis, synthesis, or evaluation to deep conceptual understanding, and well-reasoned, personal interpretations. It was discovered that the majority of the schools' questioning techniques only required students to comprehend information rather than apply critical thinking.

In addition, classroom observation teams found that several areas within the middle schools needed to be comprehensively addressed: the physical environment of the classrooms, teachers' explanations of their expectations for students, project-based learning, regular diagnostic assessment of student learning, the development of essential literacy skills, and support for quantitative thinking. The EQT assessment also revealed a lack of instructional tools such as graphic organizers in all the schools. IPS analyses indicated that teachers felt that parental support of student learning at home was necessary in order for many of these issues to be addressed.

Meeting participants decided on strategies for addressing revealed deficiencies and developed improvement plans that focused on the issues that would have the strongest impact on student achievement. They then procured professional development when appropriate and instituted the agreed-upon changes. Subsequent data meetings were used for formative assessments of the measures' efficacy.

For example, the district chose to address the lack of graphic organizers since these tools enable students to understand knowledge in greater detail as well as elaborate, justify, and explain concepts (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001). Teachers underwent intensive professional development and became enthusiastic users. Further research revealed that a particular graphic organizer called the Frayer Model was extremely effective for vocabulary building, so MPS mandated its use for the teaching of vocabulary in all subjects.

The district also supported the initiative by developing an electronic utility that offered an array of graphic organizers. The utility resided on the district's central server, and teachers uploaded it to their computers as needed. The monthly assessments helped ensure proper implementation because as Marzano states (1996), just because a school has provided training does not mean that staff members are actually using it (p. 165). As further backing, the observation teams looked for evidence of use such as graphic organizers placed on walls or whiteboards, created in workbooks and notebooks or used in overhead transparencies.

Evaluation Benefits

Previously, professional development plans were not aligned to goals stated in the district's Title I plans. Also, the professional development included in school improvement plans was fragmented, consisting mainly of conferences or the leveraging of in-house experts, and lacked a concrete process for follow-up or modeling strategies.

MPS resolved to adopt an Educational Return on Investment (EROI) philosophy toward professional development spending so that things that fell outside of targeted areas were not funded. For example, in addition to the training on graphic organizers, the schools decided to focus professional learning on the already mentioned questioning techniques so teachers could develop the skills to create higher-level questions that required students to synthesize and analyze information.

Another key benefit of the new process is that it helped teaching and district staff engage in reflective practice. They began to question how they did things and eventually aligned their actions with strategies that would have the greatest impact on student achievement. For example, once the IPS helped clarify their thoughts on parental support, teachers resolved to work directly with parents or other adult family members to ensure family support.

The IQT reduced the isolation of the teachers and helped to eliminate inconsistencies in instructional quality from one classroom to the next, and from one school to the next. Also, because it gave principals and district administrators a global view of the instructional practices in each building, they could better align their practices with their intended curriculum.

The result? MPS started the process in the 2002-03 school year with only 36% of K-6 students in the targeted schools reading at or above their grade level according to DIBELS. By the end of the first year, the percentage climbed to 68% of students, the largest DIBELS gain in the state of Alabama. By the second year, the percentage grew to 82%. The work accomplished at MPS provides evidence that large urban districts can equip teachers and administrators with an array of diagnostic tools to guide decision-making and focus professional development and school improvement efforts.

Author Biography

Michael Looney currently serves as the superintendent for Butler County School District and has engaged in significant system improvement efforts that are having a profound impact on the community he serves. His work has been highlighted by the Alabama Best Practices Center, the Governor's Congress on School Leadership, the Secretary of Education's National Reading Leadership Panel, and multiple professional, governmental and civic organizations. Mr. Looney is in the process of completing his dissertation work at the University of Alabama and will soon hold a doctorate in educational leadership.

References

Carr J. F. & Harris D. E. (2001). *Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment, and action planning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gold, S. (2005). Driven by Data. *Technology & learning. 25* (11) 6-9.

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

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom assessment that works.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H. E., Pascal J., & Valdes, R. (2002). *Measuring instructional quality in accountability systems: Classroom assignments and student achievement.* Los Angeles: CRESST/University of California.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Monitoring school quality: An indicators report*. Jessup, MD: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Popham, W. J. (2005). Instructional quality: Collecting credible evidence. *Educational leadership. 62* (6). 80-81.

Porter, A.C & Smithson J. L. (2001). *Defining, developing and using curriculum indicators*. Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Schmoker, M. (1996). *Results: The key to continuous school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Shavelson, R.J., Webb N.M., & Burstein, L. (1986). Measurement of Teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: Macmillan; London: Collier Macmillan.

