2013

An Urban School District's Preparing New Principals Program: Completers' Perceptions Of Program Effectiveness Related To Florida Principal Leadership Standards Adopted In 2011

Kelly Pelletier
University of Central Florida

AN URBAN SCHOOL DISTRICT'S PREPARING NEW PRINCIPALS PROGRAM: COMPLETERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS RELATED TO FLORIDA PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS ADOPTED IN 2011

by

KELLY A. PELLETIER
B. S. University of Central Florida, 1991
M. Ed. University of Central Florida, 1994

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2013

Major Professor: Rosemarye Taylor

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to measure the extent to which school leaders who completed the preparing new principals program in School District A perceived the program's effectiveness in preparing them to demonstrate Florida's principal leadership standards as adopted in November 2011. This study also identified the components of the preparing new principals program that influenced the professional practice of the program completers in their current leadership roles within School District A. This study was conducted at the request of the professional development services designee in School District A and is a companion study to research conducted by Eddie Ruiz and Wesley Trimble.

The Preparing New Principals Program Completer Survey was sent to 90 administrators in School District A who completed the preparing new principals program between 2008 and 2011. Follow-up interviews were conducted with six volunteers in order to further clarify responses to the survey and to gather additional input from program completers. Survey results as well as interview data were analyzed in order to give the professional development services designee information for designing a new principal preparation program for School District A.

The literature review and the results of this study supported the premise that preparing principals for school leadership in 2013 involves more than developing management skills and knowledge of the functions of a school. Principals must be instructional leaders with an unwavering focus on student achievement. Overall, results of the study found the PNPP in the urban school district supported the participant's awareness of the FPLS and also showed they perceived they were prepared to demonstrate the majority of the standards. However, the individual requirements and experiences of the PNPP had varying levels of perceived value to

the professional practice of the participants. Results of the study recommended the PNPP experiences perceived to be invaluable or not practical should be evaluated for applicability, revised accordingly or possibly eliminated to improve the effectiveness of the PNPP.

Although the structure of principal preparation programs in the state of Florida are unique due to laws that created a two leveled principal certification process, the findings and conclusions of this research study could be useful to any school district working to develop future principals. Suggested improvements to the PNPP included a longer principal internship, a strengthened mentor relationship, an application process for initial program entry, differentiated experiences, and an emphasis on increasing teacher effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this dissertation was a test of endurance not only for me, but also my family. I'd like to thank my husband, Dan, and my children, Abby and TJ, for being patient with me on all those weekends I had to work on my research. They believe in me and were supportive of my ambition to earn this doctorate degree.

I am also forever grateful to Dr. Rosemarye Taylor for her unending support and guidance in completing this research. I also would like to give a big thank you to the other education professionals on my dissertation committee, Dr. Lee Baldwin, Dr. Vickie Cartwright, Dr. Michael Grego, Dr. Mary Pat Kennedy, and Dr. Walter Doherty. All of you had a part in bringing this research to completion. Your feedback and edits were always encouraging and positive. You each have contributed to my growth as a 'savvy school leader'.

I also need to thank my doctoral cohort in this Educational Leadership program and especially Todd Trimble and Eddie Ruiz who are completing companion studies to this one. Todd and Eddie were an unending supply of encouragement and support as we pushed and pulled each other through the last three years. I can't thank you both enough for all the weekends, text messages and phone calls.

This entire process has helped me to grow not only as an educator and consumer of good research; but as a person who now believes she can do anything she sets her mind to accomplishing. Thank you all for helping me complete this research and graduate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Expectations of principals in the environment of high stakes accountability are focused on student learning outcomes (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). According to The Wallace Foundation (2012), "education research shows that most school variables, considered separately, have at most small effects on learning. The real payoff comes when individual variables combine to reach critical mass. Creating the conditions under which that can occur is the job of the principal" (p. 2). This focus on learning outcomes makes it critical for school districts to develop programs for identifying and preparing effective school leaders. Effective principals create school environments where teachers can thrive as professionals and impact student learning outcomes. With the focus on accountability, it becomes critical for school districts to examine their principal preparation programs. What makes a preparation program successful in creating principals who can in turn effectively lead their schools and impact student achievement outcomes?

School district leaders are developing programs to recruit potential high performing leaders, provide apprenticeship experiences prior to entering administrative pools, and support principals in their first years in the position (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009; Boyd et al., 2011; Corcoran, Schwartz, & Weinstein, 2009; Simmons et al., 2007; Vanderhaar, Munoz, & Rodosky, 2006). Research by Vanderhaar, Munoz, and Rodosky (2006) supports the need for principals of high poverty schools to have a different set of knowledge and skills than principals of low poverty schools. The challenges principals will face in these two types of schools are different and principal preparation programs should consider principal placement when

designing programs. Simmons et al. (2007) suggest yearlong residencies for principal candidates. These residencies should focus on relationship building, as well as leadership experiences that will allow the principal intern to turn theory into practice in a learning environment prior to being on the job as an administrator. Corcoran, Schwartz and Weinstein (2009) researched The Leadership Academy, an independent, not-for-profit organization in New York City, established to increase the pool of qualified principals for high poverty schools with low academic achievement. Within The Leadership Academy, is the Aspiring Principals Program, a 14 month principal preparation program involving three components: a summer intensive program with simulated school projects; a 10 month residency along with leadership development seminars; and a planning summer for transitioning into the school leadership position (Corcoran, Schwartz & Weinstein, 2009).

The Wallace Foundation (2012) suggested four parts to creating a pipeline of effective leadership within a school district. The first part is to clearly detail the job of principal and assistant principal based on what research defines as the knowledge, skills and behaviors principals need to be able to improve teaching and learning in their schools. The second part is providing high-quality preparation programs for aspiring school leaders. The Wallace Foundation (2012) states principal preparation programs should "recruit and select only the people with the potential and desire to become effective principals in the school districts the programs feed into" (p. 14). The preparation program should include "high-quality training and internships that reflect the realities education leaders face in the field" (The Wallace Foundation, 2012, p. 14). The third part is to hire selectively. The final part of The Wallace Foundation's

(2012) suggestions to create a pipeline of effective leadership is to evaluate the principal and give on-the-job support based on individual needs as determined by the evaluation results.

Kowal, Hassel, and Hassel (2009) researched turnaround schools and describe seven steps for school districts to follow in preparation of turnaround principals to ensure their chances of success. Kowal et al. (2009) define turnarounds as "the only proven strategies for quickly achieving success in very low-performing organizations" (p. 1). The seven steps as described by Kowal et al. (2009) include: commitment to success; choosing the right schools for turnaround strategies; developing a pipeline of turnaround leaders; approving all strategies the turnaround leader implements; holding turnaround leaders accountable for results; prioritizing teacher hiring; and engaging the community in support of the turnaround. In order to turn around the schools with the lowest performance, school districts should make their first priority the development of the pipeline of qualified turnaround principals through recruitment, targeted selection and preparation (Kowal et al., 2009; New Leaders for New Schools, 2009; University of Virginia Darden School of Business, 2011). The competencies turnaround principals need to be successful include: a strong desire to achieve success; the ability to motivate and influence others thinking and behavior in order to obtain results; the skills to connect learning goals with classroom activity; and staying focused, committed and self-assured throughout the process of the turnaround (Kowal et al., 2009; New Leaders for New Schools, 2009).

New Leaders for New Schools (2009) has a three-pronged definition of principal effectiveness: focusing on improving a variety of student outcomes; managing human capital to drive teacher effectiveness; and implementing researched based principal leadership actions.

Recommendations to states include aligning systems, programs and strategies to increase the number of principals who meet the three-pronged definition of principal effectiveness with special focus on high-poverty and low achieving schools (New Leaders for New Schools, 2009).

The University of Virginia Darden School of Business (2011) Turnaround Specialist Program prepares principals over a two year period through coursework, case studies, interactive discussions, workshops, residencies, implementation of action plans and school site visits. The Turnaround Specialist Program does not teach leaders a set of prescribed actions, but instead focuses on practices and processes that will build internal capacity to initiate change and sustain success over time (University of Virginia Darden School of Business, 2011). The program curriculum includes a focus on the following: understanding the fundamentals and context of successful turnarounds; communicating a vision for the urgent need to change; developing a culture of high expectations; building coalitions and implementing shared decision making; using data to drive decisions and monitor the need for mid-course corrections; developing strategic plans and identifying innovative opportunities; and teaching school district leaders to think like leaders, not managers (University of Virginia Darden School of Business, 2011).

In January 2010, the Florida Department of Education applied to the United States Department of Education for Race To The Top grant funding. Florida's Race To The Top application (2010) stated, "Florida has challenged itself to be the 'first in the nation' to change the culture of the profession by ensuring that all teachers and school leaders are well-selected, prepared, supported, respected, and accountable for their students' achievement" (p. 11). The application goes on to state, "Florida envisions a student-centered school environment where all

teachers are supported and engaged in peer collaboration around data analysis, content, instructional methods, and student mastery. To secure this environment, Florida will invest heavily in strategies that advance teacher and leader effectiveness and expects a significant return in improved student achievement." (p. 11).

This study was conducted at the request of School District A, a large urban school district located in central Florida. This school district has high percentages of students who live in poverty, whose primary home language is not English, and who present multiple challenges to learning. As a large urban school district focused on all students learning at a high level, the problem studied was the extent to which potential principals are prepared to lead schools. The purpose of the study was to gather perceptions of the Preparing New Principal Program completers to discover their perception of how effectively the program experience prepared them to be a successful school administrator using Florida Principal Leadership Standards adopted November 15, 2011 (SBE Rule 6A-5.080). A further purpose was to make research-based recommendations for program improvement.

Conceptual Framework

This study explored the concept of effective principal leadership behaviors that are conducive to increasing student achievement outcomes and the implementation of these behaviors in a program intended to prepare new assistant principals for the principalship. In meta-analysis research on the influence of principals on student achievement outcomes, Hattie (2009) stated, "in the meta-analysis on the effects of principals, there is an important moderator, relating the type of principal leadership" (p. 83). He continued to describe two types of principal

leadership, instructional and transformational. Principals who are instructional leaders create safe learning climates, set clear instructional goals and maintain high expectations for both the teachers and students in their schools. Principals who are transformational leaders inspire their teachers to reach high levels of moral purpose and commitment to working together toward common goals. The results of Hattie's (2009) meta-analysis support instructional leadership as having the greatest impact on student outcomes. Hattie (2009) reported common dimensions of instructional leadership found in the research that had the greatest impact on student achievement include: being committed to and participating in teacher learning and development; evaluating and giving feedback to teachers on their teaching and the curriculum used in classrooms; making strategic decisions involving resources with a focus on instruction; setting clear goals and expectations; and ensuring an orderly and supportive learning environment by maintaining classroom instruction as the focus both inside and outside classrooms.

Hattie (2009) also reviewed "various leadership competencies derived from the many assessment centers for principals and the resultant effects on student achievement" (p. 84). His review found instructional leadership criteria such as leadership skills and organizational abilities along with written communication skills had the strongest correlations with student achievement outcomes. On the other hand, transformational leadership criteria such as having a wide variety of personal interests, sensitivity to others, and personal motivation had almost no effect on student outcomes. Hattie (2009) found other principal competencies that have high effect sizes related to higher student outcomes: knowing what goals need addressing within a school; having strong ideals about education and communicating their beliefs to teachers; actively monitoring

the impact of school practices on student learning; ensuring teachers are informed of current theories and practices in the field of education; being willing to make changes; and being knowledgeable of current curriculum, instruction and assessment trends.

Other researchers have also examined the behavioral practices of effective principals. The five most effective principal leadership practices as discussed by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) are situational awareness, intellectual stimulation, input, change agent, and culture. Situational awareness is the ability to read details and happenings in the school and use the information to address issues and problems. Intellectual stimulation is the ability of the principal to keep the faculty current on educational theory and practice. Input is the skill of involving teachers in all aspects of decision making. Change agent involves the principal being willing to question the status quo and implement change. The final leadership practice involves the principal creating a culture of shared beliefs and a sense of community. These behavioral practices are very similar to those discussed by Hattie (2009) as having the greatest impact on student achievement outcomes.

Reeves (2004) believed there is more than "the general issue of the crisis in education", there is a "crisis in educational leadership" (p. 81). He went on to say, "to some extent the crisis in leadership is a self-inflicted wound" (p. 81). Across the nation, there is a lack of teacher leaders who want to become principals when they can make a much better hourly rate of pay by remaining in the classroom and have less stress and responsibility (Reeves, 2002; Reeves, 2004). Reeves (2004) contended, "if the organization is ever to have congruity between its values and the daily decisions of leadership, then the people assigned to leadership positions must largely

share the values, history, culture, and traditions of that organization. This requires internal leadership development" (p. 82). Reeves (2004) indicated school districts need to develop recruitment programs and preparation programs that will create an unlimited supply of potential new principals. Leadership preparation programs are an investment in the future (Reeves, 2002).

Building a successful principal preparation program includes the following components as defined by Reeves (2002): identifying prospective leaders; creating an educational leadership preparation program; supporting students, teachers, and parents through servant leadership; and creating synergy by blending leadership, learning and teaching.

The first of these components, identifying prospective leaders, requires the school district to decide "what knowledge and skills the school leaders in this system need to be successful" (p. 161). After these criteria have been identified, the school district decides, "How will we know when a candidate possesses the essential knowledge and skills required for leadership success?" (p. 161). Reeves (2002) suggested a blending of traditional preparation such as university programs in leadership development with real world experiences as well as actual leadership decisions collected in a type of portfolio would give the school district a better picture of the potential of a candidate. The second component involves creating a school district leadership preparation program. Reeves (2002) suggested, "the school system could become a center of leadership preparation, providing skills in personnel management, strategic planning, and data analysis that are needed by all leaders" (p. 161). He described a program of study that involves research, case studies, small group work and reflection with a focus on people, strategies, systems and organizations (Reeves, 2002). The third component is the idea of the principal as

servant leader. Reeves (2002) said, “the most effective leaders routinely serve others, namely, the employees and other stakeholders” (p. 165). He described a servant leader as a principal who will pick up trash on campus, evaluate student work, work with students in a variety of situations, and pay attention to the personal as well as professional needs of their employees (Reeves, 2002). The final component is to develop principals who teach and learn along with their employees. Reeves (2002) stated, “developing a new generation of leaders demands that our best teachers lead and that our best leaders teach” (p. 171).

Statement of the Problem

In November 2011, the Florida State Board of Education adopted new standards for principal leadership (SBE Rule 6A-5.080). The adoption of these new leadership standards impacted school districts in Florida by facilitating the need to update and possibly change the approved principal preparation programs these school districts were using to prepare new school leaders for principal certification by the State of Florida. In the state of Florida, the pathway to becoming a principal involves a two leveled process. The Florida State Board of Education defines the two levels as Level I, which allows for initial certification in educational leadership, and then Level II, which is a school district based program extending the learning experiences from the Level I program and leads to school principal certification (SBE Rule 6A-5.081).

Participants in the Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) have already completed a Level I program by completing a pre-service school leadership program leading to certification in educational leadership and have been hired as assistant principals in School District A. The principal preparation program is a Level II program when completed will allow the participant to

earn Florida principal certification. The problem to be studied in this research was the effectiveness of the PNPP in School District A to prepare future principals for success. At the time of this study, there had not been any research conducted on the effectiveness of the current PNPP. The professional development services designee in School District A requested the research be conducted prior to the development of a new principal preparation program.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the extent to which school leaders who completed the PNPP from 2008 to 2011 in School District A perceived the program's effectiveness in preparing them to successfully demonstrate the Florida's principal leadership standards as adopted in November 2011. This study also identified the components and constructs of the PNPP that influenced the professional practice of program completers in their current leadership roles. Findings informed the development of a principal preparation program in School District A aligned with the new standards. Additionally, the needs of school leaders serving schools with varying socio-economic status levels were examined and input was given for differentiating the principal preparation program to meet their specific needs.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived value of the constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program, in influencing the professional practice of program completers from 2008-2011, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

2. To what extent, if any, do program completers from 2008-2011 believe the Preparing New Principals Program enabled them to demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?
3. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 serving schools with varying socio-economic status levels, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?
4. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 representing a different number of years of teaching experience, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are offered to clarify terminology used in this study.

Construct: The knowledge category under which the components of the preparing new principals program were organized. Three constructs were analyzed: instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge.

Florida Principal Leadership Standards 2011: Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. There are ten standards grouped into four domains. Each standard has a set of indicators that further clarify or define the standard. These standards are the foundation for administrator evaluation, professional learning systems, leadership preparation programs and certification requirements.

Perceived Value: The value the program completer assigned to each individual component of the PNPP in regards to its influence on their professional practice and success as a school leader. Value choices included: extremely valuable, valuable, not valuable, impractical, and not applicable.

Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP): The program of study developed to prepare new school leaders for the job responsibilities of being a principal which includes successfully meeting the expectations of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The program is approved by the Florida State Board of Education as a Level II preparation program for principal certification.

Professional Development Services Designee: The administrator who has the responsibility of developing professional learning programs and experiences for all teachers and administrators in School District A. This administrator develops, coordinates, and implements all professional learning programs, as well as conducts follow-up activities.

Program Completer: A current employee of School District A, who has successfully completed the PNPP. The completers include principals, assistant principals, non-school based administrators, and teachers.

PNPP Completer Survey: A survey instrument developed by the researcher and sent to all the completers of the PNPP from 2008 to 2011. The survey was sent to the completers at the start of this research study.

School District A: A large urban school district in the central Florida area where this research study was conducted. School District A includes 900 administrators (school and non-school

based), 12,747 instructional staff and 180,307 students. Student racial distribution is: 41% White; 30% Black; 21% Hispanic; 4% Asian; 3% Multi-cultural; 1% American Indian or Alaska Native. In the school district, 60% of the students qualify for the federal free and reduced lunch program.

Socio-economic Status (SES): an economic measure that considers a family's annual income and is indicated by the percent of students in a school who qualify for the federal free and reduced lunch program. In School District A, a high SES school is one where 75% or more of the student population qualifies for the federal free and reduced lunch program.

Standard: A behavior, skill set or knowledge base that should be demonstrated by the leader of an effective school.

Methodology

Research Design

The research design for this study used mixed methods including qualitative and quantitative data collected through the use of a confidential perceptual survey and structured interviews. Initially, the PNPP completers received an e-mail from the school district's professional development services designee telling them that the request to complete the survey will follow and how important their input will be to the development of a new preparation program. Within one week they received a second e-mail and were asked to complete an electronic survey. Since the researcher works within the school district, responses were anonymous and there was only one follow-up e-mail reminding program completers to

participate. The survey is found in Appendix A and the informed consent letter for the survey in Appendix C.

Surveys were followed up with structured interviews if the program completer volunteered to be interviewed. Responses given during the interview were reported anonymously and in aggregate or by code.

This research study did not implement any programs or treat the population of program completers in any way. It was conducted at the request of the professional development services designee in School District A.

Participants

The population for this study was school leaders in School District A, who successfully completed the PNPP during the time period from 2008 to 2011. School District A includes 900 administrators (school and non-school based), 12,747 instructional staff and 180,307 students. Student racial distribution is: 41% White; 30% Black; 21% Hispanic; 4% Asian; 3% Multi-cultural; 1% American Indian or Alaska Native. In the school district, 60% of the students qualify for the federal free and reduced lunch program.

The sample included 90 school leaders who completed the program during the indicated time period. These 90 participants work for the school district, where they completed the principal preparation program. Participants have experience in the school district as teachers, assistant principals, principals, or non-school based administrators.

Instrumentation

The Preparing New Principals Program Completer Survey was developed by the researcher based on a list of required components of the principal preparation program in School District A, the content of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, as well as the demographic and background information of the survey participants. It was reviewed for content validity by knowledgeable experts in the field and within the school district. Additional doctorial students with experience in educational leadership and survey construction were also consulted for input on the clarity and understanding of the intended purpose of the questions on the survey, thereby providing additional content validity. The survey was edited and revised based on the input of these professionals.

The survey included demographic and background information of the program completers in the first section. The second section measured the value each program completer placed on the required components of the PNPP in terms of their work expectations. The required components of the program were organized into three constructs: Instructional leadership, building community and decision making and technical knowledge. The third section assessed the program completers' level of preparation to meet the new Florida principal leadership standards. The fourth, fifth and sixth sections asked the program completer to rank the types of experiences and methods of content delivery within the preparation program. Program completers were also asked open-ended questions to provide input on how program effectiveness could be improved in section seven. As a follow-up, program completers were offered an opportunity to be interviewed by the researcher.

Structured interview questions were developed after analysis of the quantitative data obtained from the survey.

Procedures

The school district's professional development services designee was contacted to provide information on the structure of the PNPP, to give input into the survey instrument, and to provide the number of school leaders who have completed the program from 2008 to 2011.

Approval for this research was obtained from School District A's Senior Director for Accountability, Research and Assessment by submitting a research request form along with the research proposal to the Office of Accountability, Research and Assessment. Approval for conducting this research was also obtained from the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board. The approval forms can be found in Appendix E and F.

Once approval was granted, an e-mail from the school district's professional development services designee was sent asking program completers to participate in this research study in order to inform the development of a new PNPP. Following the e-mail request, an e-mail introducing the researcher and describing the research study was sent to the 90 identified school district employees in the targeted population. The e-mail included the school district approval form, the participant informed consent letter and a link to the electronic survey they were asked to complete. The research participants were not identified or tied to their survey responses in any way. The researcher knew the identities of the original 90 employees invited to participate, but their responses to the survey were completely anonymous.

Since the participants were not identified in any way and responses were completely anonymous; the researcher did not know who had and who had not completed the survey. One week after the initial e-mail was sent asking for participation, a second e-mail was sent to thank the participants who had already completed the survey and ask the ones who had not yet completed it, to consider participating by completing the survey.

To further clarify survey responses, at the end of the survey instrument there was a question asking if the participant would be willing to be interviewed. Structured interview questions were developed after the findings of the survey had been analyzed. Consenting interviewees were identified by an assigned letter without a school name or other identifying information attached to their interview responses. Interviews were conducted over the phone and the researcher recorded responses in writing.

Data Analysis

Research findings were analyzed using SPSS version 20 software to conduct appropriate statistical analysis. Table 1 shows the dependent and independent variables for each research question along with the data sources and statistical method for analyzing the collected data. Follow-up interviews were recorded in writing and then coded and analyzed for common or significant statements.

Table 1

Research Questions, Variables Tested, Data Sources and Statistical Methods

Number	Research Question	Variables		Survey Item	Statistical Method
		Independent	Dependent		
1.	What is the difference, if any, in the perceived value of the constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program, in influencing the professional practice of program completers from 2008-2011, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?	The construct within the PNPP	Perceived value of the PNPP construct	16-48	Mean, standard deviation, confidence intervals, frequency, ANOVA and Tukey
2.	To what extent, if any, do program completers from 2008-2011 believe the Preparing New Principals Program enabled them to demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?	The specific leadership standard	Belief of being able to demonstrate a specific leadership standard	49-98	Mean, standard deviation, confidence intervals, frequency
3.	What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 serving schools with varying socio-economic status levels, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?	The specific leadership standard and the socio-economic status of the school	Belief of being able to demonstrate a specific leadership standard	7; 49-98	Mean, standard deviation, confidence intervals, frequency, ANOVA and Scheffe
4.	What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 representing a different number of years of teaching experience, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?	The specific leadership standard and the number of years of teaching experience	Belief of being able to demonstrate a specific leadership standard	3-13; 49-98	Mean, standard deviation, confidence intervals, frequency, ANOVA and Scheffe

Significance of the Study

This research study was conducted at the request of the professional development services designee of School District A. The significance of this study was impactful as it contributed valuable insight from program completers into the current program's effectiveness in preparing them for the job responsibilities of being an effective principal.

Results of this research were used to assist in designing a new principal preparation program to meet the specifications of newly enacted principal leadership standards in the state. Survey and interview results assisted the professional development services designee in differentiating instruction and preparation for newly appointed school leaders who are required to complete a principal certification program. The findings of this study were used to create improved preparation models, methods of delivery, learning environments and implementation strategies to promote effective use of time and resources available to the school district.

The results of this study contributed to the body of knowledge on the effectiveness of principal preparation programs, and serve as feedback to decision makers on both the school district and university levels in the further development of principal preparation programs.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study include:

1. Only one school district in the state of Florida was used in the study. Results may not be generalizable to other school districts or other states.
2. The sample of survey respondents was limited to existing employees of one school district in the state of Florida.

3. Some survey respondents may not answer the questions honestly. This impacts the validity of the results.
4. The sample population includes program completers serving in positions other than principal.

Assumptions

1. It is assumed the study participant completing the survey was a school leader who completed the school district developed PNPP between the years of 2008 and 2011.
2. It is assumed the study participant understands the vocabulary and concepts included in the questions on the survey instrument.
3. It is assumed that the study participants responded accurately and indicated their honest perceptions to the questions asked in the survey.
4. It is assumed the interpretation of the data collected accurately reflected the perceptions of the study participants.

Summary

Since the passing of the No Child Left Behind legislation, followed by Race To The Top competitive grants from the federal government, principals as well as the programs that recruit and prepare principals have been closely scrutinized. Holding public schools accountable for student achievement results is high on the priority list of all state legislatures. States are implementing value added models tied to standardized test scores and will be tracking achievement back to not only schools and teachers, but to the principals of those schools and the preparation programs they completed before becoming principals. Principal preparation

programs within individual school districts have become the focus of attention as schools come under more and more accountability requirements. By researching the perceptions of the program completers in School District A, it was possible to identify the challenges and strengths in the current program and inform the decisions that went into developing a new program to meet the new Florida principal leadership standards.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The adoption by the Florida State Board of Education of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) November 15, 2011 created the need to review and revise the methods schools used to prepare school leaders. By introducing these new standards, principals across the state were being held to new expectations they may not be prepared to meet. The methods and programs used to prepare principals for leading a school were based on the prior FPLS and yet, principals were being held accountable for meeting these new standards as they continued to lead schools in Florida. School district and university based leadership programs were required to take the new standards and redesign the programs offered to prepare future school leaders. This study reviewed literature that supports the changes in the leadership standards, as well as the methods and programs used to prepare school leaders.

A database search was conducted with the assistance of library resources at the University of Central Florida. A variety of databases were searched including: Education Full Text, ERIC, Dissertations & Theses Full Text, Academic Search Premier, PsychInfo, and Business Source Premier. The key words used to search the databases were leadership preparation, instructional leadership, educational change, standards, principals, administrator education, models, educational change, and program design. Literature was reviewed from online and print journals such as the Journal of College Teaching & Learning, the Journal of Research on Leadership Education, Educational Administration Quarterly, the International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice, the Journal of Scholarship & Practice,

Educational Review, the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation, Educational Leadership, Management in Education, the Journal of Educational Administration and History, the Journal of Staff Development, The Educational Forum, the Journal of School Leadership, and the Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education. A search of the book collection at the University of Central Florida's library was also conducted using key terms such as principal leadership, educational leadership, principal preparation programs, and principal internships. A selection of books was reviewed in addition to journal articles found through the database search. Information relevant to this study was included from the selected books and referenced throughout this literature review.

In addition to the database and book catalog searches, the Internet was used as a part of the literature review search. The websites of educational organizations were visited and resulted in a collection of working papers, technical reports, research articles, research briefs and program evaluations being added to the literature review. Research and information was included in this literature review from websites such as the Florida Department of Education, The Wallace Foundation, The Council for Educational Change, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Policy Board For Educational Administration, the Southern Regional Education Board, the University Council for Educational Administration, the Center for Educational Partnerships at Old Dominion University, Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Institute for Education and Social Policy, the Center for Comprehensive School Reform and the RAND Corporation. The results of the searches

conducted of these varied literature sources have culminated in this chapter as a review of the literature available on principal preparation programs and the standards behind their development.

This literature review was organized into four sections, starting with a review of the research on effective principals which lead to the development of leadership standards upon which principal preparation programs were built and ending with a review of specific principal preparation programs. Section one included the conceptual framework upon which leadership standards were based. Discussion focused on research that links principal characteristics and behaviors to student achievement and school improvement. The second section discussed the history of leadership standards and how they were developed as well as standards that formed the basis for principal preparation programs in 2012. Section three presented a discussion of the components of successful principal preparation programs and what made these components integral parts of the preparation process. The last section reviewed specific programs across the United States and how they prepared future school leaders to meet leadership standards.

Qualities of Effective Principals

Principal preparation programs are developed from sets of established leadership standards which in turn were created from research that was based on effective principal leadership characteristics and qualities of these principals. Research conducted by Branch, Hanushek, and Rivkin (2009) studied principals in Texas from 1995 to 2002. The study looked at the tenure of the principals in their schools and the effect on the school while they were the leader. Results showed the skills of the principal are more critical in high poverty, low achieving

schools. Branch et al. (2009) also found effective principals influenced student outcomes by their interactions with teachers. Effective principals recruited, developed and retained effective teachers which in turn increased student achievement (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Vanderhaar, Munoz, & Rodosky, 2006). This research also found the longer a principal remained at a school the more effective they became as they altered the learning environment through hiring decisions, familiarity with school operations, and the effectiveness of teaching staff. Vanderhaar, Munoz and Rodosky (2006) also found the students of principals who served their schools for seven or more years had higher achievement scores than principals with less years of experience.

Principals of schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty had different challenges than those in low poverty schools. The concentration of students in a school who live in poverty was a greater predictor of low student achievement than the individual student living in poverty (Hattie, 2009; Vanderhaar et al., 2006). These principals need a different set of skills and knowledge base to effectively impact student achievement (Branch et al., 2009; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Vanderhaar et al., 2006). Vanderhaar et al. (2006) stated, "the job of a principal can make a difference not only in transforming school structures, but also on student achievement" (p. 18).

Impact on Student Achievement

A meta-analysis conducted by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) reviewed 70 studies on how leadership effected student achievement. These 70 studies included approximately 1.1 million students and 14,000 teachers from 2,894 schools across the United

States. The data from this meta-analysis showed an average effect size, reported as a correlation, of $r = 0.25$ between student achievement and school leadership. The research conducted by Waters et al. (2003) also identified 21 leadership responsibilities along with the effect sizes of each on student achievement: culture (0.29); order (0.26); discipline (0.24); resources (0.26); curriculum, instruction and assessment (0.16); focus (0.24); knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment (0.24); visibility (0.16); contingent rewards (0.15); communication (0.23); outreach (0.28); input (0.30); affirmation (0.25); relationship (0.19); change agent (0.30); optimizer (0.20); ideals and beliefs (0.25); monitors and evaluates (0.28); flexibility (0.22); situational awareness (0.33); and intellectual stimulation (0.32). School leaders had a negative impact on student achievement outcomes, if focus was placed on the wrong responsibilities and practices, or the implications of making changes were overlooked (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

Research conducted by Waters et al. (2003) determined how a school leader implemented two specific variables lead to a positive or negative impact on student achievement. The first of these variables was the decisions a leader made as to which change to focus on in order to improve their school. The importance of focus was also supported by Reeves' (2011) research discussed later in this literature review. The second variable was the ability of the leader to determine the impact of the change decisions on the stakeholders of the school. As Waters et al. (2003) states, "effective leaders understand both the order of change they are leading and how to select and skillfully use appropriate leadership practices" (p. 8). Effective school leaders had an

understanding of first and second order change and how to choose which leadership responsibilities and practices were appropriate for implementing each initiative.

The results from this meta-analysis were seen in the work of Hattie (2009) and Reeves (2011) as they extended the research base on the effects of school principals on student achievement outcomes. In conducting a 15 year study of over 800 meta-analyses, Hattie (2009) studied the influences on student learning from over 50,000 research studies which included millions of students. Hattie (2009) decided to synthesize the results of these meta-analyses and communicate the overall impact of what works in schools and the impact on student achievement through what he called "the barometer of influences" (p. 18). The barometer showed the overall effect size of the strategy or influence studied. Hattie (2009) explained an effect size of $d = 0$ would mean there is no effect on student achievement, whereas an effect size of $d = 1$ would indicate an increase of one standard deviation or a two to three year advancement in student achievement. For his barometer, Hattie (2009) defined $d = 0.2$ as a low effect size, $d = 0.4$ as medium and $d = 0.6$ as large. He further defined his interpretation of results by defining the $d = 0.4$ effect size as the "hinge-point or h-point, as this is the point on the continuum that provides the hinge or fulcrum around which all other effects are interpreted" (p. 16). Hattie's (2009) research studied 138 influences and their impact on student achievement outcomes. Influences that had effect sizes $d = 0.4$ or higher he labeled as being in the "zone of desired effects" as these had the greatest impact on student achievement as an outcome. One of the influences Hattie (2009) studied in his review of meta-analyses was principals and their effect on student achievement.

Hattie (2009) studied 11 meta-analyses on the topic of a principal's influence on student achievement which included 491 individual studies. He found the effect size of the principal to be slightly below the "zone of desired effects" with $d = 0.36$. The standard error, or variance between the studies, was low at 0.031 and the effect size, $d = 0.36$, ranks 74th out of the 138 influences Hattie (2009) researched. Hattie (2009) described two distinct forms of leadership discussed in the meta-analyses: instructional leadership and transformational leadership. Instructional leaders were focused on clear goals and objectives, had high expectations, and maintained a safe and secure learning environment. Transformational leaders were focused on inspiring teachers, promoted a high moral purpose and were committed to working in collaborative teams to achieve high academic goals. The results of Hattie's (2009) review of the meta-analyses showed transformational leadership led to higher morale and job satisfaction levels of teachers but did not have a high effect on student achievement. The strongest correlations to student achievement were instructional leadership characteristics: organizational skills, communication, focused goals, willingness to change and approach learning differently, keeping teachers up to date on the latest research and practices, and monitoring student achievement levels regularly (Hattie, 2009; Vanderhaar et al., 2006). Hattie (2009) concluded, "school leaders and teachers need to create school, staffroom, and classroom environments where error is welcomed as a learning opportunity, where discarding incorrect knowledge and understandings is welcomed, and where participants can feel safe to learn, re-learn, and explore knowledge and understanding" (p. 239).

In a six year study conducted by Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010), the practices of successful leaders were investigated at multiple levels: school, district, and state. Data were collected from 180 schools, in 43 school districts, across nine states. The data collected included: surveys from 8,391 teachers and 471 school administrators; interviews with 581 teachers and administrators, 304 school district personnel, and 124 state personnel; and observations from 312 classrooms. This six year research study resulted in the finding "that leadership is second only to classroom instruction as an influence on student learning" (p. 9). Their research discovered school leaders influenced student achievement through influencing the motivation ($r = 0.55$) and working conditions of teachers ($r = 0.58$). However, Louis et al. (2010) discussed the impact of the individual leader on student achievement was not as great as that of collective leadership. The definition of collective leadership was the combined leadership influence of all stakeholders in the school community and allowing them to have input into school decisions. Research results indicated the stakeholders of higher achieving schools had more influence on school decisions. The researchers believed the higher achievement of these schools was partly due to the input of collective knowledge from the school community.

Survey and interview results from the study conducted by Louis et al. (2010) showed teachers and principals agreed on a set of leadership practices that were the most helpful for improving instruction. These practices included: focusing on goals and high expectations for student achievement; participating and monitoring professional learning for teachers; developing opportunities for teacher collaboration; monitoring classroom practice; mentoring new teachers; being accessible; and supporting teachers with discipline issues. Darling-Hammond, LaPointe,

Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007) found similar leadership practices through their research, including: shared vision and focus on instructional practices, organizational management, leading professional learning, and being an instrument of change.

Reeves (2011) conducted an analysis of the initiatives leaders focused on in over 2,000 schools in the United States and Canada. He used the Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring (PIM) School Improvement Audit to conducted double-blind reviews by using two researchers who evaluated the schools separately and then collaborated on their assessments. The PIM School Improvement Audit results in a score of 1 (needs improvement) to 3 (exemplary). Over 1.5 million students were included in the study and all participants were voluntary. The schools included high and low poverty, urban and rural, as well as schools with high and low numbers of English language learners and students with special needs. Reeves (2011) stated, "in our study we sought to understand where leaders placed their priorities and how persistent and pervasive was the loss of focus experienced by overloaded leaders, and the implications for student achievement" (p. 24). Louis et al. (2010) also discussed the need for school leaders to focus their attention on limited priorities. If a school leader focused on too many priorities at one time, the school environment became unstable and school improvement could not happen. Through his research, Reeves (2011) defined three competing demands of a school leader's attention: programs, processes and practices. Programs included structured delivery methods of content. Schools were overloaded with programs that take up time in the classroom, eat up resources, and take energy to implement. Processes included the policies, laws, labor relation agreements, school district regulations, teacher evaluations, and required reports and plans that took up a

leader's time. Practices included the "how" of teaching. How programs were delivered and processes were implemented. Reeves (2011) believed, "if there is a theme to the research on leadership impact, it is that "practices, not programs" are the key to developing and sustaining a high level of impact" (p. 25).

Deciding to focus his research on leadership practices, Reeves (2011) evaluated 15 identified leadership practices: comprehensive needs assessment, inquiry process, specific goals, measurable goals, achievable goals, relevant goals, timely goals, targeted research-based strategies, master plan design, professional learning emphasis, professional learning implementation, parental involvement strategies, monitoring plan, monitoring frequency, and evaluation cycle. His research results showed, of the 15 practices, three clusters emerged as the practices that highly impacted student achievement: focus, monitoring and efficacy. The first of these practices, focus, Reeves (2011) described with the "rule of six" (p. 27). He went on to define the "rule of six" as the leader's inability to focus on more than six school-wide initiatives linked to student achievement at a time. The second practice, monitoring, was linked to the six focus initiatives and had three characteristics to be effective: it should be frequent; consist of observing adult actions; and have a constructive purpose. The third practice, efficacy, was the leader's belief that he or she can influence student achievement through controlling internal school practices. These leaders believed the causes for student achievement were influenced by practices inside the school and not issues from outside the school they could not control. As Hattie (2009) stated, "the visibility of teaching and learning is indeed a within-school

phenomena, can be encouraged or discouraged by the culture and politics within schools, and probably can only be maximized as a function of within-school cultures and politics" (p. 63).

Reeves' (2011) research study "revealed that a combination of high scores in these three practices—focus, monitoring, and efficacy—yielded strikingly positive results for all schools and all subjects for which we were able to gather student achievement results" (p. 27). He clarified these results by explaining that student achievement was impacted when the leader was focused on six or less initiatives so that frequent monitoring could happen. This constructive monitoring practice lead to a belief that through the effectiveness of curriculum choices and teaching strategies, the leader could control student learning.

History of Leadership Standards for Principals

The belief that schools should be run like businesses has been prominent since the early twentieth century (Murphy, 2005). Murphy (2005) stated, "this perspective has been re-energized and refined over the decades as each new idea from the corporate sector is held up as a tool or framework that school administrators should adopt (e.g., management by objectives, total quality management, benchmarking, 360 degree evaluation, and so forth)" (p. 156). Following World War II, concepts from the social and behavioral sciences were integrated into the business concepts being used in the field of educational leadership and a two pronged approach to preparing educational leaders was born (Murphy, 2005). In 1994, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) created the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) to develop standards for the profession of educational leadership and standardize expectations for school leaders in the twenty-first century (Murphy, 2005).

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards

In 1996, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), which was comprised of a variety of educational organizations and councils, adopted a set of standards for educational leaders. The standards were developed by the NPBEA Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Steering Committee to serve as a set of guidelines for policymakers of all kinds to use when developing new state policies or legislation, university preparation programs, professional learning programs, licensure requirements, and possibly evaluation tools for educational leaders (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2008). According to the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO, 2008), when these standards were written and adopted, there was little research available on the link between educational leaders and student achievement and not much agreement between researchers on the qualities and characteristics of quality school leaders. The need to update and revise the ISLLC standards was apparent and in 2008 the Council of Chief State School Officers published an updated set of standards.

The CCSSO (2008) reported the new standards were created by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration through gathering input from leaders in the field of educational leadership, policymakers, educational organizations, universities, and professional councils. The NPBEA also reviewed the latest research in the field in order to ensure the updated standards would reflect the challenges of the wide variety of skills and behaviors educational leaders must master to be effective in their roles. The 2008 ISLLC Standards were organized into six overarching categories of leadership responsibilities and then further defined

by the specific behaviors and skills a leader needed to demonstrate in order to have a positive influence on student achievement (CCSSO, 2008). The six broad standards called for leaders who were:

1. Setting a widely shared vision for learning;
2. Developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;
3. Ensuring effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
4. Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and
6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal, and cultural context. (CCSSO, 2008, p.6)

The CCSSO (2008) viewed these standards as a set of guidelines used nationally by states to implement consistent expectations of educational leaders at all levels and ultimately to have a positive impact on student achievement. The members of the CCSSO (2008) believed states across the nation would use these standards as the foundation for policy because they "provide high-level guidance and insight about the traits, functions of work, and responsibilities they will ask of their school and district leaders" (p. 5). It was the goal of the CCSSO (2008) that the 2008 ISLLC policy standards would be used by states to assess and refine their existing educational leadership preparation programs, create new education policies to standardize expectations, make

changes to system supports, evaluate the performance of current administrators, develop professional learning programs to benefit educators throughout their careers, and improve the working conditions of educational institutions.

Another perspective on the ISLLC standards was promoted by English (2012) through his concept of misrecognition. English (2012) defined the concept of misrecognition as the failure of educational leaders who developed and promoted the standards to recognize how their own interests and political power had influenced how these standards were written and the purpose behind implementation at a national level. He contended that the political positions of the educational leaders within organizations like the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), who worked as part of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration which adopted the ISLCC standards, had a key influence over the development of these standards and how they were ultimately accepted as the standardized expectations within the field (English, 2012). The influence of organizations like CCSSO shifted the focus of leadership preparation from university programs to specific skills and behaviors embedded within the licensing for school leadership positions (English, 2012). English (2012) believed, the ISLLC standards had taken a one size fits all approach to leadership development. He argued "important differences between roles are erased or marginalized" within the standards and "in other cases, some skills desirable and necessary at one level may be unnecessary or performed very differently at the next level" (p. 167).

According to English (2012), "to believe that the ISLLC standards are good for all leaders in all situations in all times is an example of a 'focusing illusion', that is, a

misrecognition" (p. 169). Standards for educational leaders need to be built on "knowledge dynamic" (English, 2006, p. 466) instead of the knowledge base used by the 2008 ISLLC standards. He went on to describe knowledge dynamic as a "shifting and fluid universe" (English, 2006, p. 466). The shift from knowledge base to knowledge dynamic changed standards from "static lists of decontextualized skills to an emphasis on contextual relevance and specificity and the art of application in such contexts" (English, 2006, p. 466). Defining a knowledge base in the field of educational leadership was limiting and led to the exclusion of important conceptual knowledge (English, 2006, 2012). As states adopted educational leadership standards based on the ISLLC standards and universities used the standards to design preparation programs for aspiring educational leaders, English (2006, 2012) contended our nation was creating standardized leaders who would not be prepared to lead the in the changing environments of schools.

In response to criticism of the ISLLC standards, Murphy (2005) said, "the design never called for mapping all the dimensions of educational leadership and every indicator of practice in every context" (p. 171). He further explained the intention of the consortium was to identify the most prominent knowledge and concepts in the field and to integrate other areas of educational leadership that influence student achievement and school improvement (Murphy, 2005). According to Murphy (2005), "the goal has been to generate a critical mass of energy to move school administration out of its 100-year orbit and to reposition the profession around leadership for learning" (p. 180).

Performance Expectations and Indicators for Education Leaders

The same year as the publication of the ISLLC 2008 policy standards, the CCSSO facilitated the creation of the *Performance Expectations and Indicators for Education Leaders* through a national collaboration of state education agency (SEA) personnel in the State Consortium on Education Leadership (SCEL) (Sanders & Kearney, 2008). The SCEL worked for four years collaborating on ideas and methods to improve educational policies, programs and practices and the results are contained in a resource and guide to implementing the ISLLC standards. According to Sanders and Kearney (2008), the purpose of the guide is "to provide a resource for policymakers and educators in states, school districts, and programs to analyze and prioritize expectations of education leaders in various roles and at strategic stages in their careers" (p. 1). These performance expectations and the corresponding indicators are meant to assist states in developing and implementing their own standards and programs by delineating observable and measurable behaviors and actions of leaders in various stages of their leadership development. The guide is organized into six overarching leadership expectations, which include: vision, mission and goals; teaching and learning; managing organizational systems and safety; collaborating with families and stakeholders; ethics and integrity; and the educational system (Sanders & Kearney, 2008, p. 4).

The *Performance Expectations and Indicators* purposefully used the ISLLC standards as the basis for the six defined leadership expectations. Sanders and Kearney (2008) explained, "because of the extensive use of the ISLLC standards in policies and programs, they are seen as *de facto* national leadership standards" (p. 5). The standards alone are not enough for an

effective policy system for educational leaders; these expectations support the standards by further clarifying how a leader would effectively achieve the standard. There is an important distinction between the standards and the performance expectations. As an example, one of the ISLLC standards states a school leader must effectively manage the operations of the school (standard), but knowing how to make that happen on a daily basis (performance) is a different kind of knowledge (Sanders & Kearney, 2008).

Sanders and Kearney (2008) encouraged the use of the performance expectations by states and school districts to support continued growth of educational leaders across their careers, to identify the critical knowledge and skills for different levels of leaders, and to structure induction activities to develop leaders over time. Leaders grow from the beginning level of their careers to becoming a mentor to other leaders or serving as a turn-around specialist and their expected level of performance should be different at each of these stages (Sanders & Kearney, 2008). Sanders and Kearney (2008) concluded this resource is a powerful tool "to recruit, train, guide and support high-quality leaders needed in our nation's districts and schools" (p. 12).

Florida Principal Leadership Standards

Since the passing of federal No Child Left Behind legislation, states across the nation have passed similar legislation with the ultimate goal of holding school districts and schools accountable for student achievement results. A strong link between school leadership and student achievement is shown and as a result, many states have adopted statewide leadership standards (Vitaska, 2008). States used leadership standards as the basis for professional learning programs, leadership preparation, induction and mentoring, certification requirements,

performance evaluations, and salary incentives (Vitaska, 2008). Vitaska (2008) reported more than 40 states have based their state leadership standards on the 1996 ISLLC standards.

In Florida, principal leadership standards were established by the Florida State Board of Education in 2005. The Florida Principal Leadership Standards, Florida Administrative Rule 6A-5.080, as adopted in 2005, included only three standards for school leaders. This first version of the standards called for Florida's leaders to be able to demonstrate competence in the areas of instructional leadership, operational leadership, and school leadership (Florida State Board of Education, 2005). These three standards were broken down into skills that should be demonstrated as follows:

1. Instructional Leadership: instructional leadership; managing the learning environment;
2. Operational Leadership: school environment; learning, accountability and assessment; decision making strategies; technology; human resource development; ethical leadership; and
3. School Leadership: vision; community and stakeholder partnerships; diversity. (Florida State Board of Education, 2005, p. 1)

In March 2011, the Florida State Board of Education began working on revising these standards as a result of Florida's 2010 Student Success Act and Race To The Top (RTTP) requirements for educational leaders. The newly revised version of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards was adopted in November 2011 and became effective in December 2011 (Florida State Board of Education, 2011). The Florida State Board of Education (2011) states,

"the standards are based on contemporary research on multi-dimensional school leadership, and represent skill sets and knowledge bases needed in effective schools" (p. 1). The revisions of the standards were extensive as the State Board of Education expanded them from three standards with little clarification to ten standards grouped within four leadership domains. Each of the ten standards included descriptors which are the skills and actions the state expects school leaders to demonstrate. The State Board of Education (2011) included the descriptors to meet the needs of school districts as they develop professional learning programs, curriculum for preparation programs, proficiency assessments and performance evaluations for school leaders. The four domains included student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership and professional and ethical behavior (Florida State Board of Education, 2011). The first domain, student achievement, includes standards focused on student learning results and student learning as a priority. The second domain, instructional leadership, includes standards focused on instructional plan implementation, faculty development, and learning environment. The third domain, organizational leadership, includes standards focused on decision making, leadership development, school management, and communication. The fourth domain, professional and ethical behavior, includes the last standard focused on professional and ethical behaviors.

In order to qualify for principal certification in the state of Florida, a candidate must complete two levels of school leadership programs. Descriptions of the two levels of programs are included in Florida Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081 (Florida Board of Education, 2007). The purpose of the first level (Level I), as described in Rule 6A-5.081, is to gain initial certification in educational leadership by completing a state approved Masters Degree program.

Level I certification is required in order to serve as an assistant principal in the state. The second level of certification (Level II) builds on leadership preparation experiences from Level I programs and upon completion allows for School Principal certification. The Level II programs are designed and implemented by individual school districts across the state and must be approved by the Florida Board of Education.

Characteristics of Effective Principal Preparation Programs

According to Hallinger (2003), "overall, it is fair to say that in 1980 both pre-service and in-service training for principals and other school leaders were non-systemic, optional, and sparsely provided globally" (p. 4). He described the general trend for preparation was to ensure principals had an awareness of government regulations. In the United States in the 1980's, principal professional learning consisted of attendance at the annual professional conference conducted by the principal's association.

In the 1990s as states developed new accountability policies, the role of the principal became to align all aspects of a school environment so that instruction and student achievement increased (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007; Hallinger, 2003). The primary focus of principals shifted to ensuring all students were successful. Traditionally, principals have not had the early career support and on-going learning opportunities that other professions like doctors had as a matter of practice (Caldwell, 2003; Darling-Hammond et al., 2007).

Vanderhaar et al. (2006) commented, "the pressure to reform schools has forced school districts to examine their administrator recruitment and preparation efforts to ensure that

qualified principal candidates are both available and well-prepared when an opening occurs" (p. 18). Principal preparation programs should focus on the instructional knowledge, skills and practices that enable principals to ensure increases in student academic achievement no matter what type of school they are leading (Marzano et al., 2005; Vanderhaar et al., 2006).

In the meta-analysis conducted by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) a synthesis of the research showed increasing a principal's leadership abilities will translate into an increase in student achievement results. Marzano et al. (2005) developed a plan of action based on their research results for school leaders to implement their visions for school improvement and increasing student achievement. The plan suggested by these researchers involves the following five steps: "develop a strong leadership team; distribute some responsibilities throughout the leadership team; select the right work; identify the order of magnitude implied by the selected work; and match the management style to the order of magnitude of the change initiative" (p. 98).

Louis et al. (2010) included suggestions for school district preparation programs based on the results of their research connecting school leaders to student achievement. In order to promote collective leadership within schools, school districts should incorporate learning experiences for principals on how to extend decision making power to other stakeholders (teachers, parents, and students) in the school community. According to Louis et al. (2010), "principal preparation and professional learning programs should continue to emphasize both the 'softer' (emotional) and the 'harder' (behavioral) aspects of leadership" (p. 53). They emphasized the need for differentiated preparation for middle and high school principals since

they are faced with large, complex systems and have specific needs for influencing achievement in their schools. Differentiated preparation programs are also needed for leaders of schools with high levels of poverty. The skills necessary to successfully implement school improvement initiatives in these low achieving schools are very different from higher achieving schools and these principals will need much more support as they engage in the work necessary for improvement (Louis et al., 2010). School leaders should be taught how to develop teacher leaders within the school to encourage their participation in decision making and implementation of innovative teaching practices (Louis et al., 2010; Marzano et al., 2005). Above all else, Louis et al. (2010) cautioned against development of "one size fits all" preparation programs for school leaders (p. 101). Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007) agreed with the idea of differentiating principal preparation programs and staying away from standardized programs where all leaders complete the same requirements no matter where they will be working as a school leader.

In his blueprint for successful leadership, Caldwell (2003) defined 10 domains principals need to put into practice in order to be successful leaders. Effective preparation programs should include professional learning experiences in these areas: curriculum, pedagogy, design, professionalism, leader development, resources, knowledge management, governance, boundary spanning, and international protocols. Caldwell (2003) called for school leaders to develop "a capacity for systematic abandonment" (p. 35). He described abandonment as the practice of letting go of methods and practices that have become common place and acceptable within schools. Leaders need to be taught a willingness to change the status quo and abandon

curriculum, strategies, practices, and traditions that will not help advance the belief that all students can achieve at high levels.