Recruiting Teachers, Principals, and Superintendents: A Job Choice Theory Perspective

Rose Mary Newton, EdD
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL

Noelle Witherspoon, EdS
Research Assistant
Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies
University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL

Recruitment includes all organizational practices and decisions affecting the number and type of individuals willing to apply for and accept vacant positions (Rynes, 1991). Effective recruitment practices have the potential to improve the quality of educational experience for students, reduce the cost of personnel development, and decrease the turnover rate (Heneman, Schwab, Fossum, & Dyer, 1986; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1996). To fulfill these promises, individuals charged with developing recruitment materials and practices must consider the needs of the applicant as well as the needs of the organization. Prospective applicants often rely on information contained in announcements of a position vacancy, brochures, and video-taped recruitment messages to determine whether a position is likely to meet their job-related needs.

Paying close attention to the content of recruitment messages is important because information about the job and the organization have been shown to be the most salient variables influencing whether individuals are motivated to pursue and accept job opportunities (Rynes, 1991). Job choice theory postulates that three theoretical perspectives largely account for the motivation and decision making of prospective applicants (Behling, Labovitz., & Gainer, 1968). These perspectives propose that aspiring educators are motivated by factors that meet their economic needs (the objective theoretical perspective), their psychological needs (the subjective theoretical perspective), or their need for information about the work itself (the critical contact theoretical perspective).

In the educational arena, researchers have conducted laboratory experiments and surveys investigating the influence of organizational characteristics and job attributes on the decision making of prospective applicants for teaching positions, the principalship, and the superintendency. These studies are informed, explicitly or implicitly, by the theoretical perspectives associated with job choice theory. In terms of study design, researchers have largely relied on laboratory

experiments and surveys to identify factors likely to influence job attraction. The sections that follow highlight the shortage of qualified applicants for positions in education and provide an overview of selected empirical recruitment research.

Factors that Motivate Prospective Teachers

Recruiting sufficient numbers of qualified teachers is one of the most daunting tasks facing today's educational leaders. Factors contributing to the shortage include large scale retirement of the generation that began teaching after World War II, the high turnover rate for beginning teachers, and competition from other areas of the employment sector (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000; Young & Castetter, 2004). A series of studies provide practical information for determining the most influential information to include in communications designed to meet this human resource need.

In one of the earliest studies of this kind, 10 education majors, role-playing applicants for elementary teaching positions, examined hypothetical job descriptions by manipulating job attributes and organizational characteristics. As aspiring teachers, the participants preferred jobs that would permit them to remain in the local area and out of inner city schools (Rynes & Lawler, 1983). Realizing that research examining the influence of single attributes fails to account for the large number of potentially relevant variables, researchers began to examine reactions to categories of job attributes under conditions varied according to three theories of job choice.

An early study in this vein (Young, Rinehart, & Place, 1989) found that aspiring elementary teachers reacted more favorably to attribute categories associated with the subjective theory of job choice than to attribute

categories associated with either the objective or the critical contact theory of job choice.

Similarly, videotaped simulated interviews were used to investigate the effects of job and organizational attributes, applicant characteristics, and recruiter characteristics on applicant attraction to elementary teaching positions (Young, Rinehart, & Heneman, 1993). Education majors rated three interview scripts emphasizing either economic job attributes such as life insurance, intrinsic job attributes such as the opportunity to work in a multicultural school and community, or work context attributes such as class size. The study participants rated the economic category of attributes significantly less favorably than the intrinsic and work context categories of attributes.

Men and women aspiring to elementary teaching positions may be motivated by different factors. Two studies examined applicant reactions to formal position advertisements emphasizing either extrinsic rewards such as job security or intrinsic rewards such as sense of accomplishment (Winter, 1996; Winter, 1997). Men evaluated advertisements with extrinsic attributes more favorably than women and women evaluated advertisements with intrinsic attributes more favorably than men.

Factors that Motivate Prospective Principals

Several trends account for the perceived shortage of qualified applicants for principal vacancies. Large numbers of principals are retiring, many principals are moving to non-administrative positions, and teachers are increasingly reluctant to seek the vacated positions (Barker, 1997; Doud & Keller, 1998; McAdams, 1998; Muse & Thomas, 1991). The shortage is predicted to increase by 20% through the year 2008 because 40% of the

nation's principals are nearing retirement (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000).