Heck (2003) conducted a study of a school district's administrative preparation program, similar to a Level II certification program in Florida. The program had 180 graduates over a five year period. Of the 180 graduates of the program, 36 have become principals and 24 of these volunteered to be interviewed for this study. The preparation program these new principals participated in included the following components: a cohort format; integrated university coursework; seminars with principals and university professors; and a year-long paid internship in a school (Heck, 2003). The data from the interviews identified three commonalities that were contributing factors to the candidate becoming a principal. The first commonality was a perception and belief of being prepared. The new principals reported having clear knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of a principal. The second commonality was the development and maintenance of networks of support with other principals. These new principals had consistent communication with their colleagues, mentors and former cohort members, creating a network of educators to rely on for advice and moral support. The third and final practice they had in common was the evolution of their professional learning needs as they advanced in their careers. These new principals sought different types of professional learning depending on their school assignments and their professional growth needs as they gained experience on the job. Heck (2003) concluded, "administrative preparation programs should maximize formal learning opportunities and in-context growth once students occupy administrative positions to allow new administrators to develop behavioral options for varying school contexts and needs" (p. 252).

A study of four exemplary professional learning programs for developing principals was conducted by Darling-Hammond et al. (2007). The programs studied included San Diego Unified School District in California, Region 1 of the New York City Public Schools in New York, Hartford Public Schools in Connecticut, and Jefferson County in Kentucky. The study included conducting interviews, reviewing documents, observing meetings and professional learning workshops as well as observing principals on the job. The purpose of the research was to discover if there were preparation programs that reliably produced effective school leaders. All four programs had principals engaged in powerful learning experiences through visiting other schools and engaging in discussions of how to use teacher evaluation and learning to improve instruction. The programs also offered professional learning focused on curriculum and instructional practices, mentoring and networking experiences, and peer coaching. The study found three common features within the school district professional learning programs (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007). The first commonality was a learning continuum established from pre-service preparation through later career principals including retired principals mentoring new principals. The second commonality was leadership learning grounded in practice, including observing and evaluating teachers as well as professional reading and discussions organized around leadership models. The third and final commonality was established collegial learning networks like study groups, mentoring and peer coaching to give leaders a community of shared practices and a source of support and advice. Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) concluded, "we found that the exemplary in-service programs had developed a comprehensive approach to developing practice in practice, through a well connected set of learning opportunities that are

informed by a coherent view of teaching and learning and are grounded in both theory and practice" (p. 146).

The Wallace Foundation (2012) studied school leaders and leadership skills for more than 10 years. Through their extensive research they have identified five core responsibilities for school leaders, "shaping a vision of academic success for all students; creating a climate hospitable to education; cultivating leadership in others; improving instruction; and managing people, data and processes to foster school improvement" (p. 4). This list of five key principal functions summarizes the research and gives a focus for principal preparation programs.

Principal Preparation Programs

States and school districts across the United States are feeling the pressure of finding, preparing and retaining effective school principals who have the skills to positively impact student achievement and not just manage the school building (Mitgang, 2012). According to Mitgang (2012), in his report produced for The Wallace Foundation, "early indications are that there may be payoffs for students in having better-trained principals" (p. 5). Mitgang (2012) has compiled five lessons for school districts in developing principal preparation programs, which apply to Level II certification programs in Florida.

The first lesson described by Mitgang (2012) was to be selective in the process of identifying potential leaders for participation in the school district program. Many school districts were using research based screening tools to identify promising candidates based on their background experiences and leadership skills as well as their personal beliefs and values. These tools allowed school districts to raise the quality of candidates in the administrative pool

and ensured the drive for being a school leader was present before the school district spent time and money to prepare the candidate. School districts should also screen for diversity among the candidates to fit the needs of the schools they could be leading.

Mitgang's (2012) second lesson was to develop program curriculum that developed principals who were ready to lead change in schools and improve instruction. This included a meaningful internship experience that was more than shadowing a principal at a school location. The curriculum and the internship should lead the principal candidate through analyzing and responding to real-world challenges and issues. These findings were also supported by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB, 2007) through research conducted on the internship experience. The study surveyed principals in the 16 state SREB region who served as mentors to aspiring school leaders during their formal internships. The results of the research found, like Mitgang (2012), the need for authentic, problem-based experiences that allowed the intern to move beyond routine tasks and managerial duties to leading teams of teachers to analyze problems and find solutions (Simmons et al., 2007; SREB, 2007).

The third lesson described by Mitgang (2012) was that school districts should focus their programs on the needs of the schools within the school district and collaborate with nearby universities to develop initial certification leadership programs to assure the pool of candidates will have the qualifications necessary to meet the needs of the schools (Hitt, Tucker, & Young, 2012; Mitgang, 2012; Simmons et al., 2007).

The fourth lesson was for states to support school district efforts through "a methodical channeling of state authority and funding toward the goal of building a pipeline of well-qualified

school leaders in concert with districts, universities and other training providers" (Mitgang, 2012, p. 20). SREB (2007) agreed with this lesson and stated, "interns and their mentors have been left to their own capabilities—with little support or few guarantees of high-quality learning experiences to benefit the state in leading school improvement efforts" (p. 69). States should make an investment to prepare principals to be effective mentors so authentic internship experiences can happen (SREB, 2007).

The fifth and final lesson described by Mitgang (2012) involved preparation and support for principals after they are hired and hit the ground running in their schools, as would be in Florida with school district based Level II principal preparation programs for advanced certification. Well designed mentoring programs and on-going professional learning throughout the career of a principal are critical pieces to retaining leaders in schools (Hitt et al., 2012; Mitgang, 2012; Simmons et al., 2007). Research on mentoring programs for new school leaders within their first year on the job was conducted by The Wallace Foundation (2007) through site visits of schools in New York City and Jefferson County, Kentucky public schools. The Wallace Foundation (2007) believed "the days of 'sink or swim' for new principals must end if they are to stand any reasonable chance of succeeding in their increasingly tough jobs" (p. 3). Results of the research conducted by The Wallace Foundation (2007) produced the following suggestions for school districts when developing mentor programs for new principals: require professional learning experiences for the mentor; focus mentoring activities on leadership behaviors and beliefs for improving instruction; establish a mentoring period of at least a year; designate enough funding for the program to provide quality professional learning experiences and

stipends; and establish mentoring to "provide the new principal with the knowledge, skills and courage to become leaders of change" (p. 4).

These five areas of focus for preparation programs were mirrored in research done by Hitt, Tucker, and Young (2012) in their description of the phases of building a "professional pipeline for educational leadership" (p. 1). The pipeline started with the pre-service phase which includes recruitment, selection, and preparation. In Florida, the pre-service phase is obtaining Level I certification after completing a Masters Degree in educational leadership. The pipeline then moves on to the professional learning phase which includes recruitment and selection, induction and then on-going professional learning throughout the career of the leader. This phase includes Level II professional learning programs for principal certification developed by school districts in the state of Florida.

Florida's Professional Learning for School Leaders

In 2006, the Florida legislature passed the William Cecil Golden professional learning program for school leaders (F.S. 1012.986, 2012). The program was established to support instructional leaders throughout the state and offer a one-stop-shop for professional learning and collaborative networking. The goals of the program were outlined in the legislation as: providing resources and tools for instructional leadership; serving as a clearinghouse for research based information for increasing student achievement; increasing the quality of pre-service and professional learning programs for principals; and supporting research based instructional practices. The law also calls for the Florida Department of Education to offer this program through a variety of delivery methods including: approved school district preparation programs;

technology based instruction; regional consortium organizations; and leadership academies. In order to facilitate delivery of the William Cecil Golden program, the Florida Department of Education created the Florida School Leaders website.

The Florida School Leaders website, located at www.floridaschoolleaders.org, was created to help school leaders expand their skills and meet their professional learning needs as they progress through their careers. The website is a clearinghouse for resources and information to assist Florida school leaders in meeting the requirements of Florida's Principal Leadership Standards (Florida Department of Education, 2006). This website is the William Cecil Golden professional learning program for school leaders and it incorporates a variety of resources for school leaders. Resources available on the website include: information on conferences offered across the state; on-line courses and learning modules; materials for facilitating leadership activities with teachers on a variety of topics; professional journal articles and newspaper article links; links to other websites of educational interest; toolkits for leading school improvement, lesson study, and change initiatives; access to groups for networking and collegial support; and tools for tracking personal professional learning activities (Florida Department of Education, 2006).

The Florida Board of Education followed this legislation by instituting Board Rule 6A-5.081, for approval of school leadership programs. This rule was established in 2007 and sets forth the requirements for school districts to seek approval for Level II programs designed to grant school principal certification in the state of Florida (Florida Board of Education, 2007). The rule allows the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) to approve a school district Level

II principal certification program for a period of seven years, after which the approval must be renewed. Approved programs must be developmental and based on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The Level II programs are required to incorporate the William Cecil Golden school professional learning program for school leaders in order to ensure consistency in leadership development statewide.

Florida Turnaround Leaders Program

As a part of Florida's Race To The Top application, the Florida Department of Education partnered with the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), participating school districts, and two universities to develop the Florida Turnaround Leaders Program (Florida Department of Education, 2012). The program which started in 2012 was designed to be two and a half years long with the goal of preparing aspiring school leaders to improve student achievement in chronically low performing secondary schools. The Florida Turnaround Leaders Program includes both Level I and Level II certification since participants earn a Masters Degree in educational leadership, Level I, as well as complete requirements for principal certification, Level II. Seven school districts and select charter schools in the state participated with 80 to 100 aspiring leaders in the program. The program is completely funded through Florida's Race to the Top grant, so there is no financial obligation from participating school districts or the participants. The program is modeled after the University of Virginia School Turnaround Specialist Program curriculum and program components. The key components of the Florida Turnaround Leaders Program include: ten quarterly seminars covering SREB developed modules along with four on-line modules; a master's degree in Educational Leadership for those

who do not already have one (half the cost paid by the program); a year-long practicum where small groups of participants will work at case study schools under a professional learning mentor principal; a six month internship experience at a low performing secondary school including the completion of an action research project; and completion of a performance-based portfolio to document the knowledge and skills the participant has mastered through this program (Florida Department of Education, 2012).

Summary

Vanderhaar et al. (2006) conducted a research study in a large urban school district in the Midwest that included 133 schools and approximately 96,000 students. The study included approximately 91 principals with two or more years of experience who were working in the study school district. Results of the research study found "no statistically significant main effect of school district preparation on achievement scores" (p. 27). In other words, this research did not find a link between the principal participating in the school district preparation program and an increase in student achievement at their school. However, as Mitgang (2012) states in his review of preparation programs for The Wallace Foundation, "maintaining subpar leadership training also carries a cost: principals ill prepared to survive the stresses of their jobs and lacking the qualities and skills to turn around failing schools. The cost will be borne most heavily by schoolchildren" (p. 27).

As school districts design Level II principal preparation programs for principal certification, relevant research and reports should be reviewed to ensure school leaders receive

the most up-to-date professional learning and experiences to prepare them for the responsibilities and stresses of the job.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In Florida, there are two levels of school leadership programs leading to the certification needed to serve as a school principal in the state. These two levels of programs are described in Florida Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081 (Florida Board of Education, 2007). The purpose of a Level I program, as described in Rule 6A-5.081, is to gain initial certification in educational leadership which allows educators to serve as assistant principals in the state. A Level II program builds on leadership preparation experiences from Level I programs and upon completion allows for School Principal certification. This study was conducted in a large urban school district in the state of Florida, referred to as School District A. School District A includes 900 administrators (school and non-school based), 12,747 instructional staff and 180,307 students. Student racial distribution is: 41% White; 30% Black; 21% Hispanic; 4% Asian; 3% Multi-cultural; 1% American Indian or Alaska Native. In the school district, 60% of the students qualify for the federal free and reduced lunch program.

The study was initiated at the request of the professional development services designee in School District A to inform the development of a new principal preparation program for Level II principal certification. The research questions were tested using the methodology described in this chapter. The chapter is organized into five sections beginning in section one with the purpose of the study and the research questions posed for investigation. Section two describes the study participants and the characteristics of this group. The third section includes the development of the survey instrument used to gather data from the participants. In the fourth

section, the data collection procedures are delineated and section five describes how the data were analyzed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the extent to which school leaders who completed School District A's principal preparation program from 2008 to 2011 perceived the program's effectiveness in successfully preparing them to demonstrate the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). This study identified the components of the preparation program that influenced the professional practice of program completers in their current leadership roles within School District A. Research results informed the development of a principal preparation program aligned with the new FPLS. Additionally, the needs of urban versus suburban school leaders were examined and input given for differentiating the principal preparation program to meet their specific needs. Taking into account research on the qualities of effective principals including their impact on student achievement as well as characteristics of successful principal preparation programs, four research questions were formulated as the focus of this research study.

1. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived value of the constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program, in influencing the professional practice of program completers from 2008-2011, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?
2. To what extent, if any, do program completers from 2008-2011 believe the Preparing New Principals Program enabled them to demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

3. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 serving schools with varying socio-economic status levels, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?
4. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 representing a different number of years of teaching experience, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

Participants

This study used the entire population of administrators in School District A, who had completed the school district approved principal preparation program from 2008 to 2011. In order to participate in School District A's PNPP, an employee had to be appointed to an assistant principal position and hold Level I certification in the state of Florida in Educational Leadership. The professional development services designee in School District A was contacted for the list of employees who had completed the PNPP from 2008 to 2011. The list included 90 employees, 55 were female and 35 were male and their ages range from 31 years old to more than 60. In 2012, when this study was conducted, 41 were principals, 40 were assistant principals, three were working in school district-level positions, two were teachers, and four were no longer employed in School District A. Of the employees working in schools, there were 43 at the elementary level, 25 at the middle school level, 14 at the high school level, and one at a K-8 school.

This study surveyed the entire population of 90 employees. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) suggest a sample size of 73 when the population size is 90. However, the targeted population was available as well as easily accessible and there was no need to pull a sample of the population (Krathwohl, 2009; Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Surveying the entire population will give School District A results for the most recent graduates of the Preparing New Principals Program and allow the researcher to report reliable results (Krathwohl, 2009). The purpose of the study was to inform School District A of the perceptions of the program graduates, so results were not intended to be generalized to a larger population of school district employees or school administrators in other school districts in Florida. Results of this study do not have external generality because the circumstances under which the study was conducted were specific to the school district and the principal preparation program being analyzed (Krathwohl, 2009).

Follow-up interviews were conducted with six survey participants, seven percent of the population. This nonrandom sample of the larger population was selected because they volunteered to be interviewed by the researcher. According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), for qualitative research it is optimal to use between 1 and 20 participants. The six volunteers included five male, one female, two assistant principals and four principals. The six volunteers also worked at different school levels, three at the elementary level, two at the middle school level and one at the high school level.

Instrumentation

The Preparing New Principals Program Completer Survey (Appendix A) was developed by the researcher to meet the needs of this study. A draft survey was created after discussions

with the professional development services designee of School District A and reviewing the components of the PNPP and the FPLS adopted November 15, 2011. Questions were written to be short, clear, and unbiased so participants had consistent responses and questions were answered as the researcher intended which supports the internal validity of the survey (Ritter & Sue, 2007a). In order to include all information requested by the professional development services designee in School District A, the survey contained 117 questions. The length was a concern, but according to Ritter and Sue (2007b) should not affect the response rate since the targeted population was employed by School District A and had a vested interest in completing the survey and the time required to complete the survey was not unreasonable. The draft survey was reviewed for content validity and readability by knowledgeable experts in the field of education and within School District A. Additional doctorial students with experience in educational leadership and survey construction were also consulted during the construction of the survey. These doctorial students gave input on the clarity of the questions and their understanding of the intended purpose of each question, thereby providing additional content validity. The survey was edited and revised based on the input of these professionals. An electronic format was used for delivery of the survey to the study participants. An internet based survey application was selected for the appealing format of questions, low cost of distribution, ease of responding for participants and rapid response capability (Krathwohl, 2009; Ritter & Sue, 2007a, 2007b). The electronic survey was piloted by sending it to assistant principals and principals within School District A, who were not included in the target population. These

educators completed the electronic survey and reviewed it for ease of use, readability and content validity (Krathwohl, 2009). Changes and revisions were made based on their feedback.

According to Ritter and Sue (2007a), the survey contained three categories of questions: attitude, factual, and demographic. Questions were organized into seven sections. Section one, questions 1 to 15, included multiple choice and open-ended questions. Section two, questions 16 to 48, used a Likert scale to measure the value each participant placed on the required components of the PNPP. These required components of the program were organized into three constructs as shown in Table 2. Section three, questions 49 to 98, used a Likert scale to assess the participants' level of preparation to meet the 2011 FPLS. Sections four, five and six, questions 99 to 115, asked the participant to rank order the types of experiences and methods of content delivery within the preparation program. Section seven, questions 116 and 117, asked open-ended questions to provide input on how program effectiveness could be improved. As a follow-up, at the end of the survey, participants were offered an opportunity to volunteer to be interviewed by the researcher.

Table 2

Survey Constructs and Item Numbers

Construct	Survey Items
Instructional Leadership	16-30
Building Community and Decision Making	31-39
Technical Knowledge	40-48

Structured interview questions were developed for follow-up interviews based on responses given to the open-ended questions in the survey (Krathwohl, 2009). The same

questions were asked of each volunteer participant and consisted of four open-ended opinion questions (Appendix B). Additional probing questions were asked as follow-up to participant responses to clarify the response or determine the participant's thinking.

Data Collection Procedures

The research design used for this study was mixed methods of qualitative and quantitative data collected through the use of a confidential perceptual survey and structured interviews. The procedures used to collect data for each method are described separately.

Quantitative

In February 2012, the researcher met with the professional development services designee of School District A to gather the information needed to design the survey instrument and discuss the type of data that needed to be collected by the survey. A survey was drafted and approved by the professional development services designee of School District A. The proposal for the research study was submitted to the Institutional Review Board of the University of Central Florida in March 2012 and approval was granted (Appendix E). The research proposal was then submitted to School District A for approval from the Senior Director of Accountability, Research and Assessment. This approval was granted in March 2012 as well (Appendix F). An internet based survey distribution tool was chosen and the survey was designed and piloted before being sent to the population of 90 employees in School District A. After the survey was piloted and revisions were made to fix the glitches, the researcher contacted the professional development services designee of School District A to send an email to the 90 employees in the targeted population encouraging them to participate in the research study and letting them know

the researcher would be contacting them soon. The professional development services designee of School District A is the supervisor of the Preparing New Principals Program, lending her sponsorship to this research study gave the study legitimacy and established a reason for the participant to complete the survey (Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2009).

In order to improve response rates for the electronic survey, the researcher used elements of the tailored design method as described by Dillman, Smyth and Christian (2009). The sponsor provided the first contact in May 2012 and established the importance of the research study and asked for participant input because it was needed to improve the existing program. The researcher contacted the 90 employees a week later via email with information about the research study, an invitation to participate, the consent letter (Appendix C), and an electronic link to the survey. The research participants were not identified or tied to their survey responses in any way. The researcher knew the identities of the original 90 employees invited to participate, but their responses to the survey were completely anonymous. Following the second email contact, 48 participants, 53 percent of the population, completed the survey. Since the participants were not identified in any way and responses were anonymous; the researcher did not know who had and who had not completed the survey. A third contact was made a week later via email thanking those who had already completed the survey and asking for those who had not completed it to consider participating. Following the third contact there were an additional five survey responses, bringing the total number of responses to 53, 59 percent of the population. The final contact was made a week later and resulted in three additional responses by the end of

July, bringing the total to 56 completed surveys, 62 percent of the population. The survey link was open and accepting responses from May 14 to July 30, 2012.

Qualitative

After analyzing the responses to the open-ended questions in the PNPP Survey, interview questions were developed and the six interview volunteers were contacted to schedule face to face interviews. According to Krathwohl (2009) interviews conducted face to face will allow the researcher to establish trust, use body language to show interest in responses and illicit more information from the interviewee. Since the researcher is also an employee of School District A, there was an existing relationship between the researcher and each of the six interview volunteers. Therefore the interviewees were comfortable talking to the researcher and establishing a trust relationship was not difficult. Interviews were conducted over a two week period in December 2012. The researcher met with five of the interviewees at their schools and one at a mutually agreed upon location off school property for the convenience of the interviewee.

Each interview began with the researcher thanking the volunteer for participating and assuring them their identity will be protected. The interviewee was asked to sign a consent letter for the interview (Appendix D). The consent letter included permission to record the interview. The researcher used a recording application on an ipad to electronically record the interview. Each interviewee was asked the same structured questions and probed for clarification as necessary during the interview. Following the interview, the recording was transcribed word for

word by the researcher and then the recording was deleted. Interviews were coded with a number and only the researcher knew which volunteer matched each number.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed according to the type of data collected. The method of analysis for the quantitative and qualitative data collected is described separately. A description of the research questions, the independent and dependent variables, corresponding item numbers from the survey and the statistical method used for analysis can be found in Table 1, Chapter 1.

Quantitative

The data collected from the 56 responses to the electronic survey were uploaded into SPSS version 20 for statistical analysis. Steinberg (2011) guided the researcher in deciding which statistical tests to run for each research question. Analysis for research question one used items 16 to 48 on the PNPP survey. Responses to the Likert scale for these items were given a corresponding number 1 to 4 and uploaded into SPSS version 20 to find the mean, standard deviation, confidence interval and frequency for each item. These descriptive statistics were reported and combined into constructs as described in Table 2. A mean for each construct was calculated and an ANOVA was conducted to determine any differences between the mean values of each construct. A significance level of .01 ($p = .01$) was used as the common level for statistical significance (Lomax, 2007). A Tukey LSD was conducted as a follow-up to the ANOVA for results with statistical significance at the $p = .01$ level in order to find the specific construct that caused the significance.

Research question two was analyzed with descriptive statistics for each of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). Responses to the Likert scale for these items were given a corresponding number 1 to 5 and uploaded into SPSS version 20 to find the mean, standard deviation, confidence interval and frequency were reported for each item 49 to 98.

Research questions three and four were analyzed by combining the FPLS into four domains: student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behavior. The items included in each domain are listed in Table 3. A mean was calculated for each domain and then was used to calculate an ANOVA. A Scheffe's post-hoc test was used if statistical significance was found in order to determine between which domains the significance occurred. Descriptive statistics including the mean, standard deviation, and confidence interval were also reported.

Table 3

Florida Principal Leadership Standards Domains and Item Numbers

Domain	Survey Items
Student Achievement	49-54
Instructional Leadership	55-71
Organizational Leadership	72-92
Professional and Ethical Behavior	93-98

For research question three, an ANOVA was calculated to find the difference in the level of preparation to meet the standards in each domain and the socio-economic status of the school. An ANOVA was calculated for each of the four domains. A Scheffe's post-hoc test was conducted as a follow-up to the ANOVA for results with statistical significance at the $p = .01$ level in order to find the specific socio-economic percentage that caused the significance.

To analyze results for research question four, an ANOVA was calculated to find the difference in the level of preparation to meet the standards in each domain and the years of teaching experience. An ANOVA was calculated for each of the four domains. A Scheffe's post-hoc test was conducted as a follow-up to the ANOVA for results with statistical significance at the $p = .05$ level in order to find the specific demographic measure that caused the significance.

Qualitative

Data collected from the interviews were analyzed using a constant comparison method, or coding, as described by Krathwohl (2009). The transcribed interviews were analyzed for recurring themes by looking for commonly used words or phrases and coding each occurrence. The codes were reviewed looking for themes, trends and patterns. Tables were created to describe the themes that emerged from the interview data and specific comments from interviewees were included in the tables as evidence of the interpreted results. The qualitative data were used to strengthen the interpretation of the quantitative results of this research study, this rationale is called significance enhancement (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). Data triangulation was also used by comparing the results from the quantitative and the qualitative parts of this study, two different types of data were used to validate the research findings (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

Summary

This chapter began with a description of the two levels of principal preparation programs in the state of Florida. The purpose for conducting this research was reviewed and the research

questions being investigated were restated. A description of the targeted population was discussed and how the 90 employees of School District A were selected to participate in the study. The instrument used for the quantitative data collection was a researcher designed survey. The instrumentation section described the validity of the survey and how the interview questions for the qualitative data collection were developed. The procedures for each data collection method, quantitative and qualitative, were delineated. Included in the procedures section was the response rate for the survey and the process for conducting the follow-up interviews. Lastly, the methods for analyzing both the survey and interview data were described. Chapter 4 contains the results and tables for all data analysis conducted.

CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of educators who completed the Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) in a large urban school district related to their readiness to demonstrate the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) as adopted in November 2011. Completers of the PNPP from 2008 to 2011 were surveyed to give feedback to School District A on the effectiveness of the program in order to influence revisions to the program for future leaders in the school district. Also investigated were the components and constructs of the PNPP that influenced the professional practice of the program completers. After the survey was completed, face-to-face interviews were conducted with volunteers as a follow-up to the survey.

The Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) in School District A is designated Level II certification program by the state of Florida. There are two levels of principal certification as described by Florida Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081 (Florida Board of Education, 2007). Completing a Level I program is the first step toward becoming a principal by completing a Masters Degree program and obtaining educational leadership certification to become eligible to serve as an assistant principal. Level II programs are developed by each individual school district in Florida and are designed to build on the experiences from Level I programs. These Level II programs are approved by the Florida Board of Education and upon completion, an assistant principal is eligible to hold a Florida School Principal certificate. Therefore, this

research study focused on a Level II program, or PNPP, for School District A in the state of Florida.

This chapter presents the analysis for the four stated research questions. Analysis of the research questions includes results of the data collected from the Preparing New Principal Program Completer Survey (Appendix A) along with the results from six interviews conducted with program completers. The first part of the chapter reviews the population included in the study as well as the demographics of the participants. The second part of the chapter presents the analysis for each of the four research questions. The remainder of the chapter presents an analysis of the open-ended questions from the survey as well as the interview results and is concluded with ancillary analysis results.

Population

The population for this study consisted of the entire group of 90 PNPP completers for the five-year period from 2008 to 2011. All 90 members of the target population were employed by School District A as assistant principals and had completed a Level I certification program at the time they participated in the PNPP. The names and contact information of the 90 employees was supplied by the professional development designee of School District A. The Preparing New Principals Program Completers Survey (Appendix A) was sent to all 90 members of the target population. The list of 90 PNPP completers included 35 males (38.9%) and 55 females (61.1%) and their ages ranged from 31 years old to more than 60. At the time this study was conducted, in 2012, 41 were principals, 40 were assistant principals, three were employed in district-level positions, two were teachers, and four were no longer employed in School District A. Of the 83

who were still employed in School District A, 43 were working at the elementary school level, 25 at the middle school level, 14 at the high school level, and one at a K-8 school.