Recruitment researchers often employ laboratory experiments to examine attraction to the principalship. For example, experienced elementary, middle and high school teachers rated the contents of recruitment brochures manipulating the managerial and instructional attributes associated with the position (Winter & Dunaway, 1997). High school teachers rated brochures emphasizing management job attributes more positively and elementary and middle school teachers rated brochures emphasizing instructional leadership job attributes more positively. Similarly, when experienced elementary school, middle school, and high school teachers played the roles of school council members responsible for selecting a school principal from among eight candidates, elementary and middle school teachers preferred candidates oriented towards instructional leadership and high school teachers preferred candidates oriented towards managerial leadership (Winter, McCabe, & Newton, 1998).

Somewhat later, Newton and Zeitoun (2003) invited a national sample of over 200 public school teachers to evaluate a formal announcement of a principal vacancy that manipulated the preferred leadership style (authoritative, democratic) and the number of hours to be worked per week (45, 55, 65). The major findings were that men were more attracted to the position than women and both men and women preferred the democratic leadership style. Also, particularly for the participating women, job attractiveness decreased as the time needed to fulfill the job worked per week increased.

A national sample of experienced principals role-played applicants seeking their first administrative position (Newton, Giesen,

Freeman, Bishop, & Zeitoun, 2003). Procedurally, experienced principals read 16 hypothetical job descriptions containing two levels of specified attributes of the principal's role: 1) percentage of time devoted to instructional leadership (30%, 60%); 2) salary level ($10,000 above the highest paid teacher in the district, $30,000 above the highest paid teacher in the district); 3) hours worked per week (45 hours, 65 hours), and 4) job security (retain tenure gained as a teacher, lose tenure gained as a teacher). A series of statistical tests revealed two major findings: (a) the majority of the participants (both men and women) based their rating decisions on the level of salary depicted (women = 40; men = 60); and (b) women were more likely to make decisions based on the opportunity to engage in instructional leadership (women = 16; men = 5).

Researchers have also employed the survey research method to examine the influence of job attributes and organizational characteristics on teacher attraction for the principalship. When Pounder and Merrill (2001) examined factors that influence potential candidates' job perceptions and intentions regarding the high school principalship, job attraction was significantly related to objective factors (salary and benefits), a subjective factor (the desire to improve education), and a work-context factor (the time needed to fulfill the demands of the job). Similarly, Newton and Bishop (2003) examined whether clusters of organizational characteristics and job attributes influenced teacher attraction for the principalship. The major findings were as follows: males were more attracted to the principalship than females; the cluster of job attributes under consideration enhanced teacher attraction for the job; and the cluster of attributes depicting the internal conditions of the workplace diminished teacher attraction for the job.

Factors that Motivate Prospective Superintendents

Over the course of the next decade, recruiting talented individuals for the superintendency may become critical. A recent 10-year survey found that half of today's superintendents are over age 50, most states have early retirement programs beginning at age 55, and most superintendents retire between the ages of 57 and 60 (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). The authors of this survey point out that it would not be uncommon to see a turnover of about 30% in the early part of the 21st century.

Unfortunately, there continues to be a scarcity of empirical studies providing direction for the recruitment of superintendents. An exception is a recent study investigating whether the major roles of the superintendency and district size influenced the job attraction ratings of potential applicants (Newton, in press). Randomly-selected public school principals rated one of nine recruitment messages for a hypothetical superintendent's position. For both male and female prospective applicants, the most appealing position announcements emphasized the instructional leadership role and the least appealing position announcements emphasized either the managerial role in small districts or the political leadership role in large districts.

Conclusions and Practical Implications

The impending retirement of educators hired after World War II heightens the need for recruitment at all educational levels. The recruitment challenge is to attract and hire a talented and diverse cadre of individuals to fill the vacated positions. Job choice theory and the research reviewed here provide practical information in designing recruitment messages to meet this challenge. The job attributes and organizational characteristics selected for inclusion in recruitment messages have a significant and important influence on applicant perceptions of job attractiveness. Furthermore, factors associated with the objective, subjective, and critical contact perspectives largely account for applicant motivation. Nevertheless, the relative importance of each factor may vary systematically depending on applicant characteristics (career stage, gender) and the organizational level of the vacant position.

In terms of career stage, applicants seeking their first teaching position at the elementary level are likely to be motivated by subjective factors. On the other hand, more experienced applicants for the principalship are likely to be motivated by an objective factor (e.g., salary), work context factors (e.g., time constraints), and information about the work itself (the time devoted to various work roles). The influence of specific aspects of the work itself may vary by organizational level with applicants at the high school level being more amenable to engaging in managerial duties than applicants at either the elementary or middle school levels. Applicants for the superintendency, particularly men, are likely to base their job choice decision on an objective factor (salary).