The response rate for the survey was 62 percent with 56 members of the original population completing the Preparing New Principals Program Completers Survey. The 56 PNPP completers were asked if they would volunteer to be interviewed as a follow-up to the survey. There were six participants who volunteered to be interviewed. The demographics of the six volunteers are described later in this chapter with the analysis of the interview questions.

Participant Demographics

The first section of the Preparing New Principals Program Completers Survey included demographic questions about the participants. The information gathered from the 56 participants was used to answer the research questions and to describe the group of completers who participated in this research study. The 56 participants were comprised of 21 males and 35 females, which are comparable to the gender percentages of the entire population. The ethnicity of the participant group was diverse with 29 White, Non-Hispanic, 15 Black, 11 White, Hispanic, and one Asian participant. The ages of the participants at the time they completed the survey were reported in the following age ranges: zero participants were 21 to 30 years old; 16 were 31 to 40 years old; 25 were 41 to 50 years old; 14 were 51 to 60 years old; and only one was more than 60 years old.

Questions were asked concerning the employment experience of the participants in order to gauge the levels and types of experiences the participants have had prior to and following completion of the PNPP. Participants were asked what their position in 2012 was when they

completed the survey. At the time they completed the survey in 2012, 24 participants were principals, 28 were assistant principals, and four were non-school based administrators. Table 4 shows the demographic information for the survey participants as of 2012 when the survey was completed along with the frequencies and percentages.

Table 4

Participants' Demographics in 2012 (N = 56)

	Frequency (*f*)	Percent (%)
Gender		
Male	21	37.5
Female	35	62.5
Ethnicity		
Black	15	26.8
White/Non-Hispanic	29	51.8
White/Hispanic	11	19.6
Asian	1	1.8
Other	0	0
Age range		
21-30 years	0	0
31-40 years	16	28.6
41-50 years	25	44.6
51-60 years	14	25.0
More than 60	1	1.8
Position in School District A		
Principal	24	42.9
Assistant Principal	28	50.0
Non-School Based Administrator	4	7.1
Instructional Staff	0	0

Of the 52 participants who are school based administrators, 30 were at the elementary level, 15 were at the middle school level and seven were at the high school level. In addition to information about the position the participant held and the school level where each participant

was employed at the time they completed the survey, the percentage of free or reduced lunch students was also reported. Descriptions of the schools where the participants were employed at the time the survey was completed are shown in Tables 5 with frequencies and percentages. The analysis of research question three also uses the percentage of free or reduced lunch students at the school where the participant is employed. The results were diverse with 80.8 percent of the participants reporting the percentage of free or reduced lunch students was higher than 50 percent. There were four participants who were not employed at a school and therefore did not answer this question.

Table 5

Descriptions of the Participants' Schools (N = 52)

	Frequency (*f*)	Percent (%)
School Level		
Elementary	30	53.6
Middle	15	26.8
High	7	12.5
Free and Reduced Lunch Student Percentage		
Less than 50	10	17.9
51-64	14	25.0
65-74	6	10.7
75-84	4	7.1
85 or higher	18	32.1

Participants were also asked to indicate the number of years they have served in an administrative position within School District A and also if they have served as an administrator in any school district. Results are shown in Table 6 for these two questions. The results of these

two questions show the majority of the participants have gained their administrative experience working in School District A and not from other school districts. One participant had zero to one year of administrative experience outside of School District A. There were three participants who reported having more than six years of administrative experience in a school district other than School District A.

Table 6

Administrative Experiences of the Participants (N = 56)

	In any School District	In School District A
Years of Experience	*f* (%)	*f* (%)
0 to 1	1 (1.8)	0 (0)
2 to 4	8 (14.3)	8 (14.3)
5 to 6	24 (42.9)	20 (37.5)
More than 6	27 (48.2)	24 (42.9)

Participants were also asked about their classroom teaching experience as well as teacher leadership experience. Results are shown in Tables 7 for these two questions. Research question four uses the results for the number of years of teaching experience prior to entering the PNPP. Participants with 10 years or less of teaching experience prior to entering the PNPP comprised 60.8 percent (34 of the 56) of the group and 39.2 percent (22 of the 56) reported having 11 or more years of experience. Responses to the query about teacher leadership experiences are also shown in Table 7. Of the 56 participants, 66.1 percent (37 of the 56) reported three years of teacher leadership experience or less and 91.1 percent (51 of the 56) had seven years or less of experience. Teacher leadership experience consists of any and all experiences outside of

classroom teaching, such as being a dean, curriculum resource teacher, or a subject matter instructional coach.

Table 7

Participants' Employment Experience (N = 56)

	Frequency (*f*)	Percent (%)
Years of Classroom Teaching		
0 to 5	17	30.4
6 to 10	17	30.4
11 to 20	18	32.1
21 to 30	4	7.1
31 or more	0	0
Years as a Teacher Leader		
0 to 3	37	66.1
4 to 7	14	25.0
8 to 11	3	5.4
12 to 15	2	3.5
16 or more	0	0

When asked what year the participant completed the PNPP, 19 completed the program in 2008, 17 in 2009, 12 in 2010, and eight in 2011. Of the 56 participants, 15 of them completed the PNPP in two years or less, 20 took three years to complete it, 13 took four years and eight completed it in five or more years. The average for completing the PNPP was 3.3 years. Table 8 describes the information for the participants concerning completion of the PNPP.

Table 8

Completion of the Preparing New Principals Program (N = 56)

	Frequency (*f*)	Percent (%)
Year Completed the PNPP		
2008	19	33.9
2009	17	30.4
2010	12	21.4
2011	8	14.3
Years to Complete All Requirements		
2 or less years	15	26.8
3 years	20	35.7
4 years	13	23.2
5 or more years	8	14.3

Testing the Research Questions

This study was guided by four research questions which were answered with data gathered from sections two and three of the Preparing New Principals Program Completer Survey (Appendix A). Each research question and the corresponding analysis of the data collected are presented in the following sections of this chapter.

Research Question One

What is the difference, if any, in the perceived value of the constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program, in influencing the professional practice of program completers from 2008-2011, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

This research question was answered in two parts, first with descriptive statistics, and then with a repeated measures ANOVA to compare the three constructs of the program

(instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge). All of the data used to answer this research question were gathered from participant responses to the questions in section two of the PNPP Completers Survey (items 16 to 48), covering perceived value of the PNPP components. The questions in this section provided four-point Likert scale responses, ranging from impractical to extremely valuable. A fifth option, not applicable, was available. However, because a response of not applicable does not fit within the scale, these responses were treated as missing values and not included in the number of responses used to calculate the descriptive statistics.

The participant responses, frequencies and percentages for each individual question are reported in Tables 9, 10 and 11. The descriptive statistics were addressed by calculating means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals for each individual question. Confidence levels were examined to look for overlapping intervals as an indication of similarities or differences in the means of responses. Results of the descriptive statistics are contained in Tables 12, 13, and 14. Items in Tables 9 to 14 are grouped according to the identified construct of which they were a part: instructional leadership (items 16-30), building community and decision making (items 31-39), or technical knowledge (items 40-48).

In Table 9, the majority of the participants found the components in the instructional leadership construct to be valuable or extremely valuable. Not every participant completed every component, so many indicated a not applicable response. Responses to the question about the value of the relationship with their assigned PNPP Coach indicated only 29 participants, 52 percent, perceived this to be a valuable or extremely valuable relationship. There were seven

participants, 12.5 percent, who indicated the relationship with their assigned PNPP Coach to be impractical and 18 participants, 32.1 percent, indicated the relationship to be not valuable. The relationship with their principal mentor was given a much higher value with 48 participants, 85.7 percent, indicating the relationship to be valuable or extremely valuable and only six participants, 10.7 percent, reporting the relationship to be impractical or not valuable. The requirement to complete an 8-week internship was indicated as valuable or extremely valuable by 50 participants, 89.2 percent.

Table 9

Participants' Value Placed on PNPP Construct, Instructional Leadership (Items 16-30): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Component	Not Applicable *f* (%)	Impractical *f* (%)	Not Valuable *f* (%)	Valuable *f* (%)	Extremely Valuable *f* (%)
Conferencing skills/coaching skills	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	32 (57.1)	21 (37.5)
Expert Leaders Series	2 (3.6)	2 (3.6)	5 (8.9)	35 (62.5)	12 (21.4)
Leadership for Differentiated Classroom (on-line)	9 (16.1)	1 (1.8)	10 (17.9)	29 (51.8)	7 (12.5)
Response to Intervention (on-line)	27 (48.2)	1 (1.8)	7 (12.5)	18 (32.1)	3 (5.4)
Response to Intervention (face-to-face)	21 (37.5)	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	17 (30.4)	12 (21.4)
Schools that Learn (on-line)	9 (16.1)	0 (0)	10 (17.9)	33 (58.9)	4 (7.1)
New Managers Orientation	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	3 (5.4)	26 (46.4)	25 (44.6)
ESOL for Administrators	19 (33.9)	2 (3.6)	8 (14.3)	22 (39.3)	5 (8.9)
Leadership Assessments (ASAP PORTAL)	6 (10.7)	3 (5.4)	13 (23.2)	28 (50.0)	6 (10.7)
Instructional Leadership Dialogues	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	12 (21.4)	25 (44.6)	17 (30.4)
Relationship with assigned PNPP Coach	2 (3.6)	7 (12.5)	18 (32.1)	20 (35.7)	9 (16.1)
Relationship with completers principal mentor	2 (3.6)	4 (7.1)	2 (3.6)	16 (28.6)	32 (57.1)
Job Shadows	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	6 (10.7)	30 (53.6)	18 (32.1)
Written leadership plans	1 (1.8)	0 (0)	12 (21.4)	33 (58.9)	10 (17.9)
8-week principal internship	1 (1.8)	1 (1.8)	4 (7.1)	20 (35.7)	30 (53.6)

The construct, building community and decision making, shows two components that larger numbers of participants did not complete and indicated were not applicable. These included Ruby Payne awareness which nine participants, 16.1 percent, did not complete and staff development protocol practices which 13 participants, 23.2 percent, did not complete. In this construct, facilitative leadership is highly rated by participants, with 54 participants, 96.4 percent, indicating it was valuable or extremely valuable. The requirement for media relations is also rated valuable or extremely valuable by 54 participants, 96.4 percent. The least valuable component in this construct was the diversity on-line course, with 11 participants, 19.6 percent, indicating it was impractical or not valuable. Table 10 displays the results for this construct.

Table 10

Participants' Value Placed on PNPP Construct, Building Community and Decision Making (Items 31-39): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Component	Not Applicable *f* (%)	Impractical *f* (%)	Not Valuable *f* (%)	Valuable *f* (%)	Extremely Valuable *f* (%)
Ruby Payne Awareness (on-line)	9 (16.1)	1 (1.8)	1 (1.8)	28 (50.0)	17 (30.4)
Ethical Leadership	4 (7.1)	0 (0)	4 (7.1)	25 (44.6)	23 (41.1)
Facilitative Leadership, Tapping Power of Participation	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	0 (0)	33 (58.9)	21 (37.5)
Interviewing and Hiring Practices (on-line)	7 (12.5)	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	27 (48.2)	19 (33.9)
Media Relations	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	30 (53.6)	24 (42.9)
Problem Solving and Decision Making (PSDM)	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	5 (8.9)	26 (46.4)	23 (41.1)
Staff Development Protocol Practices (on-line)	13 (23.2)	1 (1.8)	8 (14.3)	27 (48.2)	7 (12.5)
Diversity (on-line)	5 (8.9)	2 (3.6)	9 (16.1)	31 (55.4)	9 (16.1)
Yearly survey of school staff	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	4 (7.1)	26 (46.4)	24 (42.9)

Included in Table 11, are the frequencies and percentages for the construct, technical knowledge. These results show larger numbers of participants did not complete two of the components and indicated them as not applicable. These included data analysis which nine participants, 16.1 percent, did not complete and podcasts which 10 participants, 17.9 percent, did not complete. In this construct, teacher evaluation system is highly rated by participants, with 53 participants, 94.6 percent, indicating it was valuable or extremely valuable. The requirement for

holding a yearly progress meeting was also highly rated valuable or extremely valuable by 51 participants, 91.1 percent. The least valuable components in this construct were master schedule, with 15 participants, 26.8 percent, and podcasts, with 20 participants, 35.7 percent, indicating it was impractical or not valuable.

Table 11

Participants' Value Placed on PNPP Construct, Technical Knowledge (Items 40-48): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Component	Not Applicable *f* (%)	Impractical *f* (%)	Not Valuable *f* (%)	Valuable *f* (%)	Extremely Valuable *f* (%)
Budget	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	8 (14.3)	21 (37.5)	24 (42.9)
Teacher Evaluation System (FPMS or Marzano)	1 (1.8)	0 (0)	2 (3.6)	21 (37.5)	32 (57.1)
Master Schedule	1 (1.8)	1 (1.8)	14 (25.0)	27 (48.2)	13 (23.2)
Data Analysis (on-line)	9 (16.1)	2 (3.6)	6 (10.7)	25 (44.6)	14 (25.0)
Employee Relations	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.8)	27 (48.2)	28 (50.0)
Podcasts	10 (17.9)	4 (7.1)	16 (28.6)	21 (37.5)	5 (8.9)
PNPP Orientation	1 (1.8)	1 (1.8)	4 (7.1)	33 (58.9)	17 (30.4)
SharePoint Orientation	5 (8.9)	1 (1.8)	5 (8.9)	26 (46.4)	19 (33.9)
Yearly progress meetings with district staff	2 (3.6)	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	33 (58.9)	18 (32.1)

A participant response of not applicable was treated as a missing value and not included in the number of responses used to calculate the descriptive statistics shown in Tables 12, 13 and 14. Descriptive statistics for the instructional leadership construct, shown in Table 12, indicated the highest mean values for the relationship with the participant's principal mentor at a mean of

3.41 and the 8-week principal internship at a mean of 3.44. The components with the lowest mean values were leadership assessments at a mean of 2.74 and the relationship with assigned PNPP coach at a mean of 2.57. Table 12 contains items number 16 to 30 ordered from the highest to lowest mean value.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for Value Placed on PNPP Construct, Instructional Leadership, rank ordered by mean (Items 16-30)

Item	Component	*N*	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
30	8-week principal internship	55	3.44	0.71	3.24	3.63
27	Relationship with completers principal mentor	54	3.41	0.88	3.17	3.65
16	Conferencing skills/coaching skills	56	3.32	0.58	3.17	3.48
22	New Managers Orientation	56	3.32	0.74	3.12	3.52
20	Response to Intervention (face-to-face)	35	3.17	0.71	2.93	3.41
28	Job Shadows	56	3.14	0.75	2.94	3.34
17	Expert Leaders Series	54	3.06	0.69	2.87	3.24
25	Instructional Leadership Dialogues	56	3.02	0.82	2.80	3.24
29	Written leadership plans	55	2.96	0.64	2.79	3.14
18	Leadership for Differentiated Classroom (on-line)	47	2.89	0.67	2.70	3.09
21	Schools that Learn (on-line)	47	2.87	0.54	2.71	3.03
23	ESOL for Administrators	37	2.81	0.74	2.56	3.06
19	Response to Intervention (on-line)	29	2.79	0.68	2.54	3.05
24	Leadership Assessments (ASAP PORTAL)	50	2.74	0.75	2.53	2.95
26	Relationship with assigned PNPP Coach	54	2.57	0.92	2.32	2.83

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Descriptive statistics for the building community and decision making construct, shown in Table 13, indicated the highest mean values for media relations at a mean of 3.39 and ethical leadership at a mean of 3.37. The components with the lowest mean values were staff development protocol practices at a mean of 2.93 and diversity at a mean of 2.92. Table 13 contains items number 31 to 39 ordered from the highest to lowest mean value.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for Value Placed on PNPP Construct, Building Community and Decision Making, rank ordered by mean (Items 31-39)

Item	Component	*N*	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
35	Media Relations	56	3.39	0.56	3.24	3.54
32	Ethical Leadership	52	3.37	0.63	3.19	3.54
34	Interviewing and Hiring Practices (on-line)	49	3.33	0.59	3.16	3.50
31	Ruby Payne Awareness (on-line)	47	3.30	0.62	3.12	3.48
33	Facilitative Leadership, Tapping Power of Participation	56	3.30	0.66	3.13	3.48
39	Yearly survey of school staff	56	3.29	0.76	3.08	3.49
36	Problem Solving and Decision Making (PSDM)	56	3.25	0.77	3.04	3.46
37	Staff Development Protocol Practices (on-line)	43	2.93	0.67	2.72	3.14
38	Diversity (on-line)	51	2.92	0.72	2.72	3.12

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Descriptive statistics for the technical knowledge construct, shown in Table 14, indicated the highest mean values for the teacher evaluation system preparation at a mean of 3.55 and

employee relations at a mean of 3.48. The components with the lowest mean values were master schedule at a mean of 2.95 and completing the podcasts at a mean of 2.59. Table 14 contains items number 40 to 48 ordered from the highest to lowest mean value.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for Value Placed on PNPP Construct, Technical Knowledge, rank ordered by mean (Items 40-48)

Item	Component	*N*	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
41	Teacher Evaluation System (FPMS or Marzano)	55	3.55	0.57	3.39	3.70
44	Employee Relations	56	3.48	0.54	3.34	3.63
48	Yearly progress meetings with district staff	54	3.28	0.56	3.12	3.43
47	SharePoint Orientation	51	3.24	0.71	3.04	3.43
46	PNPP Orientation	55	3.20	0.65	3.02	3.38
40	Budget	56	3.18	0.88	2.94	3.41
43	Data Analysis (on-line)	47	3.09	0.78	2.86	3.31
42	Master Schedule	55	2.95	0.76	2.74	3.15
45	Podcasts	46	2.59	0.81	2.35	2.83

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

The descriptive statistics for the three PNPP constructs are presented in Table 15, including the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each construct. The means range from 3.04 to 3.24 and the standard deviations range from 0.38 to 0.47. The 95% confidence intervals overlap for the constructs of technical knowledge and building community

and decision making. However, the 95% confidence interval for instructional leadership only overlaps building community and decision making by 0.01 indicating more differences than similarities with the other two constructs. Table 15 contains the constructs ordered from the highest to lowest mean value.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics, Value Placed on PNPP Components by Construct Category, ordered by mean (N = 56)

			95% CI	
Construct	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
Building Community and Decision Making	3.24	0.41	3.13	3.35
Technical Knowledge	3.18	0.47	3.05	3.30
Instructional Leadership	3.04	0.38	2.94	3.14

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

The ANOVA results, $F(2, 110) = 11.90$, $p < .001$, indicated that there was a statistically significant difference among respondents in their perception of the value of the three constructs of the PNPP. The ANOVA results are presented in Table 16. A post hoc analysis was conducted to determine between which constructs the significant difference occurred. A Tukey's Least Significant Difference test was used to determine which means differed significantly from one another. The mean differences for each construct are displayed in Table 17. The mean score for instructional leadership ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 0.38$) was significantly lower than that of building community and decision making ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.41$) and of technical knowledge ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.47$), but the latter two constructs were not significantly different than each other. This indicates the significant difference is between the instructional leadership construct and both of

the other two constructs. However, there is no significant difference between the constructs of technical knowledge and building community and decision making.

Table 16

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance Results, Difference in Value Placed on PNPP Components by Construct Category (N = 56)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Construct Category	1.11	2	0.56	11.90**
Error	5.14	110	0.05	

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 17

Tukey Matrix for the Effect of Perceived Value on the PNPP Constructs

	Mean Difference		
Construct	Instructional Leadership	Building Community and Decision Making	Technical Knowledge
Instructional Leadership	---	0.194*	0.135*
Building Community and Decision Making	0.194*	---	0.059
Technical Knowledge	0.135*	0.059	---

*$p < .05$.

Research Question Two

To what extent, if any, do program completers from 2008-2011 believe the Preparing New Principals Program enabled them to demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

This research question was addressed with descriptive statistics. All of the data used to answer this research question were gathered from participant responses to the questions in section three of the PNPP Completers Survey (items 49 to 98), covering perceived preparation for successfully meeting the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). The 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards can be found in Appendix G. All of these questions provided five-point Likert scale responses, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, with a neutral response in the middle.

The participant responses, frequencies and percentages for each individual leadership standard are reported in Tables 18 to 23. The descriptive statistics were addressed by calculating means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals for each individual standard. Results of the descriptive statistics are contained in Tables 24 to 28. Items in all tables are grouped according to the FPLS domain of which they were a part. The four domains the FPLS are separated into include student achievement (items 49-54), instructional leadership (items 55-71), organizational leadership (items 72-92), and professional and ethical behavior (items 93-98). Descriptive statistics for each of the four FPLS domains are reported in Table 29.

The first of the four FPLS domains was student achievement which included six standards. Analysis of the participant's responses to whether they believed the PNPP prepared

them to meet these standards showed the standard “maintain a school climate that supports student engagement in learning” as the one they believed they were the most prepared to meet. In regards to this standard, 46 participants, 82.1 percent, responded they agree or strongly agree they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. Within this domain, six participants, 10.7 percent, reported a lack of preparation to demonstrate the standard “engage faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.” Table 18 presents the results for each of the six standards in the student achievement domain.

Table 18

Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Student Achievement Domain (Items 49-54): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Leadership Standard	Strongly Disagree *f (%)*	Disagree *f (%)*	Neutral/ No Opinion *f (%)*	Agree *f (%)*	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Ensure learning goals based on state standards and district curricula.	0 (0)	5 (8.9)	8 (14.3)	36 (64.3)	7 (12.5)
Ensure learning results based on performance and growth on student assessments.	1 (1.8)	4 (7.1)	6 (10.7)	35 (62.5)	10 (17.9)
Enable faculty/staff focus on student learning.	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	9 (16.1)	37 (66.1)	7 (12.5)
Maintain supportive school climate.	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	7 (12.5)	38 (67.9)	8 (14.3)
Generate high expectations.	0 (0)	5 (8.9)	7 (12.5)	34 (60.7)	10 (17.9)
Engage faculty/staff in closing performance gaps among subgroups.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	7 (12.5)	35 (62.5)	8 (14.3)

The second of the four FPLS domains was instructional leadership which included 17 standards. The frequencies and percentages for these 17 standards are reported in Tables 19 and 20. In Table 19, the first nine standards in this domain are described. Analysis of the participant's responses to whether they believed the PNPP prepared them to meet these standards showed the standard "communicate the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance" as the one they believed they were the most prepared to meet. In regards to this standard, 47 participants, 83.9 percent, responded they agree or strongly

agree they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. Within the instructional leadership domain, participants reported a lack of preparation to demonstrate two specific standards. The first of these had eight participants, 14.3 percent, reporting they disagreed or strongly disagreed they believed they were prepared to meet the standard "implement the Florid Educator Accomplished Practices through a common language of instruction." The second standard also had eight participants, 14.3 percent, reporting a lack of preparation to demonstrate the standard "ensure the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula." Table 19 displays the results for each of the first nine standards in the instructional leadership domain.

Table 19

Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Instructional Leadership Domain (Items 55-63): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Leadership Standard	Strongly Disagree *f (%)*	Disagree *f (%)*	Neutral/ No Opinion *f (%)*	Agree *f (%)*	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Implement Florida Educator Accomplished Practices using common language.	1 (1.8)	7 (12.5)	11 (19.6)	29 (51.8)	8 (14.3)
Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement.	0 (0)	5 (8.9)	6 (10.7)	33 (58.9)	12 (21.4)
Communicate relationships among standards, instruction, and performance.	0 (0)	5 (8.9)	4 (7.1)	41 (73.2)	6 (10.7)
Implement curricula/standards in rigorous, relevant manner.	0 (0)	7 (12.5)	6 (10.7)	33 (58.9)	10 (17.9)
Ensure use of assessments aligned with curricula/standards.	0 (0)	8 (14.3)	9 (16.1)	34 (60.7)	5 (8.9)
Link learning to system-wide objectives and school improvement plan.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	8 (14.3)	35 (62.5)	7 (12.5)
Provide feedback to faculty on effectiveness of instruction.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	4 (7.1)	41 (73.2)	5 (8.9)
Employ instructionally proficient faculty to meet needs of students.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	5 (8.9)	40 (71.4)	5 (8.9)
Identify instructional proficiency needs.	0 (0)	4 (7.1)	6 (10.7)	41 (73.2)	5 (8.9)

In Table 20, the next eight standards in the instructional leadership domain are described. Analysis of the participant's responses to whether they believed the PNPP prepared them to meet these eight standards showed the standard "implement professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction" as the standard they believed they were the most prepared to meet. In regards to this standard, 45 participants, 80.4 percent, responded they agree or strongly agree they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. The second standard participants believed they were prepared to meet states "promote school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students." This standard also had 45 participants, 80.4 percent, reporting they agree or strongly agree they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. Within this section of the instructional leadership domain, participants reported a lack of preparation to demonstrate two specific standards. The first of these had 11 participants, 19.6 percent, reporting a lack of preparation to demonstrate the standard "engage the faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps." The second standard had nine participants, 16.1 percent, reporting a lack of preparation to demonstrate the standard "initiate and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being." Table 20 presents the results for each of these eight standards in the instructional leadership domain.

Table 20

Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Instructional Leadership Domain (Items 64-71): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Leadership Standard	Strongly Disagree *f (%)*	Disagree *f (%)*	Neutral/ No Opinion *f (%)*	Agree *f (%)*	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Implement culturally relevant professional learning for differentiated instruction.	1 (1.8)	6 (10.7)	4 (7.1)	40 (71.4)	5 (8.9)
Engage faculty in professional learning.	0 (0)	8 (14.3)	6 (10.7)	36 (64.3)	6 (10.7)
Maintain student-centered learning environment.	1 (1.8)	6 (10.7)	5 (8.9)	35 (62.5)	9 (16.1)
Use diversity to motivate all students.	1 (1.8)	7 (12.5)	5 (8.9)	34 (60.7)	9 (16.1)
Promote practices to value diversity.	1 (1.8)	6 (10.7)	4 (7.1)	36 (64.3)	9 (16.1)
Provide monitoring and feedback on learning environment quality.	0 (0)	8 (14.3)	6 (10.7)	34 (60.7)	8 (14.3)
Support student opportunities for success.	0 (0)	9 (16.1)	5 (8.9)	35 (62.5)	7 (12.5)
Engage faculty in identifying/eliminating achievement gaps.	0 (0)	11 (19.6)	6 (10.7)	28 (50.0)	11 (19.6)

The third of the four FPLS domains was organizational leadership which included 21 standards. The frequencies and percentages for these 21 standards are reported in Tables 21 and 22. In Table 21, the first 10 standards in this domain are described. Analysis of the participant's responses to whether they believed the PNPP prepared them to meet these standards showed the

standard “use critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions” as the one they believed they were the most prepared to meet. In regards to this standard, 49 participants, 87.5 percent, responded they agree or strongly agree they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. Within the organizational leadership domain, participants reported a lack of preparation to demonstrate two specific standards. The first of these had 11 participants, 19.6 percent, reporting a lack of preparation to demonstrate the standard “plan for succession management in key positions.” The second of these standards had nine participants, 16.1 percent, reporting a lack of preparation to demonstrate the standard “use effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.” Table 21 presents the results for each of the first 10 standards in the organizational leadership domain.

Table 21

Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Organizational Leadership Domain (Items 72-81): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Leadership Standard	Strongly Disagree *f (%)*	Disagree *f (%)*	Neutral/ No Opinion *f (%)*	Agree *f (%)*	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Attend to decisions affecting student learning and teacher proficiency.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	7 (12.5)	32 (57.1)	11 (19.6)
Use critical thinking and problem solving to define problems and identify solutions.	0 (0)	1 (1.8)	6 (10.7)	35 (62.5)	14 (25.0)
Evaluate decisions; implement follow-up actions and revise as needed.	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	6 (10.7)	35 (62.5)	12 (21.4)
Empower others; distribute leadership.	0 (0)	4 (7.1)	6 (10.7)	36 (64.3)	10 (17.9)
Use technology to enhance decision making and efficiency in the school.	0 (0)	9 (16.1)	9 (16.1)	31 (55.4)	7 (12.5)
Identify and cultivate potential leaders.	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	10 (17.9)	33 (58.9)	10 (17.9)
Provide evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	9 (16.1)	33 (58.9)	8 (14.3)
Plan for succession management.	0 (0)	11 (19.6)	14 (25.0)	23 (41.1)	8 (14.3)
Promote teacher-leadership functions.	0 (0)	7 (12.5)	9 (16.1)	33 (58.9)	7 (12.5)
Develop relationships among all stakeholders.	0 (0)	8 (14.3)	4 (7.1)	37 (66.1)	7 (12.5)

In Table 22, the next 11 standards in the organizational leadership domain are described. Analysis of the second section of this domain showed participant's believed the PNPP prepared them to meet the three standards. The first of these three standards "organize time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans" was reported as the one of the standards they believed they were the most prepared to meet. In regards to this standard, 48 participants, 85.7 percent, responded they agree or strongly agree they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. The second standard participants believed they were prepared to meet states "recognize individuals for effective performance." This standard also had 48 participants, 85.7 percent, reporting they agree or strongly agree they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. The third standard participants believed they were prepared to meet also had 48 participants, 85.7 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing they were prepared to demonstrate the skill. This third standard states "ensure faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions." Within this domain, participants reported a lack of preparation to demonstrate one specific standard. This standard had seven participants, 12.5 percent, reporting they disagree they were prepared to meet the standard "be fiscally responsible and maximize the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities." Table 22 displays the results for each of these 11 standards in the second section of the organizational leadership domain.

Table 22

Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Organizational Leadership Domain (Items 82-92): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Leadership Standard	Strongly Disagree *f (%)*	Disagree *f (%)*	Neutral/No Opinion *f (%)*	Agree *f (%)*	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Organize time, tasks, and projects effectively.	0 (0)	4 (7.1)	4 (7.1)	39 (69.6)	9 (16.1)
Establish appropriate deadlines for self and entire organization.	0 (0)	5 (8.9)	5 (8.9)	36 (64.3)	10 (17.9)
Promote collegial school improvement and faculty development efforts.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	5 (8.9)	37 (66.1)	8 (14.3)
Be fiscally responsible in use of fiscal resources for instructional priorities.	0 (0)	7 (12.5)	7 (12.5)	35 (62.5)	7 (12.5)
Listen, learn from all stakeholders.	0 (0)	4 (7.1)	5 (8.9)	35 (62.5)	12 (21.4)
Recognize individuals for effective performance.	1 (1.8)	3 (5.4)	4 (7.1)	35 (62.5)	13 (23.2)
Communicate expectations/performance information to stakeholders.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	5 (8.9)	34 (60.7)	11 (19.6)
Maintain high visibility in school/community.	0 (0)	5 (8.9)	4 (7.1)	31 (55.4)	16 (28.6)
Engage stakeholders in conversations about important school issues.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	7 (12.5)	33 (58.9)	10 (17.9)
Use appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	5 (8.9)	34 (60.7)	11 (19.6)
Ensure faculty receives information about standards, requirements, decisions.	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	5 (8.9)	37 (66.1)	11 (19.6)

The last of the four FPLS domains was professional and ethical behavior which included six standards. Analysis of the participant's responses to whether they believed the PNPP prepared them to meet this group of standards showed "adhere to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida" as the standard they were most prepared to demonstrate. This standard received the highest frequency of participants who agreed or strongly agreed with 50 participants, 89.3 percent, indicating they were prepared to demonstrate this skill. Within the professional and ethical behavior domain, seven participants, 12.5 percent, reported a lack of preparation to demonstrate the standard "demonstrate a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community." In Table 23, the results for each of the six standards in the professional and ethical behavior domain are described.

Table 23

Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Professional and Ethical Behavior Domain (Items 93-98): Frequencies and Percentages (N = 56)

Leadership Standard	Strongly Disagree *f (%)*	Disagree *f (%)*	Neutral/No Opinion *f (%)*	Agree *f (%)*	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Adhere to Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct.	0 (0)	3 (5.4)	3 (5.4)	35 (62.5)	15 (26.8)
Demonstrate resiliency by maintaining focus on school vision.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	6 (10.7)	32 (57.1)	12 (21.4)
Demonstrate commitment to student success by identifying barriers.	0 (0)	7 (12.5)	7 (12.5)	30 (53.6)	12 (21.4)
Engage in professional learning to improve professional practice.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	3 (5.4)	35 (62.5)	12 (21.4)
Demonstrate willingness to admit and learn from errors.	0 (0)	5 (8.9)	6 (10.7)	35 (62.5)	10 (17.9)
Demonstrate explicit improvement in specific performance areas.	0 (0)	6 (10.7)	3 (5.4)	37 (66.1)	10 (17.9)

The descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, and 95% confidence intervals for each standard in the FPLS student achievement domain are reported in Table 24. This table contains items number 49 to 54 ordered from the highest to lowest mean value. The means for the student achievement domain range from 3.80 to 3.91 and the standard deviations ranges from 0.70 to 0.85. Results show overlapping 95% confidence intervals for all six of these standards indicating similarities in the means between the standards in this domain. The highest mean reported is for the standard "school climate supports student learning." This

standard had a mean of 3.91 with a 95% confidence interval from 3.72 to 4.10 and a standard deviation of 0.70 indicating less variance in the responses. This mean supports the high agreement frequencies reported in Table 18 for the same standard.

Within the student achievement domain, the lowest mean of 3.80 was reported for two standards. The first of these low standards was "learning goals on state/district standards" which reported a mean of 3.80, a 95% confidence interval from 3.60 to 4.01 and a standard deviation of 0.77. The second of these low standards was "faculty efforts to close subgroup performance gaps" which reported a mean of 3.80, a 95% confidence interval from 3.58 to 4.02 and a standard deviation of 0.82. These results support the high disagreement frequencies reported in Table 18 for the same two standards.

Table 24

Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Student Achievement Domain, Items 49-54, rank ordered by mean (N = 56)

Item	Leadership Standard	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
52	School climate supports student learning	3.91	0.70	3.72	4.10
50	Learning results evidenced by assessments	3.88	0.85	3.65	4.10
53	High expectations for growth in all students	3.88	0.81	3.66	4.09
51	Student learning-focused faculty system	3.86	0.70	3.67	4.04
49	Learning goals on state/district standards	3.80	0.77	3.60	4.01
54	Faculty efforts to close subgroup performance gaps	3.80	0.82	3.58	4.02

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

The descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, and 95% confidence intervals for each standard in the FPLS instructional leadership domain are reported in Table 25. This table contains items number 55 to 71 ordered from the highest to lowest mean value. The means for the instructional leadership domain range from 3.64 to 3.93 and the standard deviations ranges from 0.68 to 1.01. Results show overlapping 95% confidence intervals for all 17 of these standards indicating similarities in the means between the standards in this domain. The highest mean reported is for the standard "engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement." This standard had a mean of 3.93 with a 95% confidence interval from 3.71 to 4.15 and a standard deviation of 0.83 indicating moderate variance in the responses when compared to the standard deviation of the other standards in this domain. This mean does not support the highest agreement frequencies reported in Tables 19 and 20 for this domain and this same standard. The frequencies for this standard from Table 19 show 45 participants, 80.4 percent, agreed or strongly agreed they were prepared to demonstrate this skill.

Although the lowest mean of 3.64 was reported for two standards in this domain, one of these had a lower 95% confidence interval and a standard deviation which indicates more variability in the responses from participants. This lowest standard was "implement the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices" which reported a mean of 3.64, a 95% confidence interval from 3.39 to 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.94. These results do not support the highest disagreement frequencies for this domain and this standard which are reported in Tables 19 and 20. The frequencies for this standard from Table 19 show eight participants, 14.3 percent, disagreed they were prepared to demonstrate this skill.

Table 25

Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Instructional Leadership Domain, Items 55-71, rank ordered by mean (N = 56)

Item	Leadership Standard	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
56	Data analysis for instructional planning	3.93	0.83	3.71	4.15
57	Relationships among standards, instruction, and performance	3.86	0.72	3.66	4.05
63	Identify faculty instructional proficiency needs	3.84	0.68	3.66	4.02
58	Implement curricula/standards w/rigor, relevance	3.82	0.88	3.59	4.06
68	Promote valuing similarities and differences in students	3.82	0.90	3.58	4.06
61	Evaluate, monitor, provide instruction feedback	3.80	0.75	3.60	4.00
66	Safe, respectful, inclusive learning environment	3.80	0.90	3.56	4.05
62	Employ instructionally proficient faculty	3.79	0.76	3.58	3.99
60	Learning linked to strategic objectives	3.77	0.81	3.55	3.98
67	Use diversity to improve student learning	3.77	0.93	3.52	4.02
64	Implement learning enabling culturally relevant instruction	3.75	0.84	3.53	3.97
69	Monitor and feedback quality of learning environment	3.75	0.88	3.51	3.99
65	Engage faculty in professional learning	3.71	0.85	3.49	3.94
70	Continuous improvement processes for student success	3.71	0.89	3.48	3.95
71	Faculty understanding of cultural and developmental issues related to student learning	3.70	1.01	3.43	3.97
55	Implement Florida Educator Accomplished Practices	3.64	0.94	3.39	3.90
59	Appropriate use of aligned assessments	3.64	0.84	3.42	3.87

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

The descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, and 95% confidence intervals for each standard in the FPLS organizational leadership domain are reported in Tables 26 and 27. These tables contain items number 72 to 92 ordered from the highest to lowest mean value. The means for the organizational leadership domain range from 3.50 to 4.11 and the standard deviations ranges from 0.65 to 0.97. Results show overlapping 95% confidence intervals for all 21 of these standards indicating similarities in the means between the standards in this domain. The highest mean reported for this domain is for the standard "use critical thinking to define problems and solutions." This standard had a mean of 4.11 with a 95% confidence interval from 3.93 to 4.28 and a standard deviation of 0.65 indicating the lowest variance in the responses when compared to the standard deviation of the other standards in this domain. This mean supports the highest agreement frequencies reported in Tables 21 and 22 for this domain and this same standard. The lowest standard mean reported for this domain was 3.64 with a standard deviation indicating the highest variability in responses from participants when compared to the other standard deviations in this domain. This lowest standard was "plan succession management for key positions" which reported a mean of 3.50, a 95% confidence interval from 3.24 to 3.76 and a standard deviation of 0.97. These results support the highest disagreement frequencies for this domain and this same standard as Tables 21 and 22 report.

Table 26

Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Organizational Leadership Domain, first 12 items rank ordered by mean (N = 56)

Item	Leadership Standard	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
73	Use critical thinking to define problems and solutions	4.11	0.65	3.93	4.28
89	Maintain high visibility at school	4.04	0.85	3.81	4.26
74	Evaluate decisions for effectiveness, equity, outcome	4.00	0.74	3.80	4.20
87	Recognize individuals for effective performance	4.00	0.83	3.78	4.22
92	Faculty receives timely info about requirements and standards	4.00	0.71	3.81	4.19
86	Actively listen to and learn from stakeholders	3.98	0.77	3.77	4.19
82	Organize time and projects effectively	3.95	0.72	3.75	4.14
75	Empower others and distribute leadership	3.93	0.76	3.73	4.13
83	Establish appropriate deadlines for self/organization	3.91	0.79	3.70	4.12
77	Cultivate potential and emerging leaders	3.89	0.76	3.69	4.10
88	Communicate student expectations to community	3.89	0.85	3.67	4.12
91	Utilize appropriate technology for collaboration	3.89	0.85	3.67	4.12

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 27

Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Organizational Leadership Domain, last 9 items rank ordered by mean (N = 56)

Item	Leadership Standard	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
72	Prioritize decisions impacting quality of student learning and teacher proficiency	3.86	0.86	3.63	4.09
84	Allocate resources to promote school improvement and faculty development	3.84	0.80	3.62	4.05
90	Opportunities to engage community in constructive conversations about important school issues	3.84	0.85	3.61	4.07
78	Evidence of delegation and trust in subordinates	3.77	0.83	3.55	3.99
81	Supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education leaders	3.77	0.85	3.54	4.00
85	Fiscal responsibility; maximize resources	3.75	0.84	3.53	3.97
80	Teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning	3.71	0.85	3.49	3.94
76	Effective technology integration for decision making	3.64	0.90	3.40	3.88
79	Plan succession management for key positions	3.50	0.97	3.24	3.76

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

The descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, and 95% confidence intervals for each standard in the FPLS professional and ethical behavior domain are reported in Table 28. This table contains items number 93 to 98 ordered from the highest to lowest mean value. The means for the professional and ethical behavior domain range from 3.84 to 4.11 and the standard deviations ranges from 0.73 to 0.91. Results show overlapping 95% confidence

intervals for all six of these standards indicating similarities in the means between the standards in this domain. The highest mean reported is for the standard "adhere to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct." This standard had a mean of 4.11 with a 95% confidence interval from 3.91 to 4.30 and a standard deviation of 0.73 indicating the lowest variance in responses when compared to the standard deviation of the other standards in this domain. This mean supports the high agreement frequencies reported in Table 23 for the same domain and standard.

The lowest standard mean reported for this domain was 3.84 with a standard deviation indicating the highest variability in responses from participants when compared to the other standard deviations in this domain. This lowest standard was "commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community" which reported a mean of 3.84, a 95% confidence interval from 3.60 to 4.08 and a standard deviation of 0.91. These results support the highest disagreement frequencies reported in Table 23 for the same domain and standard.

Table 28

Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS, Professional and Ethical Behavior, Items 93-98, rank ordered by mean (N = 56)

Item	Item	*M*	*SD*	95% CI	
				LL	*UL*
93	Adheres to Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct	4.11	0.73	3.91	4.30
96	Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment w/school system	3.95	0.84	3.72	4.17
98	Demonstrate explicit improvement in specific performance areas	3.91	0.82	3.69	4.13
94	Focused on school vision, reacts constructively	3.89	0.87	3.66	4.13
97	Demonstrate willingness to admit error and learn	3.89	0.80	3.68	4.11
95	Commitment to success of all students	3.84	0.91	3.60	4.08

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

The descriptive statistics for all four domains of the FPLS are shown in Table 29 including means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals. The means for the FPLS domains range from 3.77 to 3.93 and the standard deviations ranges from 0.64 to 0.71. The 95% confidence intervals for all four domains overlap indicating similarities in the means of each domain. The standard deviations are close to each other indicating similar variability in the responses to each domain. The highest mean was 3.93 for professional and ethical behavior. This domain had a standard deviation of 0.71 and a 95% confidence interval from 3.74 to 4.12. The domain with the lowest mean was instructional leadership. This domain had a mean of 3.77, standard deviation of 0.66, and a 95% confidence interval from 3.59 to 3.95.

Table 29

Descriptive Statistics for Participants' Perceived Preparedness to Meet the 2011 FPLS by Domain, rank ordered by mean (N = 56)

Domain	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
Professional and Ethical Behaviors	3.93	0.71	3.74	4.12
Organizational Leadership	3.87	0.64	3.70	4.04
Student Achievement	3.85	0.67	3.68	4.03
Instructional Leadership	3.77	0.66	3.59	3.95

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

Research Question Three

What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 serving schools with varying socio-economic status levels, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

For each of the same four FPLS domains described in research question two, student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behavior, composite variables were created for analysis via separate one-way ANOVAs. For a given domain, all pertinent items with valid responses were summed and divided by the number of items to attain a composite variable that retained the same scale as the original items (minimum of 1, maximum of 5) and could be interpreted the same way. The domains served as dependent variables, while the variable of free or reduced lunch percentage for the participant's

school, separated into categories of 50% or less, 51-74%, and 75% or more, served as the independent variable for each analysis.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS student achievement domain and free or reduced lunch percentage are presented in Table 30. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 48) = 10.51$, $p < .001$, indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in this composite variable between participants at schools with different free or reduced lunch rates. Scheffe's post-hoc test was used to test for individual pairwise differences. Those in schools with a 50% or less free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.51$), as well as those in schools with a 75% or more free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.50$), gave a significantly higher mean rating of this construct than did those in schools with a 51-74% free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.63$). However, the 50% or less and the 75% or more groups did not significantly differ from one another. Table 31 describes the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each free and reduced lunch rate categories for the student achievement domain.

Table 30

Analysis of Variance Results, Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Student Achievement (N = 51)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Free or Reduced Lunch Category	6.51	2	3.26	10.51**
Error	14.87	48	0.31	
Total	21.38	50		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 31

Descriptive Statistics for Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Student Achievement (N = 51)

			95% CI	
School Free or Reduced Lunch Rate	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
Less than 50% (*n* = 10)	4.25	0.51	3.88	4.62
51-74% (*n* = 20)	3.45	0.63	3.16	3.74
75% or more (*n* = 21)	4.14	0.50	3.91	4.37

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS instructional leadership domain and free or reduced lunch percentage are shown in Table 32. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 47) = 18.06$, $p < .001$, indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in this composite variable between respondents at schools with different free or reduced lunch rates. Scheffe's post-hoc test was used to test for individual pairwise differences. Those in schools with a 50% or less free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.50$), as well as those in schools with a 75% or more free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.35$), gave a significantly higher mean rating of this construct than did those in schools with a 51-74% free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.56$). However, the 50% or less and the 75% or more groups did not significantly differ from one another. Table 33 describes the means, standard deviations and

95% confidence intervals for each free and reduced lunch rate categories for the instructional leadership domain.

Table 32

Analysis of Variance Results, Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Instructional Leadership (N = 50)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Free or Reduced Lunch Category	8.07	2	4.03	18.06**
Error	10.50	47	0.22	
Total	18.57	49		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 33

Descriptive Statistics for Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Instructional Leadership (N = 50)

			95% CI	
School Free or Reduced Lunch Rate l	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
Less than 50% (*n* = 10)	4.25	0.50	3.89	4.61
51-74% (*n* = 20)	3.35	0.56	3.09	3.61
75% or more (*n* = 20)	4.12	0.35	3.96	4.29

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS organizational leadership domain and free and reduced lunch percentage are shown in Table 34. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 49) = 11.75$, $p < .001$, indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in this composite variable between respondents at schools with different free or reduced lunch rates. Scheffe's post-hoc test was used to test for individual pairwise differences. Those in schools with a 50% or less free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.46$), as well as those in schools with a 75% or more free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.53$), gave a significantly higher mean rating of this construct than did those in schools with a 51-74% free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 0.60$). Table 35 describes the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each free and reduced lunch rate categories for the organizational leadership domain.

Table 34

Analysis of Variance Results, Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Organization Leadership (N = 52)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Free or Reduced Lunch Category	7.09	2	3.54	11.75**
Error	14.77	49	0.30	
Total	21.85	51		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 35

Descriptive Statistics for Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Organization Leadership (N = 52)

			95% CI	
School Free or Reduced Lunch Rate	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
Less than 50% (*n* = 10)	4.32	0.46	3.99	4.65
51-74% (*n* = 20)	3.43	0.60	3.15	3.71
75% or more (*n* = 22)	4.10	0.53	3.86	4.33

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS professional and ethical behavior domain and free or reduced lunch percentage are shown in Table 36. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 49) = 11.41$, $p < .001$, indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in this composite variable between respondents at schools with different free or reduced lunch rates. Scheffe's post-hoc test was used to test for individual pairwise differences. Those in schools with a 50% or less free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.48$, $SD = 0.43$), as well as those in schools with a 75% or more free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.57$), gave a significantly higher mean rating of this construct than did those in schools with a 51-74% free or reduced lunch rate ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 0.71$). Table 37 describes the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each free and reduced lunch rate categories for the professional and ethical behavior domain.

Table 36

Analysis of Variance Results, Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Professional and Ethical Behavior (N = 52)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Free or Reduced Lunch Category	8.48	2	4.24	11.41**
Error	18.20	49	0.37	
Total	26.67	51		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 37

Descriptive Statistics for Free or Reduced Lunch Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Professional and Ethical Behavior (N = 52)

			95% CI	
School Free or Reduced Lunch Rate	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
Less than 50% (*n* = 10)	4.48	0.43	4.17	4.79
51-74% (*n* = 20)	3.47	0.71	3.13	3.80
75% or more (*n* = 22)	4.16	0.57	3.91	4.41

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

Research Question Four

What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 representing a different number of years of teaching experience, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

For each of the same four FPLS domains as the previous two research questions, student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behaviors, composite variables were created for analysis via separate one-way ANOVAs. For a given domain, all pertinent items with valid responses were summed and divided by the number of items to attain a composite variable that retained the same scale as the original items (minimum of 1, maximum of 5) and could be interpreted the same way. The domains served as dependent variables, while the variable of Years of Teaching Experience was selected as the independent variable due to its level of interest as a potential influence on being prepared in an administrative role. This variable had three levels: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, and 11 or more years of prior teaching experience.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS student achievement domain and prior years of teaching experience are shown in Table 38. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 53) = 0.30$, $p = .74$, indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in this composite variable between respondents with different levels of prior teaching experience. Although the differences were not significant, it should be noted that while those with 6-10 years of experience had the highest mean response to this domain ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.59$) as compared to those with 0-5 years of experience ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.70$), or those with 11 or more years of

teaching experience (*M* = 3.80, *SD* = 0.70), these differences were not statistically significant. Table 39 describes the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each of the prior years of teaching experience categories for the student achievement domain.

Table 38

Analysis of Variance Results, Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Student Achievement (N = 56)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Years of Classroom Teaching	0.28	2	0.14	0.30
Error	24.28	53	0.46	
Total	24.56	55		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 39

Descriptive Statistics for Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Student Achievement (N = 56)

			95% CI	
Years of Experience	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
0-5 years (*n* = 17)	3.80	0.70	3.44	4.17
6-10 years (*n* = 17)	3.96	0.59	3.66	4.27
11 or more years (*n* = 22)	3.81	0.72	3.49	4.13

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS instructional leadership domain and prior years of teaching experience are shown in Table 40. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 53) = 0.34$, $p = .71$, indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in this composite variable between respondents with different levels of prior teaching experience. Although the differences were not significant, it should be noted that while those with 6-10 years of experience had the highest mean response to this domain ($M = 3.87$, $SD = 0.67$) as compared to those with 0-5 years of experience ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.73$), or those with 11 or more years of teaching experience ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.62$), these differences were not statistically significant. Table 41 describes the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each of the prior years of teaching experience categories for the instructional leadership domain.

Table 40

Analysis of Variance Results, Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Instructional Leadership (N = 56)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Years of Classroom Teaching	0.31	2	0.15	0.34
Error	23.87	53	0.45	
Total	24.18	55		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 41

Descriptive Statistics for Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Instructional Leadership (N = 56)

			95% CI	
Years of Experience	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
0-5 years (*n* = 17)	3.68	0.73	3.30	4.05
6-10 years (*n* = 17)	3.87	0.67	3.53	4.21
11 or more years (*n* = 22)	3.77	0.62	3.49	4.04

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS organizational leadership domain and prior years of teaching experience are shown in Table 42. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 53) = 0.11$, $p = .90$, indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in this composite variable between respondents with different levels of prior teaching experience. Although the differences were not significant, it should be noted that while those with 11 or more years of experience had the highest mean response to this domain ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.75$) as compared to those with 0-5 years of experience ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.48$), or those with 6-10 years of teaching experience ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.66$), these differences were not statistically significant. Table 43 describes the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each of the prior years of teaching experience categories for the organizational leadership domain.

Table 42

Analysis of Variance Results, Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Organization Leadership (N = 56)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Years of Classroom Teaching	0.09	2	0.05	0.11
Error	22.55	53	0.43	
Total	22.65	55		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 43

Descriptive Statistics for Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Organization Leadership (N = 56)

			95% CI	
Years of Experience	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
0-5 years (*n* = 17)	3.85	0.48	3.60	4.09
6-10 years (*n* = 17)	3.83	0.66	3.49	4.17
11 or more years (*n* = 22)	3.92	0.75	3.59	4.25

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

The ANOVA analysis results for preparation to meet the FPLS professional and ethical behavior domain and prior years of teaching experience are shown in Table 44. The ANOVA results, $F(2, 53) = 0.71$, $p = .49$, indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in this composite variable between respondents with different levels of prior teaching experience.