In summary, recruitment message content containing information about the job and the organization has a powerful influence on whether prospective applicants are attracted to position vacancies. Organizational representatives responsible for recruiting teachers and principals are encouraged to take the applicant perspective into account by devising balanced recruitment messages emphasizing the objective, subjective, and critical contact factors associated with the position.

Author Biographies

Rose Mary Newton is an associate professor at the University of Alabama where she coordinates the programs in educational administration and leadership. Her primary research interest is the recruitment of educational leaders. Publications include "Is Androcentric Bias in Educational Administration on the Wane?" in the *Journal of School Leadership* and "Does Recruitment Message Content Normalize the Superintendency as Male?" in the *Educational Administration Quarterly*.

Noelle Witherspoon is a doctoral candidate at the University of Alabama. She has served as an elementary principal, a regional reading consultant, and a national consultant regarding literacy and culturally relevant pedagogy. Her research interests include feminist methodologies, leadership for literacy education, and ethics in education.

References

Barker, S. L. (1997). Is your successor in your schoolhouse? Finding principal candidates. *NASSP Bulletin, 82,* 85-91.

Behling, O., Labovitz, G., & Gainer, M. (1968). College recruiting: A theoretical base. *Personnel Journal, 47*, 13-19.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (1998). *The K-8 principal in 1998: A 10-year study of the National Association of Elementary School Principals.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Glass, T. E., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Heneman, H. G. III, Schwab, D. P., Fossum, J. A., & Dyer, L. D. (1986). *Personnel/human resource management* (3rd ed.). Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

McAdams, R. P. (1998). Who'll run the schools? *The American School Board Journal, 185,* 37-39.

Muse, I. D., & Thomas, G. J. (1999). The thinning ranks of rural school administration: The principalship in trouble. *Rural Educator, 13*, 8-12.

Newton, R. M. (in press). Does recruitment message content normalize the superintendency as "male"? *The Educational Administration Quarterly.*

Newton, R. M., & Bishop, H. (2003). Predictors of teacher attraction for principalship: The influence of work conditions, job attributes, and teacher characteristics. *Research in Schools, 10*(2), 45-51.

Newton, R. M., Giesen, J., Freeman, J., Bishop, H., & Zeitoun, P. (2003). Assessing the reactions of men and women to attributes of the principalship. *The Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(4), 505-531.

Newton, R. M., & Zeitoun, P. (2003). Is androcentric bias in educational administration on the wane? Perplexing findings. *Journal of School Leadership, 13*(4), 385-404.

Pounder, D., & Merrill, R. (2001). Job desirability of the high school principalship: A job choice theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *37*(1), 27-57.

Rynes, S. L. (1991). Recruitment, job choice, and post-hire consequences: A call for new research directions. In M. D. Dunnette & L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 399-444), 2nd ed., Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rynes, S., & Lawler, J. (1983). A policy-capturing investigation of the role of expectancies in decisions to pursue job alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *68*, 620-631.

Schwab, D. P., Rynes, S. L., & Aldag, R. J. (1987). Theories and research on job search choice. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.) *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 5 pp. 129-166). Greenwich, CT: JAL.

U. S. Department of Labor. (2000). *Occupational outlook handbook, 2000-01 Edition* (Bulletin 2520). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Winter, P. A. (1996). Applicant evaluations of position advertisements: The influence of sex, job message content, and information order. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10*, 163-171.

Winter, P. A., & Dunaway, D. M. (1997). Reactions of teachers, as applicants, to principal recruitment practices in a reform environment: The effects of job attributes, job information source, and school level. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 10*, 105-116.

Winter, P. A., McCabe, D. H., & Newton, R. M. (1998). Principal selection decisions made by teachers: The influence of work values, principal job attributes, and school level. *Journal of School Leadership, 8,* 251-279.

Winter, P. A., Millay, J. D., Björk, L. G., & Keedy, J. L. (2005). Superintendent recruitment: Effects of school councils, job status, signing bonus, and district wealth. *Journal of School Leadership*, *15,* 433-455

Winter, P. A. & Morgenthal, J. R. (2002). Principal recruitment in a reform environment: Effects of school achievement and school level on applicant attraction to the job. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(3), 319-340.

Young, I. P. & Castetter, W. B. (2004). *The human resource function in educational administration* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Young, I. P., Rinehart, J., & Heneman, H. G. III (1993). Effects of job attribute categories, applicant job experience, and recruiter sex on applicant job attractiveness ratings. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7,* 55-66.

Young, I. P., Rinehart, J., & Place, W. (1989). Theories for teacher selection: Objective, subjective, and critical contact. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, *5*(4), 329-336.