Although the differences were not significant, it should be noted that while those with 11 or more years of experience had the highest mean response to this domain (M = 4.07, SD = 0.83) as compared to those with 0-5 years of experience (M = 3.88, SD = 0.55), or those with 6-10 years of teaching experience (M = 3.80, SD = 0.70), these differences were not statistically significant. Table 45 describes the means, standard deviations and 95% confidence intervals for each of the prior years of teaching experience categories for the professional and ethical behavior domain.

Table 44

Analysis of Variance Results, Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Professional and Ethical Behavior (N = 56)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Years of Classroom Teaching	0.73	2	0.36	0.71
Error	27.04	53	0.51	
Total	27.77	55		

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 45

Descriptive Statistics for Years of Classroom Teaching Effect on Perceived FPLS Preparation, Professional and Ethical Behavior (N = 56)

			95% CI	
Years of Experience	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
0-5 years (*n* = 17)	3.88	0.55	3.60	4.16
6-10 years (*n* = 17)	3.80	0.70	3.44	4.16
11 or more years (*n* = 22)	4.07	0.83	3.70	4.44

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

Analysis of Open-Ended Survey Questions

The Preparing New Principals Completer Survey contained two open-ended questions in Section 7, item numbers 116 and 117. In item number 116, respondents were given the prompt, "I would have been better prepared to be a principal if…" and asked to complete the statement. The response rate for this question was 89 percent as 50 of the 56 respondents completed it with comments. Three themes emerged from the posed statement: internships and practical experiences, professional learning and technical knowledge, and, mentoring and coaching. Table 46 displays the themes, frequencies and sample responses.

Table 46

Preparation for the Principalship: Themes, Frequencies, and Responses (N = 50)

Themes	Frequency (*f*)	Sample Responses to: I would have been better prepared if…
Internships and Practical Experiences	17	"It would have been beneficial to spend a week or so in another school just to observe and ask questions" (Respondent 3). "… I had a meaningful internship outlining prerequisites, a thorough job description, and issues/problems a principal faces on a day to day basis" (Respondent 37). "… the program was designed for relevancy vs. getting work done" (Respondent 51).
Professional Learning and Technical Knowledge	17	"There are a few things I think the PNPP should add: master scheduling training using live data…budget training, actually moving money and positions around…training regarding internal accounts" (Respondent 5). "… there was more training in the area of instructional leadership" (Respondent 12). "…I received more training in how to deal with employee relations issues and more training on how to identify instructional programs that need to be fixed and how to do that" (Respondent 53).
Mentoring and Coaching	16	"I was given no real feedback from my principal" (Respondent 5). "My experiences were very different from that of my PNPP peers due to the wide variety of leadership styles of our principals. It seems like there should be some uniformity…to make sure they have the opportunity to learn and experience important job responsibilities" (Respondent 9). "… I spent more time learning from acting principals. I would have liked to see coursework revolve around reflections and discussions with acting principals" (Respondent 40).

In item number 117, respondents were asked to respond to the following prompt: "Please provide any other comments that you believe will improve the effectiveness of the PNPP". The response rate for this question was 63 percent or 35 of the 56 respondents provided comments. There were six respondents who commented on the program meeting their needs as it is currently designed and did not offer any suggestions for improvement. Three themes emerged from the respondents' suggestions for improving the existing PNPP: differentiated requirements, mentoring and coaching, and on-the-job experiences. Interestingly, two of the themes overlap with the previous open-ended item. Table 47 displays the themes, frequencies and sample responses.

Table 47

Improvement of the PNPP: Themes, Frequencies, and Responses (N = 35)

Themes	Frequency (*f*)	Sample Responses
Differentiated Requirements	4	"When people move in from out of state, make sure to value their experience" (Respondent 16). "In my case, I had already completed a preparing new principal program in another state and find that experience is what gives you the wisdom in making decisions for school leadership" (Respondent 28). "I came in with much administrative experience. The program would have been better if it had a component which allowed for the successful transfer of previous experiences into the current work environment" (Respondent 51).
Mentoring and Coaching	10	"Perhaps a panel of successful principals from diverse schools to talk to the up and coming leaders about what it really takes to be a great leader" (Respondent 8). "The mentoring piece is weak. In my case I never had a mentor. The person that was assigned to me never communicated with me. I went through the program without any contact" (Respondent 18). "I felt the PNPP coach/mentee relationship could be better. I felt that people often aligned themselves with people they knew which often could not provide a different view point since they knew each other. As a mentee, I felt that my coach did not stretch me." (Respondent 34). "A strong emphasis on mentorship needs to be a key component of PNPP" (Respondent 50).
On-The-Job Experiences	5	"Actual on the job training is where most of the learning occurs. If accountability, documentation, and reflection could be based on actual experiences, I think the most learning would take place" (Respondent 40). "Assistant principals should be given more of an opportunity to actually engage in what a principal does at the work site. They are not actually given an opportunity to grow at their school campus" (Respondent 45).

Analysis of Interview Questions

Interviews were conducted with six volunteers as a follow-up to the survey results. Interviews were conducted at the PNPP completer's school campus or at a mutually agreed upon location not on a school campus. The recorded interviews were transcribed and analyzed using a coding method described by Krathwohl (2009). Each of the six volunteers was asked four structured questions developed to further clarify survey results. Responses to the interview questions were then analyzed for common words and phrases to identify patterns and themes.

Since the interviews were conducted with volunteers, the sample was not representative of the entire population of PNPP completers. Of the six interviewees, four were principals and two were assistant principals. The six were from different school levels: one high school, one middle school, and four from elementary schools. There were five males and one female. The ethnicity of the group was not diverse with five White, Non-Hispanic volunteers and one White, Hispanic volunteer. Table 48 displays the demographics of each interview volunteer.

Table 48

Demographic Data for Interview Volunteers

Interviewee	School Level	Position	Gender	Ethnicity	Interviewee Identification
1	Middle	Principal	Male	Hispanic	PrMS1
2	Elementary	Principal	Male	White	PrElem1
3	Elementary	Principal	Female	White	PrElem2
4	High	Assistant Principal	Male	White	APrHS1
5	Elementary	Principal	Male	White	PrElem3
6	Elementary	Assistant Principal	Male	White	APrElem1

The structured interview questions asked of each volunteer are listed in Appendix B. The analysis of responses to the four interview questions are organized into tables which describe the frequency of the themes and samples of comments for each question asked as well as a discussion of the themes that emerged from interviewee responses.

The first interview question asked was, "What professional learning requirements do you think could be added to PNPP?" The themes that emerged in the responses to this question included: instructional leadership, professional learning with practical application, coaching on-the-job, and reflecting on practice. The frequency of each theme and sample comments are described in Table 49. This comment made by APrElem1 supports themes from the responses to the open-ended survey questions: "I think more of developing personal connections would have been good. Some types of round tables or discussions or other opportunities for me to connect with principals or other leaders from different levels and different learning communities." The theme of mentoring opportunities and giving PNPP participants experiences at different types of schools is a recurring one.

Table 49

Suggested Additions to PNPP: Themes, Frequencies, and Responses (N = 6)

Themes	Frequency (*f*)	Sample Responses
Instructional Leadership	2	"Discussions or other opportunities for me to connect with principals or other leaders from different levels and different learning communities would have been helpful and insightful for me. Especially with the drive toward more instructional leadership" (APrElem1).
		"We need curriculum leaders in our APs, and many of them are struggling in that area. Much of the PNPP process was 'minding the store' type stuff…we need to make sure our APs are well rounded" (PrElem1).
Professional Learning with Practical Application	5	"Making sure that the continual, up to date, current issues and things going on are included…professional learning communities…response to intervention…common core standards" (PrElem1).
		"More time on budget, on how to prepare a budget. Also, I think, one on FTE" (PrElem3).
		"More on budgeting, how you put it all together, what are the most important things, also where can you shave off money, where can you hide it and put it away for later" (PrElem2).
Coaching on-the-job	4	"I think some things you can't teach, like experience. Some of us of us had very global experiences and some not so much" (PrMS1).
		"Unless the principal actually sits down with you to do that and with the other duties, I don't think you get too much hands-on experiences" (PrElem3).
		"I never got any feedback to help move me up the continuum" (APrHS1).
Reflecting on Practice		"I think there needs to be a stronger emphasis on reflection. Where is the follow-up piece, where is the conversation that happens?" (APrHS1).
	2	"Job shadows…those for me were good learning experiences and writing the reflections based on those" (APrElem1).

Note: Interviewees provided multiple responses so the frequencies are more than N = 6.

The second interview question asked was, “What professional learning requirements do you think could be dropped from PNPP?” There were shorter answers to this question from each of the six interviewees, the three common themes that emerged included: leadership plans, differentiated learning pathways, and professional learning experiences. Table 50 presents the frequency of each theme and sample comments.

Table 50

Suggested Deletions from PNPP: Themes, Frequencies, and Responses (N = 6)

Themes	Frequency (*f*)	Sample Responses
Leadership Plans	2	"By looking at the plans my peers were doing, I almost think what they were doing was a waste of time in some ways" (APrElem1). "Good intentions to have documented evidence of what is being done was accomplished, but some of them are being written out and played out as a game…I think they should look at those written plans and how they can make them more meaningful" (PrElem1).
Differentiated Learning Pathways	2	"If there is a school with a really good double block reading block and that is something you put down as something you wanted to get out of a job shadow experience, then you could be referred to schools or principals to go see" (PrMS1). "It would be nice if we could tailor the process to more individual needs…like a graduate course plan, where there were requirements and then electives that would tailor to your needs where you could choose what you needed" (APrElem1).
Professional Learning Experiences	3	"Facilitative leadership is a long class and it was tough to be away from school that many days. It's a great concept and idea, but to really have that kind of time to hold that type of meeting, it just doesn't happen" (PrElem2). "There were a lot of different trainings and workshops we had to go to and now when I look back…I wonder to what extent did they really help me…I don't know how useful it was to really running a school, or to learning to run a school" (APrElem1). "I think there are some courses that could be condensed or maybe added onto, like the one about media, that's important, but I think that it could possibly be one that could be added onto another area" (PrElem3).

Note: Interviewees provided multiple responses so the frequencies are more than N = 6.

The third interview question asked was, "What type of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?" There was more consistency in the responses to this question by the six interviewees and two strong themes emerged: shadowing other principals and networking opportunities. Table 51 presents the frequency of each theme and sample comments.

Table 51

Suggested Preparation Experiences: Themes, Frequencies, and Responses (N = 6)

Themes	Frequency (*f*)	Sample Responses
Shadowing Other Principals	5	"Every principal has their own style and I think when you see that, you try to look at them and try to blend it into your own. I want to suggest to people, I didn't just stay in elementary, I went to both elementary and middle school. I wish I would have had one in high school" (PrElem3). "The job shadows were very beneficial. For example, I spent a day at a high school and marveled at how they could serve all 3000 youngsters lunch at the same time. As trivial as that may sound, how you run lunch can really impact your entire school day and your entire school year" (PrMS1). "Definitely real world demonstration, nothing can prepare you but more time in the chair" (APrHS1).
Networking Opportunities	3	"The networking was very beneficial. I know as I progressed, I had a little unofficial consortium of APs and as we progressed through PNPP we are now all principals and we all kept in touch throughout the process and so I think that is a good by-product of the program" (PrMS1). "Working with several of my colleagues, other APs…the ones I've worked closest with still to this day we will call each other and discuss items and things and say 'Hey what about this or did you get this email and what are you doing with that?' So, those connections are important and the experiences you can get from learning and working with other people" (APrElem1).

Note: Interviewees provided multiple responses so the frequencies are more than N = 6.

In addition to mentioning experiences that are beneficial for assistant principals seeking to be principals, the interviewees mentioned experiences for teacher leaders who are seeking to become assistant principals. Interviewee PrElem1 mentioned part of the job of a principal is, "looking at ways to get my dean involved with curriculum and data." This belief is supported by Interviewee APrElem1 when describing experiences instructional teacher leaders should have at the school level, "being able to work directly with teachers to move students and get students learning and increasing scores and looking at data." A caution is voiced by Interviewee PrElem2 about allowing teacher leaders to participate in PNPP learning opportunities when she said, "I know that in some of the classes I went to, I had very clear questions I needed answered since I was on the job already. If I had done those classes before I was an AP, I don't think I would have known what questions to ask. I feel they may not be getting as much out of the training as they would if they were an AP."

The final interview question was asked to follow-up on the common theme from the open-ended survey questions of the need to restructure the mentoring and coaching experiences within the PNPP. The question posed to the interviewees was, "what would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like." There was consistency in the responses to this question by the six interviewees and four strong themes emerged: personal relationship, face-to-face meetings, sharing knowledge, and building trust. Table 52 presents the frequency of each theme and sample comments.

Table 52

Components of a Mentor Relationship: Themes, Frequencies, and Responses (N = 6)

Themes	Frequency (*f*)	Sample Responses
Personal Relationships	5	"It involves getting to know somebody on a personal level" (APrElem1). "I think it takes a little more effort, for there to really be a good match instead of just a random match of a mentor, I think is key. I think there should be a personal relationship prior to being matched" (PrMS1).
Face-to-Face Meetings	4	"I think you need to make sure they are in the same learning community so they can see each other and also the person taking on that role is willing to make those efforts to reach out to the mentee" (PrElem2). "My first PNPP mentor, I had never met and just because of scheduling conflicts, I never met her. I think I randomly met her sometime last year after I heard her name somewhere and said 'oh, that's you'" (PrMS1).
Sharing Knowledge	4	"It's someone that can just sit down and talk about the experiences they have had and what they feel successful with and what they are not successful with and maybe what they didn't know when they were an AP and what they needed to learn and tell them that" (PrElem3). "Be able to take their knowledge and experience and help the person become ready for whatever their goals are" (APrElem1).
Building Trust	5	"One that you are allowed to have a critical voice through the process…you know, 'what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas', you have to feel protected in what you say" (APrHS1). "You've got to have trust. I know I can go in and speak my mind and know it's not going anywhere" (PrElem1). "I think the first thing you have to do is make sure there is complete confidence because if you have a mentor and you feel like you cannot talk to that mentor…you are not going to reveal what you don't know" (PrElem3).

Note: Interviewees provided multiple responses so the frequencies are more than N = 6.

Additional Analysis

Two of the interviewees made additional comments that were not tied to any of the posed research questions but are noted for the purpose of feedback on the PNPP in place in School District A. When compared to another large urban school district in Florida, Interviewee PrElem3 stated, "what I liked about School District A is that every assistant principal had the opportunity, although I know assistant principals who have gone through PNPP and they don't want to ever be a principal." This interviewee continued commenting about the preparation program in the other Florida school district by saying,

> They would have a select group of 20 to 25 on different levels who would be, this is going to sound sarcastic, almost privileged to be in the program. To me it was terrible that you would have someone who wanted the chance to be a principal and to go through the program and couldn't. So, when I came here and saw that we all had the opportunity, I thought that was great. (PrElem3)

The final remarks of Interviewee APrHS1 point to the intended purpose of the PNPP,

> Somehow to get from a compliance model where it's like, 'here it is, I've done it, I've satisfied that requirement' to asking yourself 'did I actually accomplish something and become better in the process'. I think to have something tangible, you know, something…I know that I like to have something that has given me such a depth of knowledge that I could speak about it to anyone. (APrHS1)

Summary

This chapter began with describing the purpose for conducting this research study. Also included was an explanation of the levels of principal certification in the state of Florida. A short description of how the study was conducted along with the population targeted was followed by the demographic information about the study participants.

The next section of the chapter included a discussion of the four posed research questions and the data analysis results for the quantitative results of the study. First, results for the analysis conducted on the value PNPP completers placed on the components of the program were described. Results were shared for each individual component as well as for the three constructs into which these components were organized. The three constructs included instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge. The ANOVA results comparing the value placed on the three constructs revealed a statistically significant difference between the value placed on the constructs technical knowledge and building community and decision making over that of instructional leadership.

These results were followed with a discussion of the PNPP completer's perception of being prepared to demonstrate the 2011 FPLS. Research questions two, three and four used these results for different comparisons. The 2011 FPLS were broken into the four domains, student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behavior for analysis. The standards the participants rated with the highest mean values, indicating they perceived they were prepared to demonstrate them, included using critical thinking skills to problem solve as well as being successful at adhering to the Florida Code of

Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. The standard the participants rated with the lowest mean value, indicating they perceived a lack of preparation to demonstrate this standard, was engaging in succession planning for important positions. When comparing the four domains, the participants believed the PNPP had most prepared them to meet the standards included in the domain of professional and ethical behaviors, which was indicated by giving it the highest mean value of the four domains.

The last two research questions used the results of the value participants placed on believing they were prepared to meet the 2011 FPLS and compared it with a specific demographic value. The first of these compared the participants by the free or reduced lunch percentage of their assigned school. The ANOVA results indicated a statistically significant difference in participants who are assigned to schools with a free or reduced lunch population that is 50% or less as well as those with a 75% or greater population. These results were the same for each of the four domains, student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behavior. The last research question compared the participants by the number of years of teaching experience they had prior to becoming an administrator. The ANOVA results for the four domains did not show any statistically significant differences in the participant's perception of being prepared to meet the 2011 FPLS.

The discussion of the quantitative data analysis results was followed by a description of the results from the qualitative data collected. The qualitative data included responses to two open-ended questions on the survey instrument and six face-to-face interviews conducted with participants who volunteered. The themes that emerged from the responses given to the two

open-ended survey questions included the importance of practical experiences, building professional and technical knowledge, as well as mentoring and coaching experiences being included in the PNPP. Participants also discussed the need to differentiate the PNPP for educators who enter School District A with administrative experience from other states or districts within Florida. The six volunteers who were interviewed supported these suggestions by mentioning the importance of being able to experience practical application of learned knowledge, reflecting on what is being learned, and having the opportunity to be coached or mentored through job shadows, networking, and exposure to many different leaders. The interviews also revealed the need to strengthen the mentor relationships in the PNPP. These participants believed the mentor and PNPP participant should have a personal relationship, share knowledge, skills and ideas, have time to meet face-to-face, and establish trust.

In Chapter 5, the data analysis presented in this chapter will be discussed. This chapter will also include the implications not only for School District A to consider in developing a new PNPP, but for any school district to consider when developing a principal preparation program. Recommendations for future research in this area will also be proposed.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The data collected in this research study as well as the analysis of that data was presented in Chapter 4. This chapter will present a synthesis of the information learned through the analysis of the data. The first section of the chapter gives a brief summary of the study and a reminder of the purpose for conducting the study. This section is followed by a discussion of the findings for each individual research question as well as the overall trends discovered from the open-ended questions and the interviews. The chapter also includes a discussion of the implications for practice for school districts or other educational organizations developing principal preparation programs. At the close of the chapter are the recommendations for further research and conclusions. Chapter 5 is intended to make connections between the data collected and the educational practices of school districts, in regards to principal preparation.

Summary of the Study

This study was conducted at the request of the professional development services designee in a large urban school district in the state of Florida. The purpose of the study was to determine if the educators who completed the existing principal preparation program in the years from 2008 to 2011 perceived they were successfully prepared to meet the Florida Principal Leadership Standards as adopted in November 2011. Results of the study were intended to give feedback to School District A in developing a new principal preparation program designed to prepare school leaders to successfully demonstrate the 2011 FPLS.

It is important to note the principal certification process in the state of Florida has two levels. According to the Florida State Board of Education (2005), "Level I programs lead to initial certification in educational leadership for the purpose of preparing individuals to serve as school leaders who may aspire to the school principalship. Level II programs build upon Level I training and lead to certification in School Principal" (SBE Rule 6A-5.081, p. 1). The Level I programs are offered by postsecondary institutions and the Level II programs are designed and offered by the local school districts in the state of Florida.

This research study analyzed the preparing new principals program (PNPP) in School District A, which is a Level II program as defined by the Florida State Board of Education. The following research questions guided this study:

1. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived value of the constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program, in influencing the professional practice of program completers from 2008-2011, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?
2. To what extent, if any, do program completers from 2008-2011 believe the Preparing New Principals Program enabled them to demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?
3. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 serving schools with varying socio-economic status levels, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

4. What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 representing a different number of years of teaching experience, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

The population of educators within School District A who completed the principal preparation program (PNPP) in the years from 2008 to 2011 was identified and invited to participate in this study. The entire population of 90 completers was asked to complete the Preparing New Principals Program Completers Survey (Appendix A). Of the 90 completers who were invited to participate, 56 actually completed the survey and six volunteered for follow-up interviews. Demographic information describing these 56 participants was collected and then presented in Chapter 4. Participants were asked to rate each of the individual components of the preparation program for its influence on their professional practice and success as a school leader. They were also presented with each of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards and asked to rate how well the PNPP prepared them to meet each standard. Participant responses to these two areas of inquiry were used to answer the four posed research questions.

As a part of the Preparing New Principals Program Completers Survey, the participants were asked to write responses to two open-ended questions concerning the principal preparation program. The comments and suggestions from these two questions were included in the analysis of the qualitative data collected along with the information from the six face-to-face interview conducted with volunteers as follow-up to the survey.

Research question one was answered with descriptive statistics to determine which components of the PNPP influenced the professional practice of the completers. The components of the preparation program were organized into three constructs, instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge, and an ANOVA was conducted to see if the completers believed any of the constructs were more valuable than the others in influencing their success as a school leader.

Research question two was answered with descriptive statistics to determine if the completers believed the PNPP prepared them to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The means for each standard were compared to determine which standards they believed they were the most prepared to demonstrate and the standards they did not believe there were prepared to demonstrate. The FPLS were also organized into four domains, student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behaviors, and the means for each domain were compared to indicate which areas the PNPP successfully prepared the school leaders and the areas of weakness in the program that should be addressed.

Research questions three and four used the means from each of the four FPLS domains in research question two and conducted an ANOVA to compare the means to a specific participant demographic. Research question three compared the FPLS means to the free or reduced lunch percentage of the participant's school. This allowed for analysis of whether the free or reduced lunch percentage of the school made a difference in the participant's perception of being prepared to demonstrate the 2011 FPLS. Possibly indicating a need to differentiate the principal

preparation program for school leaders based on this demographic. Research question four compared the FPLS means to the years of teaching experience of the participant prior to becoming a school administrator. Results of this question could indicate a greater belief of being prepared to demonstrate the FPLS because of the years of teaching experience prior to entering the principal preparation program, thus influencing the criteria for entering the program at the district level.

The themes and comments found in the qualitative data collected from the open-ended survey questions as well as from the interviews are included in the discussion of the findings for each research question in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

Discussion of the Findings

The following sections will discuss the findings for each of the four research questions as well as the interview data that was collected.

Research Question One

What is the difference, if any, in the perceived value of the constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program, in influencing the professional practice of program completers from 2008-2011, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

The PNPP components were organized into three constructs for analysis, instructional leadership, building community and decision making and technical knowledge. A statistically significant difference was found in the perceived value between the three constructs. The PNPP completers valued the constructs of building community and decision making as well as technical knowledge more than instructional leadership. These results indicate a need for School

District A to improve the components within the instructional leadership construct so the experiences are more valuable to the program participants. Hattie's (2009) meta-analysis identified instructional leaders as having the greatest impact on student achievement outcomes. The instructional leadership dimensions identified from the research examined by Hattie (2009) should be included in this construct of the PNPP: leading teachers in their professional development, evaluating and giving instructional feedback to teachers, making resource decisions focused on instruction, setting expectations and goals that are clear to everyone, and establishing classroom instruction as the focus for all aspects of school functions. Waters et al. (2003) add the ability of the principal to question the status quo and be a change agent to this list of instructional leadership dimensions.

Within the two constructs the completers indicated were more valuable to their professional practice, the highest means were given to learning experiences within the technical knowledge construct. Specifically, the PNPP completers found the knowledge of the teacher evaluation system and employee relations issues to be of greater value than any of the other components in the program. This makes sense as these two areas are very practical and applicable to the day-to-day practice of the school leader. However, two research studies, Kowal et al. (2009) and New Leaders for New Schools (2009), emphasize the competencies needed by principals in order to turn around schools and increase student achievement do not include technical knowledge as the focus. Principals need a strong personal drive to achieve success, the skills to influence and change the thinking and behavior of teachers to obtain results, and the ability to connect learning goals with activities within classrooms.

Patterns in the data show components in the PNPP that could be strengthened or possibly eliminated from the program. The data show participants rated the on-line components within the instructional leadership construct lower those in the other two constructs. The means for the on-line courses were reported on a four point scale and included leadership for a differentiated classroom (M = 2.89), response to intervention (M = 2.79) and schools that learn (M = 2.87) the content of these courses does not seem to be valuable to the participants. The ESOL for Administrators component (M = 2.81) had 19 (33.9%) report they did not take this course and 10 (17.9%) rated it as impractical or not valuable. This could be a result of the school district requiring all teachers to complete an ESOL endorsement to work within the school district and so many of the PNPP participants may believe they have knowledge of ESOL strategies, not understanding that leadership may have additional learning goals. The other component to examine is podcasts (M = 2.59) which had 10 (17.9%) report they did not take this course and 20 (35.7%) rated it as impractical or not valuable. It could be the difficulty with the technology needed to record and post the podcasts made this an experience participants did not find valuable. It could also be that they believe that no one was going to listen to the podcast and they never received any feedback; therefore, they did not see value in doing them.

Within the construct of instructional leadership are the leadership assessments, which are on-line tests the participants take at the beginning of the program and allow them to 'opt out' of having to write leadership plans. This component was rated very low with a mean of 2.7 meaning the participants did not see much value in taking these assessments. The assessments are tied to writing leadership plans which also received a low mean of 2.96. In the answers to

the open-ended questions and again in the interviews, participants commented on thinking the leadership plans were not valuable and believed the plans were completed because they were required and not because they were going to help them be successful leaders.

The University of Virginia Darden School of Business (2011) Turnaround Specialist Program recommends principal preparation programs focused on building the capacity of principals through working on practices and processes instead of prescribed actions. This program uses case studies, interactive discussions, residencies and school site visits to expose the principal candidates to these practices and processes. School District A should eliminate the program components focused on prescribed actions or technical knowledge and allow the principal candidates to learn these skills through working with experienced school principals over time.

The other area of focus in the construct of instructional leadership is the role of the assigned PNPP coach and the principal mentor along with the 8-week internship experience. Participants indicated the relationship with their principal mentor, who is the principal they are working for at their assigned school, was much more valuable with a mean of 3.41 than the relationship they had with the assigned PNPP Coach with a mean of only 2.57. The PNPP Coach is another principal within the school district, not the principal they are working for at their school, who is assigned to the participant when they enter the PNPP by the professional development designee of School District A. The 8-week internship, which was also highly rated with a mean of 3.44, is completed at the school they are working at under the direction of the principal of the school. The participants believed the relationship with their supervising

principal at their work location was much more valuable in influencing their practice which corresponds to the belief that the internship was valuable since this same principal was their mentor through this experience as well.

However, the qualitative data reflect a weakness in the program in the PNPP Coach relationship. The participants commented on wanting more exposure to other leaders outside their assigned school. They mention a need for feedback, sharing of professional knowledge, practical on-the-job experiences, learning from principals with different leadership styles and opportunities to network with other leaders. Similar experiences are described by Reeves (2002) as effective components of a principal preparation program which include a study of educational research, case studies, small group work and reflection on other leaders, the strategies they use as well as the systems and the set up of the organization. The PNPP Coach relationship could be strengthened to meet some of these needs. The interviewees believe this relationship needs to exist at a personal level and for that to occur the PNPP Coach needs to spend time with the participant, preferably face-to-face. Building that personal relationship involves reaching out to build trust and share knowledge and experiences. These finding are supported by research conducted by Heck (2003) which found factors that contributed to the effective preparation of principals included consistent communication with their colleagues, mentors and other program participants which created a network of other educators for the principal candidate to rely on for advice as well as moral support.

Research Question Two

To what extent, if any, do program completers from 2008-2011 believe the Preparing New Principals Program enabled them to demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

The 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards are organized into four domains, student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behavior. These results were reported on a five point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree that participants perceived they were prepared to demonstrate the FPLS. The participants indicated the belief they were greater prepared to demonstrate the standards in the professional and ethical behavior domain (M = 3.93). This indicates the PNPP is strong in this area of preparation. It could also be that educators who successfully complete the principal preparation program are already highly skilled in this area and did not require much additional preparation to be able to demonstrate these standards.

The instructional leadership domain received the lowest mean (M = 3.77), on a five point scale, indicating the participants perceived less preparation to demonstrate these standards when compared to the other three domains. Research conducted by Waters et al. (2003) revealed two instructional leadership variables that impacted student achievement. The first was the decisions the leaders makes concerning the area to focus on during school improvement initiatives. The second was the ability of the leader to gage the impact of the change on the school community.

These two identified variables were also expressed as areas of need in the qualitative data from the open-ended questions as well as the interviews. Participants expressed a need for more

preparation in making instructional decisions, leading professional learning with the staff, knowing how to fix instructional programs or choose the right ones to meet and instructional need in their school. Reeves (2011) and Louis et al. (2010) caution school leaders to focus their attention on limited priorities. Effective principal preparation programs should therefore provide learning experiences to address the decision making processes that will lead to correctly identified priorities.

Overall, based on the data collected, some patterns did emerge for areas where the participants did not perceive they were prepared by the PNPP in School District A to demonstrate the 2011 FPLS. The first of these is identifying and working with the teachers to close achievement gaps between demographic subgroups. A part of being successful at closing achievement gaps is the ability to use periodic formative assessment data to inform instruction and make decisions. Another need area is how to keep the success and well-being of the students as the focus during school improvement efforts as well as being able to identify the barriers that keep them from being successful. A need supported in the qualitative comments, as well as in the quantitative data, is for more preparation in making financial decisions based on instructional needs and making the most of limited financial resources.

The standard the participants believed they were the least prepared to demonstrate when compared to all the other standards is succession planning for leadership positions (M = 3.50). This is a critical area of need according to Reeves (2004) who calls it a “crisis in educational leadership” (p.81). Reeves (2002, 2004) goes on to note the fact that teachers leaders can make a better hourly rate and have less stress by remaining in the classroom. Principal candidates within

School District A need to be prepared to identify and develop other future leaders. Opportunities to learn how to encourage teacher leaders in their schools to pursue becoming principals, should be built into the PNPP or the school district will lack qualified candidates in the future to fill leadership vacancies.

Research Question Three

What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 serving schools with varying socio-economic status levels, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

In answering this research question, the same data were used as those reported on the four FPLS domains in research question two. According to Hattie (2009), the socio-economic level of the student has a high effect on student achievement (d = 0.57). Hattie (2009) describes effects higher than 0.40 as having a high effect on student achievement. Hattie (2009) goes on to state "SES is more important at the school than at the individual level" (p. 63). This research question was posed to investigate if the PNPP completers at schools with differing levels of free or reduced lunch percentages (an indication of the socio-economic status of the students who attend the school) believed they were more or less prepared to demonstrate the 2011 FPLS. The categories of free or reduced lunch percentages for the purpose of analysis were at or below 50%, between 51 and 74% and at or above 75%.

Results indicated a statistical significance between the means of the three free or reduced lunch categories for each of the four FPLS domains. The significant difference was found between the categories of at or below 50% and also at or above 75% when compared to the

middle category 51 to 74%. The highest means were reported for the category of at or below 50% in all four FPLS domains. On a five point scale, results for this domain showed student achievement had a mean of 4.25, instructional leadership a mean of 4.25, organizational leadership a mean of 4.32, and professional and ethical behavior a mean of 4.48. Close behind these means were the ones for the category of 75% or above with student achievement at a mean of 4.14, instructional leadership at 4.12, organizational leadership at 4.10, and professional and ethical behavior with a mean of 4.16.

These results indicate the participants at schools where the free or reduced lunch population is 50% or lower believed they were more prepared to demonstrate the FPLS than the participants at schools in the other categories. This could be because these participants are not faced with the challenges the higher free or reduced lunch schools need to be prepared to handle and thus based on their experiences believe themselves to be very prepared to deal with the school's daily functions. On the other hand, the participants at the schools with 75% or higher free or reduced lunch students have many additional professional learning opportunities through Title I and other district resources and thus perceived they were more prepared to meet the FPLS than those in the middle category. Because School District A set the cut off for Title I services at 75% or above free or reduced lunch percentages, these schools receive more money for resources and have requirements and professional learning that is not offered to schools with a lower percentage of these students. So, the schools in the middle category, 51 to 74%, have the challenges of students from lower socio-economic groups, without the extra supports and resources, and therefore do not think they are as prepared to meet the FPLS. Hattie (2009) states

the importance of adequate funding at the school level for resources to address "the increased level of problems and issues faced by schools teaching student from poorer backgrounds" (p. 63). The principals at schools with higher percentages of students living in poverty require a different set of knowledge and skills in order to have a positive effect on student achievement outcomes (Branch et al., 2009; Louis et al., 2010; Vanderhaar et al., 2006).

School District A needs to examine the professional learning opportunities and resources available for school leaders of schools with 51 to 74% free or reduced lunch student populations. Differentiating the preparation program for the participants based on the free or reduce percentage of the school where they work is a definite consideration for School District A. This suggestion of differentiating the knowledge and skills needed by principals based on the poverty level of the students in their school is supported by Vanderhaar, Munoz, and Rodosky (2006). Giving the participants experiences at all levels of free or reduced percentage schools would also be a good addition to the program. Responses to open-ended questions and interview data as well suggested opportunities to work with leaders at schools with these varying socio-economic groups of students would be a benefit to their preparation since they do not know what kind of a school they could be assigned to lead.

Research Question Four

What is the difference, if any, in the perceived level of preparation to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards of program completers from 2008-2011 representing a different number of years of teaching experience, as determined by the PNPP Completer Survey?

The answer to this research question also used the data collected on the four domains of the FPLS that were used in research question two. According to Hattie (2009):

> The teacher must know when learning is correct or incorrect; learn when to experiment and learn from the experience; learn to monitor, seek and give feedback; and know to try alternative learning strategies when others do not work. What is most important is that teaching is visible to the student, and that the learning is visible to the teacher. The more the student becomes the teacher and the more the teacher becomes the learner, then the more successful are the outcomes. (p. 25)

This description of an effective teacher could easily be applied to an effective school leader. Since Hattie's (2009) research showed "teachers are among the most powerful influences in learning" (p. 238), this research question was posed to investigate if PNPP completers with differing levels of teaching experience prior to becoming an administrator perceived that they were more or less prepared to demonstrate the 2011 FPLS. The categories of years of teaching experience for the purpose of analysis were at or below five years, between six and 10 years and at or above 11 years.

Results showed no statistical significance indicated when comparing any of the four domains with the years of teaching experience. However, some interesting patterns emerged in the means for the domains and the years of teaching experience. In the domains of student achievement ($M = 3.96$) and instructional leadership ($M = 3.87$) the highest means (on a five point scale) were reported in the category of six to 10 years of teaching experience leading the researcher to recommend that there be a consideration for more years of teaching experience to

build expertise prior to moving into administrative positions. When compared to the domains of organizational leadership (M = 3.92) and professional and ethical behavior (M = 4.07) the highest means were reported in the category of 11 or more years of experience. Since the participants who have 11 or more years of teaching experience are probably older than the others participating in PNPP, they may be more focused on the management roles of a school leader and therefore are more prepared for demonstrating professional ethical behaviors because they have more educational experiences. The participants who have six to 10 years of experience have been teachers during the accountability age and are more focused on instructional leadership to improve student achievement.

Qualitative Themes

Responses to the open-ended survey questions and the face-to-face interview questions supported and further clarified the perceptions of the PNPP completers toward their level of preparation to meet the 2011 FPLS.

Conclusions from the responses of participants indicate a need for the PNPP to examine the content and quantity of the classes participants are required to complete, the quality of the internship experience and the assigned mentor relationship. A pattern emerged from the qualitative data collected in regards to the practical experiences for the assistant principals through the PNPP. Participants indicated through their responses to survey item concerning the 8-week internship, that 89.3 percent of them valued the experience. However, the responses to the open-ended questions and the interviews indicated a need to improve the internship, job shadows, and other practical on-the-job experiences. PNPP participants would benefit from

longer periods of time spent at different school levels, so participants are exposed to the different functions at each level. Also, internship experiences at schools with differing levels of socio-economic levels of students, schools that are very diverse and schools with academic challenges.

Heck (2003) and Simmons et al. (2007) support a variety of different approaches for principal internships from yearlong principal candidate residencies focused on relationship building and leadership experiences to 10 month residencies paired with leadership seminars as do Corcoran et al. (2009). These studies all have something in common, 8-week internships, like the one in School District A, are not long enough to give the principal candidate a valuable learning experience. The Wallace Foundation (2012) calls for internship experiences that "reflect the realities education leaders face in the field" (p. 14). Multiple research studies (Mitgang, 2012; Simmons et al., 2007; SREB, 2007) found the need for internship experiences to include authentic, problem-based experiences that allow the intern to move beyond routines and management tasks to leading teachers, analyzing problems and finding solutions.

Implications for Practice

An effective principal preparation program should set as its target the ultimate success of the principals it is designed to prepare to lead a school. The research on effective school leadership, the design of other successful preparation programs, and the specific needs of the school district should all be considered when developing a preparation program.

An area that was not researched as a part of this study, but needs to be considered by School District A is the selection process for admitting candidates into the principal preparation program. Open-ended question responses and interview data collected in this study included

mention of assistant principals in School District A who were happy being assistant principals and did not want to be principals, while others mentioned how happy they were that School District A allowed all the assistant principals to complete the principal preparation program because it is not selective. This researcher recommends a selection process where the assistant principal has to apply for admittance into the PNPP. Also, this researcher recommends School District A create a professional learning track for the assistant principals who would like to enrich their skills in their current roles if they choose not to apply for the PNPP. Ensuring the "school leaders are well-selected" was a part of Florida's Race To The Top application (Florida Department of Education, 2010, p. 11). The Wallace Foundation (2012) calls for school districts to "recruit and select only people with the potential and desire to become effective principals" (p. 14). Reeves (2002) suggests school districts collect portfolios with examples of a candidate's leadership decisions in order to get a full picture of the potential of the candidate. Mitgang (2012) suggests the selection process could use research based screening tools to identify potential candidates based on leadership experiences, personal beliefs, and values. Being selective about the candidates who participate in the preparation program will allow for a focused preparation program that can deliver quality, valuable learning experiences for these future principals.

Louis et al. (2010) cautioned against developing standardized preparation programs for school leaders. Agreeing with their research, Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) also state effective preparation programs differentiate requirements so that leaders will get different experiences depending on the characteristics of the school where they will be working. This researcher

recommends assistant principals need time on the job to know what their learning needs are before beginning a principal preparation program. This time to learn the job will allow for differentiation based on the identified needs of the principal candidates and then plan a specific program for the individual. Results of this study also support the need for a principal preparation program that will meet the needs of educators coming into the school district with previous administrative experience as well as those working in schools with students from different socio-economic levels.

In addition to these changes, School District A should re-structure the 8-week internship experience and make it the focus of the program. New types of experiences should be structured to expose the principal candidates to different leaders, types of schools and networking opportunities. Technical knowledge course requirements should be dropped and instructional leadership experiences incorporated in meaningful and valuable ways. This researcher strongly supports on-going learning experiences for principals and career assistant principals. The preparing new principals program should not be the end of a leader's preparation for leading a school. This researcher has the following recommendations for improvements to the PNPP:

1. Implement a longer principal internship, perhaps as long as a full year under the supervision of an effective principal.
2. Clarify the role of the principal mentor and establish expectations for on-the-job experiences for the PNPP participant.
3. Eliminate the PNPP Coach position and redirect the funds into other avenues for mentoring and networking with effective principals.

4. Provide an application process for those interested in becoming principals and completing the PNPP, thereby streamlining the program and reducing unnecessary costs.
5. Establish a professional learning track for assistant principals to strengthen their skills if they chose not to pursue becoming a principal.
6. Differentiate PNPP experiences for assistant principals who enter the school district with prior administrative experience.
7. Investigate the need for differentiated professional learning for those principal candidates interested in leading schools with high poverty levels.
8. Review those PNPP requirements and experiences rated as impractical or ineffective and eliminate them from the program or improve the content to make them more valuable. Particular attention should be given to the written leadership plans, on-line classes, Response to Intervention, staff development protocol, and Ruby Payne Awareness.
9. Review PNPP requirements that have been in place prior to 2001 when accountability for student learning began to increase.
10. Focus on all aspects of instructional leadership with an emphasis on improving teacher effectiveness as well as learning experiences for all students.

Recommendations for Further Research

There are two companion studies to this research also conducted in 2012 at the request of the staff development designee in School District A. One study was conducted by Wesley

Trimble and the other by Eddie Ruiz. All three of these research studies analyze the Preparing New Principals Program in School District A using different populations of participants and a revised version of the Preparing New Principals Program Completer Survey. The following are other recommendations for further research into the effectiveness of principal preparation programs.

1. Future research into the effectiveness of a principal who completed a principal preparation program on the academic achievement of the students in the school they are assigned to lead. Examine the aspects of the preparation program that contributed to the principal's success and impact on student achievement.
2. Future research could compare principal preparation programs in similar large urban school districts in the state of Florida or across the United States.
3. Future research could investigate the reasons principals from low socio-economic schools value preparation programs more or less than principals leading more affluent schools.
4. Future research could investigate the selection process for admitting principal candidates into preparation programs. Include the criteria that should be considered for admittance, how the selection process happens and the success rate of the principals who complete the preparation program.
5. Future research could investigate the principal internship experience to identify the structure and component parts of the experience that help principal candidates believe they are prepared to lead a school. Include an examination of optimum length for the

internship, types of experiences to include, and the relationship with the internship coach or mentor.

6. Future research into the Level I certification programs (university or other educational option) in Florida and comparing the preparation level to demonstrate the Florida Principal Leadership Standards of the graduates of these programs.
7. Future research could investigate the criteria used to select and target prospective school leaders for participation in a principal preparation program either at the postsecondary level or at the school district level. Research comparing the entrance criteria for programs with the state of Florida or from across the nation.
8. Future research could investigate the difference, if any, in the combination of certification pathways and the principal preparation program, in the ability to successfully demonstrate the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.
9. Future research could investigate the legislative actions taken in other states and at the federal level that influence the development of principal preparation programs.

Conclusions

The Wallace Foundation (2012) has summarized the five critical responsibilities of principals from researching the behaviors of effective principals. These five responsibilities make a wonderful starting point for developing a principal preparation program for school principals in 2013: “shaping a vision of academic success for all students; creating a climate hospitable to education; cultivating leadership in others; improving instruction; managing people, data and processes to foster school improvement” (The Wallace Foundation, 2012, p. 2).

Preparing principals for school leadership in 2013 involves more than developing management skills and knowledge of the functions of a school. Principals must be instructional leaders with an unwavering focus on student achievement. Overall, the PNPP in School District A supports the participant's awareness of the FPLS and they perceive they are prepared to demonstrate the majority of the standards. However, the individual requirements and experiences of the PNPP have varying levels of perceived value to the professional practice of the participants. The PNPP experiences perceived to be invaluable or not practical should be evaluated for applicability, revised accordingly or possibly eliminated to improve the effectiveness of the PNPP.

This research study was conducted to directly influence the educational practices of School District A in regards to developing a principal preparation program approved by the state of Florida that certifies principals in the school district are prepared to demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Although the structure of principal preparation programs in the state of Florida are unique due to laws that created a two leveled principal certification process, the findings and conclusions of this research study can be useful to any school district working to develop future principals.

APPENDIX A: PREPARING NEW PRINCIPALS PROGRAM COMPLETER SURVEY

Preparing New Principals Program Completer Survey

I give my informed consent to participate in this study by completing this survey.

a. Yes
b. No

Section I

Please select the best answer:

1. In what calendar year did you complete the Preparing New Principals Program?
    a. 2008
    b. 2009
    c. 2010
    d. 2011
2. How many years did you participate in the PNPP before completing all requirements?
    a. 2 or less
    b. 3
    c. 4
    d. 5 or more
3. What is your current position?
    a. Principal
    b. Assistant Principal
    c. Non-school based administrator
    d. School based instructional staff
    e. Non-school based instructional staff
4. How many years have you served in an administrative position?
    a. 0-1
    b. 2-4
    c. 5-6
    d. More than 6
5. How many years have you served in an administrative position in this school district?
    a. 0-1
    b. 2-4
    c. 5-6
    d. More than 6

6. What is your school assignment level?
    a. Elementary
    b. Middle School
    c. High School
    d. Alternative School
    e. Vocational/Technical School
    f. Non-school based administrator
7. What is the school's percentage of Free/Reduced Lunch?
    a. Not applicable
    b. Less than 50
    c. 51-64
    d. 65-74
    e. 75-84
    f. 85 or higher
8. What is your age?
    a. 25 to 30
    b. 31 to 40
    c. 41 to 50
    d. 51 to 60
    e. More than 60
9. What is your race/ethnicity?
    a. Black
    b. Multi-racial
    c. White/non-Hispanic
    d. White/Hispanic
    e. Asian
    f. American Indian/Alaskan Native
    g. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
10. What is your gender?
    a. Female
    b. Male
11. How many years of classroom teaching experience did you have before you entered the Preparing New Principals Program?
    a. 0-5
    b. 6-10
    c. 11-20
    d. 21-30
    e. 31 or more

12. How many years of teacher leadership experience (Dean, CRT, Staffing Specialist, Reading Coach, etc.) did you have before you entered the Preparing New Principals Program?
    a. 0-3
    b. 4-7
    c. 8-11
    d. 12-15
    e. 16 or more
13. What was your undergraduate degree major?
    a. Elementary Education
    b. Subject Area Education (*this will have a drop down choice*: Mathematics, Science, English/Language Arts, Social Studies, Physical Education, Art, Music, Technology, Business, Engineering, Foreign Language, Reading)
    c. Other, please list:
14. Do you have a master's degree major other than Educational Leadership?
    a. No
    b. Yes. If yes, please list:
15. From what university did you earn your Educational Leadership degree or certification?

Section II

Choose the most appropriate response that reflects the **value** you place on the experience for its influence on your professional practice and your success as a school leader. It is important that you indicate how you honestly feel about these experiences, not how you think you should reply. Please choose "not applicable" for any experiences you did not participate in during the program.

PNPP Components	Not applicable	Impractical	Not valuable	Valuable	Extremely valuable
16. Conferencing skills/coaching skills					
17. Expert Leaders Series					
18. Leadership for the Differentiated Classroom (on-line)					
19. Response to Intervention (on-line)					
20. Response to Intervention (face-to-face)					
21. Schools that Learn (on-line)					
22. New Managers Orientation					
23. ESOL for Administrators					
24. Leadership Assessments (ASAP-PORTAL)					
25. Instructional Leadership Dialogues					
26. Relationship with assigned PNPP Coach (not your Principal)					

PNPP Components	Not applicable	Impractical	Not valuable	Valuable	Extremely valuable
27. Relationship with your principal mentor					
28. Job Shadows					
29. Written leadership plans					
30. 8-week principal internship					
31. Ruby Payne Awareness (on-line)					
32. Ethical Leadership					
33. Facilitative Leadership-Tapping the Power of Participation					
34. Interviewing and Hiring Practices (on-line)					
35. Media Relations					
36. Problem Solving and Decision Making (PSDM)					
37. Staff Development Protocol Practices (on-line)					
38. Diversity (on-line)					
39. Yearly survey of school staff					

PNPP Components	Not applicable	Impractical	Not valuable	Valuable	Extremely valuable
40. Budget					
41. Teacher Evaluation System (FPMS or Marzano)					
42. Master Schedule					
43. Data Analysis (on-line)					
44. Employee Relations					
45. Podcasts					
46. PNPP Orientation					
47. SharePoint Orientation					
48. Yearly progress meetings with district staff					

Section III

Based on your experiences in PNPP, please indicate your level of agreement with how well you were prepared to demonstrate the following. Your PNPP experience includes the classes and activities in which you participated as well as the experiences you had at your work location under the supervision of your Principal/learning supervisor.

The PNPP effectively prepared me to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral/no opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
49. Ensure the school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district adopted curricula.					
50. Ensure student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.					
51. Enable faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning.					
52. Maintain a school climate that supports student engagement in learning.					
53. Generate high expectations for learning growth by all students.					
54. Engage faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.					

The PNPP effectively prepared me to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral/no opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
55. Implement the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices through a common language of instruction.					
56. Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement.					
57. Communicate the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance.					
58. Implement the district adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school.					
59. Ensure the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.					
60. Generate a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan.					
61. Evaluate, monitor, and provide timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction.					
62. Employ a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served.					

The PNPP effectively prepared me to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral/no opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
63. Identify faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology.					
64. Implement professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction.					
65. Provide resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.					
66. Maintain a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy.					
67. Recognize and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning.					
68. Promote school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students.					

The PNPP effectively prepared me to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral/no opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
69. Provide recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment.					
70. Initiate and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being.					
71. Engage faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.					
72. Give priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency.					
73. Use critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions.					
74. Evaluate decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed.					
75. Empower others and distributes leadership when appropriate.					
76. Use effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.					
77. Identify and cultivates potential and emerging leaders.					

The PNPP effectively prepared me to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral/no opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
78. Provide evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders.					
79. Plan for succession management in key positions.					
80. Promote teacher–leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning.					
81. Develop sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders.					
82. Organize time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans.					
83. Establish appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization.					
84. Manage schedules, delegate, and allocate resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development.					
85. Be fiscally responsible and maximize the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.					
86. Actively listen to and learn from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders.					
87. Recognize individuals for effective performance.					

The PNPP effectively prepared me to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral/no opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
88. Communicate student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community.					
89. Maintain high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engage stakeholders in the work of the school.					
90. Create opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.					
91. Utilize appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration.					
92. Ensure faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.					
93. Adhere to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida.					
94. Demonstrate resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership.					

The PNPP effectively prepared me to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral/no opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
95. Demonstrate a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community.					
96. Engage in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system.					
97. Demonstrate willingness to admit error and learn from it.					
98. Demonstrate explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.					

Section IV

Rank the following experiences from the LEAST (1) beneficial to the MOST (6) beneficial in helping to prepare you to be a school leader. You can only use a ranking **ONE** time:

Experience:	#1 (Least beneficial)	2	3	4	5	#6 (Most beneficial)
99. Undergraduate degree course work						
100. Educational leadership master's degree or certification course work						
101. Preparing New Principals Program						
102. Mentoring and Coaching from my PNPP Coach						
103. Mentoring and Coaching from my learning supervisor/Principal						
104. On the job experiences						

Section V

Rank the following scheduling options for face to face workshops based on your preference for attending from the LEAST (1) preferred to the MOST (5) preferred. You can only use a ranking **ONE** time:

Workshops:	#1 (Least preferred)	2	3	4	#5 (Most preferred)
105. After school					
106. During the school day					
107. During holiday breaks					
108. On the weekend					
109. During the summer					

Section VI

Rank the following methods of learning based on effectiveness for transferring knowledge to practice from the LEAST (1) effective method to the MOST (6) effective method. You can only use a ranking **ONE** time:

Delivery:	#1 (Least effective)	2	3	4	5	#6 (Most effective)
110. Independent projects and self-paced learning						
111. On-line course work						
112. Discussions with colleagues						
113. Seminars with practicing administrators						
114. Internships and on the job training						
115. Attendance at professional conferences						

Section VII

Please provide the researcher with responses that will be helpful in informing program development decisions.

116. I would have been better prepared to be a principal if…

117. Please provide any other comments that you believe will improve the effectiveness of the Preparing New Principals Program.

If you would like to volunteer to be confidentially interviewed by the researcher or have additional comments for input into the new PNPP that is being developed, please contact me, Kelly Pelletier, directly at pelletierk@knights.ucf.edu or call my cell phone at 407-463-1078.

Thank you very much for taking your time to complete this survey. I can assure you, your input is confidential and will be very valuable to school district administrators as they work to develop the new program for preparing administrators.

Kelly Pelletier, Principal, Engelwood Elementary

APPENDIX B: STUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Preparing New Principals Program Completer Follow-Up Interview Questions

You have volunteered to participate in this follow-up interview and understand your responses will be kept confidential. You have signed and consent letter and agree to have this interview recorded. Please answer yes or no.