Book Review _____

Are We There Yet? Continuing to Close the Achievement Gap

Reviewed by:
Ann K. Nauman, Ph.D
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership and Technology
Southeastern Louisiana University
Hammond, LA

In a series of case studies and success stories, Patricia Davenport outlines and advertises her highly successful approach to test score improvement through what she calls, "integrated instruction."

Her method involves teachers, administrators, governing boards, and sometimes parents in a massive, cooperative effort to provide children with the knowledge and skills they need to meet state standards. As a consultant, the author travels widely, providing workshop training for educators in districts where test scores indicate a need for improvement in teaching methods and process oversight.

The work chronicles the successes of administrators, teachers, and systems in various locations, after the implementation of the author's techniques, to raise the educational levels and test scores of children in their care, despite the presence in many of their schools of those socio-economic factors often listed as reasons for lack of academic achievement.

The book is full of acronyms (i.e. PDCA, TQM, API, MEAP, etc.), some of which are not translated on first usage (i.e. AYP), and this factor, a type of jargon, presupposes a certain level of professional knowledge and makes the book somewhat less reader friendly, especially for the layperson.

The appendix gives a chart of useful suggestions under the heading, "Quality Tools," including a sample Action Plan Form. The book closes with two pages of signed letters of praise for the book and the author's system.

Reference

Patricia Davenport. (2006). *Are We There Yet? Continuing to Close the Achievement Gap,* Charleston, WV: EDVANTIA, 2006; 208 pp. with index; $29.00. To order contact EDVANTIA, 304-347-0400 or 800-624-9120; e-mail: patricia.hammer@edvantia.org.

_____

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice* is a refereed, blind-reviewed, quarterly journal with a focus on research and best practices that advance the profession of educational administration. Articles that express a point of view, shed light on a contemporary issue, or report findings and conclusions of a field of interest to educational administration professors and practitioners will be given preference. AASA members are also invited to submit news, notices, and announcements relevant to administrators and faculty in higher education. Reactions to previously published articles are also welcome.

Length of manuscripts should be as follows: Research and best-practice articles between 1,200 and 1,800 words; commentaries, book and media reviews between 400 and 600 words. Articles, commentaries, book and media reviews, citations, and references are to follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, latest edition. Permission to use previously copyrighted materials is the responsibility of the author, not the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

For review purposes, the title of the article, contributor's name, academic rank, address, department, and affiliation (for inclusion on the title page and in the author note), telephone and fax number and e-mail address should appear on a *detachable* cover page. Also please provide on the cover page current position, recently published books (within the past 18 months) and notable achievements, all for possible use in a four to five sentence biographical endnote. The contributor must indicate whether the submission is to be considered a research or best-practice article, commentary, book or media review. The type of submission must be indicated on the cover sheet in order to be considered.

Book Review Guidelines
Book review guidelines should adhere to the Author Guidelines as found above. The format of the book review is to include the following:

- Full title of book
- Author
- City, state: publisher, year; page; price
- Name and affiliation of reviewer
- Contact information for reviewer: address, country, zip or postal code, e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers
- Date of submission

Additional Information
Contributors will be notified of editorial board decisions within four to six months of receipt of papers at the editorial office. Articles to be returned must be accompanied by a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* reserves the right to make minor editorial changes without seeking approval from contributors.

Materials published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* do not constitute endorsement of the content or conclusions presented.

Submissions
Articles and book reviews are to be submitted to the editor by e-mail as an electronic attachment in Microsoft Word 2003.

Submit to:
Dr. Frederick Dembowski
Editor, *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*
Southeastern Louisiana University
Department of Educational Leadership and Technology
SLU 10549
Charles E. Cate Teacher Education Center
1300 North General Pershing, Suite 1004
Hammond, LA 70402
Tel: 985-549-5713
Fax: 985-549-5712
E-mail: fdembowski@selu.edu

AASA Professional Library

The American Association of School Administrators is pleased to provide school leaders and higher education professionals with the opportunity for access to cutting-edge books at a significant discount before they are offered to the general public. The AASA Professional Library is an annual subscription series of educational leadership books written by specialists, veteran administrators, acclaimed professors and skilled practitioners.

When you join the AASA Professional Library, you will receive four books each year on a quarterly basis.

- AASA carefully selects the books, which address timely topics that are important to superintendents and other school system leaders who are focused on student success.
- Join by March 9, 2007 and the first title you receive will be *Out-of-the-Box-Leadership*, co-edited by AASA Executive Director Paul Houston.
- An annual fee of $99 covers all four books and includes shipping. You'll save more than 15% by joining the AASA Professional Library.
- Your books will be shipped on April 1, July 1 and October 1 and January 1 to the address you provide on the order form.

Additional information and a downloadable order form are available at www.aasa.org/library.