1. What professional learning requirements do you think should be added to PNPP?
2. What professional learning requirements do you think should be dropped from PNPP?
3. What type of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?
4. What would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like?

Do you have any additional thoughts?

APPENDIX C: SURVEY INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

May 1, 2012

Dear OCPS Administrator,

You are invited to participate in a research study designed to gather data on this district's principal preparation program. As a recent completer of the Preparing New Principals Program, your perspective is important to this study. You are one of approximately 90 administrators who completed PNPP during the time period from 2008 to 2011 who is being invited to participate in this study. Your collective input, which is anonymous, will be used to help guide the development of a new program for preparing future principals in our district. This electronic survey should take you approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Your participation is voluntary. You can decline to participate in this study without any repercussion. There is no anticipated professional or financial risk involved with completing the survey. The results of this survey may be published in aggregate, but no participants will be identified. The survey responses are anonymous, so your identity is protected. Because your responses are anonymous, there will be no follow-up communication, so please complete the survey now.

If you have questions or need additional information, contact me at pelletierk@knights.ucf.edu or my faculty advisor at the University of Central Florida, Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, at (407) 823-1469 or at rosemarye.taylor@ucf.edu. Research conducted at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is done under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns regarding research participants' rights may be directed at the UCF Institutional Review Board Office at the University of Central Florida Office on Research and Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826. The telephone numbers are (407) 823-3778 or (407)882-3299.

The submission of the online survey will indicate your consent to participate in this study. The link to the survey is: XXXXXXXXXXXX .
Thank you for your assistance with this study.

Sincerely,

Kelly Pelletier, Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida
Principal, Englewood Elementary School, Orange County Public Schools
pelletierk@knights.ucf.edu
Cell phone: (407) 463-1078

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

December 10, 2012

Dear PNPP Graduate,

You recently completed an online survey regarding the school district's Preparing New Principal Program and volunteered to be interviewed to provide additional information about principal preparation. The interview will take no longer than 30 minutes to complete and consists of four questions. Your signature on this consent letter indicates your agreement to have this interview recorded.

Results from the interview will be analyzed and provided to the school district along with the results of the survey. Results will be anonymous. Your name will not be placed on the data collection instrument, only your participant number.

You will not receive any compensation or direct benefits for participating in this interview. Your participation is voluntary and you can withdraw from the interview at any time.

If you have any questions or comments please communicate with me at pelletierk@knights.ucf.edu or you can call my cell phone at 407-463-1078. Questions and concerns about research participant's rights may be directed to the UCF Institutional Review Board Office, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826. The phone number for the IRB office is 407-823-2901.

Thank you,

Kelly Pelletier
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

My signature indicates my consent to be interviewed and recorded for this study.

_____ _____

Signature Date

APPENDIX E: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

University of Central Florida

University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Kelly A. Pelletier**

Date: **March 27, 2012**

Dear Researcher:

On 3/27/2012, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Exempt Determination
Project Title:	An Urban School District's Preparing New Principals Program Completers' Perception of Program Effectiveness Related to Florida Principal Leadership Standards Adopted in 2011
Investigator:	Kelly A. Pelletier
IRB Number:	SBE-12-08300
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 03/27/2012 04:01:27 PM EST

Joanne Muratori

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX F: ORANGE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS APPROVAL

RECEIVED MAR 06 2012

Submit this form and a copy of your proposal to:
Accountability, Research, and Assessment
P.O. Box 271
Orlando, FL 32802-0271

Orange County Public Schools

RESEARCH REQUEST FORM

Your research proposal should include:
- Project Title
- Purpose and Research Problem
- Instruments
- Procedures and Proposed Data Analysis

Requester's Name Kelly Pelletier Date 3/5/2012

E-mail kelly.pelletier@ocps.net Phone 407-463-1078

Address 2032 Winding Oaks Dr., Orlando, FL 32825
Street City, State Zip

Institutional Affiliation University of Central Florida

Project Director or Advisor Dr. Rosemarye Taylor Phone 407-823-1469

Degree Sought: (check one) ☐ Associate ☒ Doctorate ☐ Bachelor's ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Master's ☐ Specialist

Project Title: An Urban School District's Preparing New Principals Program Completers' Perception of Program Effectiveness Related to Florida Principal Leadership Standards Adopted in 2011

ESTIMATED INVOLVEMENT

PERSONNEL/CENTERS	NUMBER	AMOUNT OF TIME (DAYS, HOURS, ETC.)	SPECIFY SCHOOLS BY NAME AND NUMBER OF TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, ETC.
Students	0		
Teachers	0		
Administrators	90	20 to 30 minutes	district wide
Schools/Centers	0		
Others (specify)	0		

Specify possible benefits to students/school system: This study will contribute valuable insight from OCPS PNPP completers into the current program's effectiveness in preparing them for the job responsibilities of being an effective principal. Results of this study will be used to assist in designing a new principal preparation program to meet the specifications of newly enacted principal leadership standards in Florida.

ASSURANCE

Using the proposed procedures and instrument, I hereby agree to conduct research in accordance with the policies of the Orange County Public Schools. Deviations from the approved procedures shall be cleared through the Senior Director of Accountability, Research, and Assessment. Reports and materials shall be supplied as specified.

Requester's Signature Kelly Pelletier

Approval Granted: ☒ Yes ☐ No Date: 3-15-12

Signature of the Senior Director for Accountability, Research, and Assessment Vicki Courtney

NOTE TO REQUESTER: When seeking approval at the school level, a copy of this form, signed by the Senior Director, Accountability, Research, and Assessment, should be shown to the school principal who has the option to refuse participation depending upon any school circumstance or condition. The original Research Request Form is preferable to a faxed document.

Reference School Board Policy GCS, p. 249

OCPS1044ARA (Revised 2/10)

APPENDIX G: FLORIDA PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS

Florida State Board of Education Rule: 6A-5.080 Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

(1) Purpose and Structure of the Standards.

(a) **Purpose**. The Standards are set forth in rule as Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. The Standards are based on contemporary research on multi-dimensional school leadership, and represent skill sets and knowledge bases needed in effective schools. The Standards form the foundation for school leader personnel evaluations and professional development systems, school leadership preparation programs, and educator certification requirements.

(b) **Structure**. There are ten (10) Standards grouped into categories, which can be considered domains of effective leadership. Each Standard has a title and includes, as necessary, descriptors that further clarify or define the Standard, so that the Standards may be developed further into leadership curricula and proficiency assessments in fulfillment of their purposes.

(2) The Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

(a) **Domain 1: Student Achievement**:

1. **Standard 1**: Student Learning Results. Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's student learning goals.
    a. The school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula; and
    b. Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.
2. **Standard 2**: Student Learning as a Priority. Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success. The leader:
    a. Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning;
    b. Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning;
    c. Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students; and
    d. Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.

(b) **Domain 2: Instructional Leadership:**

1. **Standard 3**: Instructional Plan Implementation. Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. The leader:

a. Implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C., through a common language of instruction;
b. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement;
c. Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance;
d. Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school; and
e. Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.

2. **Standard 4**: Faculty Development. Effective school leaders recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff. The leader:
    a. Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan;
    b. Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction;
    c. Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served;
    d. Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;
    e. Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction; and
    f. Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.
3. **Standard 5**: Learning Environment. Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population. The leader:
    a. Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy;
    b. Recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning;
    c. Promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students;
    d. Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment;

e. Initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being; and
f. Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.

(c) **Domain 3: Organizational Leadership:**

1. **Standard 6:** Decision Making. Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data. The leader:
   a. Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency;
   b. Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions;
   c. Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed;
   d. Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate; and
   e. Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.
2. **Standard 7:** Leadership Development. Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization. The leader:
   a. Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders;
   b. Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders;
   c. Plans for succession management in key positions;
   d. Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning; and
   e. Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders.
3. **Standard 8:** School Management. Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment. The leader:
   a. Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans;
   b. Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization;
   c. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development; and
   d. Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.
4. **Standard 9:** Communication. Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic

communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community. The leader:

a. Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders;
b. Recognizes individuals for effective performance;
c. Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community;
d. Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school;
e. Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.
f. Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration; and
g. Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.

(d) **Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior:**

1. **Standard 10:** Professional and Ethical Behaviors. Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader. The leader:
   a. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.;
   b. Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership;
   c. Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community;
   d. Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system;
   e. Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it; and
   f. Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.

Rulemaking Authority 1001.02, 1012.34, 1012.55(1), 1012.986(3) FS. Law Implemented 1012.55, 1012.986, 1012.34 FS. History–New 5-24-05, Formerly 6B-5.0012, Amended 12-20-11.

APPENDIX H: TRANSCRIPTS OF PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

Interviewee 1

Transcription of Interview with PrMS1 on December 10, 2012

Consented to the interview and signed the consent form.

1. What professional learning requirements do you think could be added to PNPP?

The PNPP was very thorough I thought, coming from a different school district. While it was painful and challenging at times, I am still very impressed with the fact that we don't let just anybody in so to speak. As far as what could have been added, coming into the job, what I felt I hadn't encountered before, I think some things you can't teach, like experience. Maybe labor relations, the contract, and how that impacts on a daily basis, would be helpful. I have had to learn those things as they happen. Once again as APs, some of us had very global experiences and some not so much. Master schedule is something that I did not have, it always seemed to land in the hands of someone else or another Assistant Principal, so it's something I have been learning on the job. There was a master schedule component in PNPP, but I don't feel like it really sufficiently prepared me for when I became a principal. Being able to put it into the computer and all the background knowledge that is linked to it, like FTE, and certification.

2. What professional learning requirements do you think should be dropped from PNPP?

Something I mentioned during my exit interview from the program. I don't think it should be dropped necessarily, but maybe improved, is the visitations, the job shadows. I think a lot of us end up doing them just to get them over with and some of us wind up doing them over the summer when school is not in session just because of our schedules and that is when it was the most beneficial for us. I think those could be tweaked and more thought as to what you want to get out of the shadow before you actually shadow. If that is like a process or form that is developed and maybe it could be a task for the PDS staff. Like if there is a school with a really good double reading block and that is something you put down as something you wanted to get out of a job shadow experience, then PDS could refer you to schools or principals to go see.

3. What types of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?

To spite what I just said, some of the job shadows were very beneficial. It was kind of dependent on who I shadowed and how much they put into it. For example, I spent a day at a High School, and I was marveled at the myth of how they could serve all 3000 youngsters lunch at the same time. I always thought that was impossible until I saw it in person. As trivial as that

may sound, how you run lunch can really impact your entire school day and your entire school year. That was very beneficial. The networking was very beneficial. I know as I progressed, I had a little unofficial consortium of APs and as we progressed through PNPP we are now all principals and we all kept in touch throughout the process and so I think that is a good by-product of the program. It just makes for a well-rounded principal and I think for the district it definitely helped get the "one vision, one voice" out there since you are training all the future principals in the same way or just about in the same way.

4. What would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like?

I think the best scenarios are when they are mutually beneficial, when both learn from each other. For me personally, I had my mentor and then I had those who I really reached out to for help and kind of unofficially called my mentors. For me it always helped to have somebody who was where I wanted to be, for example, right now I am a principal, I am aspiring to become a high school principal, so my mentor is a high school principal. He does have middle school experience, so it helps me in that way, but for me personally, I am always looking forward to the next step and what it's going to take for me to get there. I think it takes a little more effort, but for there to really be a good match instead of just a random match of a mentor, I think is key. Screening both the mentor and the mentee before and having some type of idea. I probably got more out of my unofficial than my official mentoring sessions. Trust and non-competitiveness. As principals we can sometimes fall into that, so making sure that doesn't get in the way. I've been lucky, since I've heard that some people have mentors in the same learning community and they kind of say "I'll give some of my secrets, but not all my secrets" type of thing. So, that is probably something that should be looked at. But, it should be a mutually agreed upon match and not an I just got an email saying this is your mentor and I think I have no idea who that person is and I have to look them up on in the directory and vice versa. I think there should be a personal relationship prior to being matched or being given the choice to pick a mentor and explain why I want that person, I would easily be able to explain why. Like my first PNPP mentor, I had never met and just because of scheduling conflicts, I never met her. I think I randomly met her sometime last year after I heard her name somewhere and said "oh, that's you". My second or third year in the program, I was reassigned a new mentor, I just got an email saying I had a new mentor.

Any additional thoughts you would like included?

Nothing I can think of. While it felt like a thorn in my side, it overall impresses me that our district goes to the lengths it does to make sure that nobody is going to hold a title unless they are ready. It is sometimes a test of endurance more than anything else.

Interviewee 2

Transcription of Interview with PrElem1 on December 17, 2012

Consented to the interview and signed the consent form.

1. What professional learning requirements do you think could be added to PNPP?

There was such extensive training during the PNPP, right now, the only thing that I see that could be included is just making sure that the continual, up to date on current issues and things that are going on. So, currently right now we would be looking at Professional Learning Communities which wasn't involved in the PNPP during my time, but it is one of the biggest pushes. RtI which wasn't at the time either, just making sure they are staying current. Common Core Standards, that it is included as an overall piece and that it is included whether it is required or as an elective part in order to keep the APs current and up to date. We had a conversation in our principals meeting last week about how we need curriculum leaders in our APs, and many of them are struggling in that area. The Area Superintendent was adamant in that the people who are interviewing who are coming up from deans are just not curriculum leaders. Much of the PNPP process that I did was "minding the store" type stuff. So, getting some intensive curriculum time, because, again, more than half of the force comes from teacher to dean to AP and we need to make sure that they are well rounded. There aren't as many that go teacher to CRT to AP, there are more that take the other path. A lot of those people who get into the curriculum side want to stay on that side and want to do curriculum and staff development and do not do the school leadership side. We need to stay up with the curriculum side of training.

2. What professional learning requirements do you think should be dropped from PNPP?

I was right in the middle, after my first year, when they implemented the leadership assessments, and I recall, a lot of my colleagues did not perform well on those assessments, but I did. I was able to test out of about a half a dozen courses. So, that part was great for me and also for the district to collect data on their aspiring leaders because it gave them a baseline data on where their aspiring leaders actually were, so having that in the middle was great because it cut the time it was going to take me to finish the courses and requirements because I was able to test out. The only thing I can think of that could be dropped would be to modify the plan structure, that was a long drawn out piece. Good intentions to have documented evidence of what is being done was accomplished, but some of them are being written out and played out as a game, alright, this is what we are doing, but it is something that I would be doing anyway so what is the value in all

the documentation. So, I think they should look at those written plans and how they can make them more meaningful.

3. What types of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?

Right now I don't have an AP, but I do have a dean and looking at ways to get my dean involved with curriculum and data is a huge piece. I am trying to find ways to get her involved with things that will provide her with those experiences and still allow her to deal with the duties of being a dean. Right now she can do the facilities and all that without having to think about it and that's great, but planning a before and after school tutoring program, breaking down the data and disaggregating the data, getting the groups formed and working with teachers, I am trying to get into this hiring piece, looking at students and grouping based on ability in reading and math, you know there is so much coming up that she will be able to get involved with. I'm lucky since we don't have a high discipline piece at this school, so she is able to focus time on learning these things. At other schools, she would be running around with the discipline non-stop, I mean, the principals do at some schools with the discipline and thankfully we are really able to impact student learning in a different way here. Providing those curriculum pieces is really a big part and then having a principal that will allow their APs to do these things. I was in a situation as a new AP where I also had a brand new principal and she wanted to control each piece and did not want to delegate or when she did delegate it was with specific instructions on how she wanted it, so there was not a lot of autonomy for me to branch out and try things or work ideas in even. Again my knowledge base was not even strong enough curriculum wise for me to actually have any good input, it took me a good, it took until my third year after a change in position, change in school for me to have some of that autonomy to work on my own independently with teachers and with the leadership team, still keeping the principal side by side instead of that hierarchy down.

4. What would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like?

You've got to have trust. There are, for whatever reason, that trust background, that building, that time together, is huge in forming that trust. I have been in situations where for some reason or another, because principals move and APs move frequently within the system that sometimes it's tough for that trust relationship to go. I was fortunate with PNPP, I was paired with a great mentor and love him to death, he helped get me through it, because the first two, two and a half years was a challenge with my principal because we have two different styles in how we work and how we work with people. The bottom line was we were both there, but how we worked with and through people was a little different. My mentor also had known my principal since he followed her at an elementary school where they both worked and fortunately he and I had a

strong relationship and a strong trust bond that we still have to this day. I know I can go in and speak my mind and know it's not going anywhere, he will ask the right questions to get me to think through it and see that the end goal is exactly the same and we were able to determine that the end goal for my principal and I was right on, but we were able to determine that. I had that trust relationship with him to really work through those pieces and speak my mind but be able to see that the end goal is still the same between me and my principal, but how we each chose to get there was different. There were days when I was calling him yelling and screaming, like "yahhhhh". He was assigned to me and we couldn't have been a better match. Now, I was paired with someone and it didn't work out like that because he was on the completely other side of the district and we only talked once a year. We need to cluster the mentors in the learning communities where people are located so that they at least will see each other once a month at a meeting instead of waiting for the Superintendents Summit to actually have a conversation, and even then it's usually only to say hello have a handshake and good bye. I have had the opportunity with my Bridge mentor to have these strong relationships, life-long relationships. Now I have a mentee and she is a beginning principal and we already have that bond. It's tough to form that trust relationship. Having input and allowing people to go out and find their own mentors, or have input into who is assigned as their mentor would be good. Allowing them to request people where the relationship already exists.

Any additional thoughts you would like included?

Use common sense and don't get stuck on the program. Don't allow it to sit and get old and dusty. It should be fluid and always changing. There will always be something new that needs to be added and introduced. We have to start as school leaders now to look toward the future and what is going to be needed for our future leaders, we need to be forward thinking to be able to say let's add this now, because it is something our leaders are going to need 2 years from now.

Interviewee 3

Transcription of Interview with PrElem2 on December 19, 2012

Consented to the interview and signed the consent form.

1. What professional learning requirements do you think could be added to PNPP?

More on budgeting, just more on here is how you put it all together, but what are the most important things, also where can you shave off money, where can you hide it and put it away for later, and just that bottom line where they take back the 5% and you realize you don't have any money left. What are the priorities? That is something I have had to look for, I have sought out guidance in others about how to prioritize. We need some examples of how to prioritize, I don't think we got enough information on that.

Also, I would guess interviewing, streamlining interviewing, because I have had to do so much this year. I learned a lot as an AP, with the principal I had, she and I did a lot of the interviewing together and I learned a lot from working with her. Just to have a bank of questions, here are appropriate questions for this type of position versus this position since it's not all one size fits all. I had the little 2 hour class on it, but it was not nearly enough. I knew more going into the class, since I had experience interviewing with my principal prior to taking the class then I got from the actual class. It would just be nice to have a bank of questions, you know, we see people email those out all the time to each other, but it would be nice to have them like on a Sharepoint where principals could go and get them.

Those are the two right off the top of my head I can think of.

2. What professional learning requirements do you think should be dropped from PNPP?

Facilitative Leadership, is a long class and it was tough to be away from the school that many days. I think they have shortened it now, but when I did it I was out for 4 days. It's a great concept and idea, but to really have that kind of time to hold that type of meeting, it just doesn't happen. I mean, I got some basics and good ideas for holding meetings, but logistically, the half an hour I have to hold meetings with teachers on their planning time is just not going to work for this process.

3. What types of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?

I think having time outside of the classroom to see how a school runs, is one of the things. I went into the leadership role in a different way than I think a lot of others do. I left the classroom after teaching for 12 years to become a consultant and I visited schools throughout the country and saw all different schools at all different levels, mostly Title I schools, and I got to see the inner workings of the school from a visitors point of view so I got to see the whole picture. I went classroom to classroom and had an advantage really even over the principal there because I was coming from the outside looking in. I got to see the classrooms and the principals didn't know I was watching them like a hawk. I created a list of the things I would do and the things I would never do. The PNPP has us go and shadow, but compared to what I had done on my own already, it was nothing. I know that much of what I do day in and day out is from what I learned from my 8 years of watching how other principals operated. I learned much of what I do now from going back and visiting the same schools over the years. Many of them I would go back for 2 and 3 years to observe. It was a school reform model, so I was giving them things to change and I would go back to see if the things we had suggested worked or see if they did not. Then I would be able to talk to them about why it was not working if they had not done what I had told them to do. So, I had the opportunity to see lots of different schools K to 8 and some high school. I don't think there is enough of that going on because once you get involved as an AP, it's hard for you to get away. I know that when I did my shadows in PNPP, I did them right at the end because I knew I had to get them done. So, they were OK, but since I had seen so much already in my 8 years, the 2 or 4 shadows would not have been enough.

Follow up question: Do you think there is anything a principal going into a Title I school might benefit from that would be different from someone going into a non-Title I school?

I feel it would be harder to go from a Title I to a non-Title I than to go from a non-Title I to a Title I, just because in a Title I school your inclination is to nurture and you put those priorities first, so going to a non-Title I would be easier for someone. I am just used to being everything for everyone. If you need something, I will get it for you. I feel like if I were at a non-Title I school, I would be too much of a busy-body trying to do everything for everyone. I would try to do too much. Like here, I have no PTA or SAC. If I didn't combine the two groups, if would just be me and 2 staff members at each meeting. To have an active PTA , with someone coming in all the time, would be hard for me too. Because I am so nurturing, in a Title I school like this, I just automatically do everything for everyone. I think people need to experience both. Being in a Title I school is more tiring and stressful and people need to realize that because there is just so much going on all the time. It takes a lot out of you. I think the Title I school leader is used to doing this already, just on a much larger scale, classroom teachers are already used to doing everything for everyone, so the transition to Title I is easier it's just on a much larger scale.

4. What would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like?

When comparing my mentor from when I was a mentee and now when I got my own Bridge grant mentee. My mentor was in my same learning community and also at the elementary level and my mentor sought me out. She would call me and say "hey, I'm your mentor. When we go to the principal's meetings, I am saving you a seat". She would email me and call me just to check in and see how I was doing. I wouldn't call her regularly unless I had a specific question. There were times when I would be in my car going home and my cell phone would ring and it would be her just checking in. She sought me out and she made sure I had someone I could look for and trust. Where the person I mentored for PNPP, had a Bridge grant mentor who was not in the same learning community and they never saw each other. So, I think you need to make sure they are in the same learning community so they can see each other and also the person taking on that role is willing to make those efforts to reach out to the mentee and not rely on the mentee to go to them.

Any additional thoughts you would like included?

I have an aspiring leader on my staff and she has gone to some of the PNPP classes already and I'm wondering if it's just too early for her to be doing that. I know they are trying to get people to get those done prior to becoming an AP, which in some respects is great since you won't be missing out on the things you will be learning in the school, but it seems like it's just too early as an aspiring leader. Maybe not in your first year as an aspiring leader, maybe it would be better to do later in the program before they become an AP. I know when she goes to those, she feels uncomfortable when she is the only one there who is not an AP. I don't know how that is supposed to work, maybe there is some that you take as an aspiring leader and then some you don't take until you become an AP, because you just don't know the right questions to ask. I know that in some of the classes I went to, I had very clear questions I needed answered since I was on the job already. If I had done those classes before I was an AP, I don't think I would have known what questions to ask. I feel they may not be getting as much out of the training as they would if they were an AP. It's like maybe there should be two levels of classes, the ones that you can take before you are an AP and then some to take after you become an AP.

Interviewee 4

Transcription of Interview with APrHS1 on December 11, 2012

Consented to the interview and signed the consent form.

1. What professional learning requirements do you think could be added to PNPP?

I think there needs to be a stronger emphasis on reflection. I think that there is a reflective piece built into the PNPP but I am not sure what happens once the opinion is put out there. Where is the follow up piece, where is the conversation that happens, "by the way APrHS1, you thought this, this and this…". It's almost like the coaching cycle for a teacher or the clinical supervision where you get the first response and you see it, it's just seems like after I did that reflection piece I never saw it again, I never got any feedback after that to help move me up that continuum.

2. What professional learning requirements do you think should be dropped from PNPP?

I guess, I'm different, I think everything has value and there is learning in everything. I feel like I got something out of it because I thought I would get something out of it and I worked hard to get something out of it. Honestly, I feel like the whole Sharepoint, I don't know of anybody who went in and read my stuff and I asked. I mean, I wouldn't write a paper in an hour, I would sometimes spend a week or two on a paper in order to have a body of work I was proud of, that was different, that I thought could get published and I would ask people, I have asked Area Sups and other principals, I would ask them, do you want to see how your APs think, go in and read their reflection pieces and that will give you an idea of where their mindset is at least in those particular areas. I don't know of anybody that went in and looked at my stuff other than to say for an audit. It's a great place to house your stuff, but it's almost like a computerized curriculum, where if the teacher is not going in and making the course adjustments based on what they are seeing then providing some insight and some redirection, you know, expect what you inspect.

3. What types of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?

Well definitely real world demonstration, nothing can prepare you but more time in the chair. I mean, you've got the internship and part of the challenge there is that with the stakes and the environment that we are in right now, it's harder for the sitting principals to let go and from a high school level, the summer school experience is pretty much out the window now because it has been reduced and neutered now as far as the time and the quantity of kids that you don't

really get a full exposure. I guess time there to really do an internship to have somebody who is really working you through it and coaching you through the process. I was fortunate to have a good one in my principal, for mine, even though he didn't let go, he definitely gave me experiences, a lot that I wish I didn't have at the time, but I'm glad I have now.

4. What would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like?

One that is open, one that you are allowed to have a critical voice through the process, one that you can, you know, "what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas", you have to feel protected in what you say. Even if it's not quite right, every conversation that you have is a chance to educate somebody. So, to be able to freely give an opinion. A sincere commitment to work, I mean, there is nothing easy, from an Assistant Principal, about shaping a coach or shaping teachers to shape children, it's hard work. To be really involved in this process, to be there for the long haul to be committed to make that person better, hopefully over time it's not just a mentor/mentee, you become friends. I know when I work with my mentor, I always looked at as it would hurt more to let them down than myself, because they are giving me their time and time is sacred. You know, everyone thinks money, but time is something you can never get back. I want an open, trustworthy environment, you know look at your Covey stuff for trustworthy qualities. I forget…someone in the professional development department used to teach that. That critical voice piece, but be tactful when you do it.

Any additional thoughts you would like included?

On the top of my head, I can't think of any others. Much like UCF doctorate program is moving toward action research. I think to have something tangible, you know, something...I know that I like to have something that has given me such a depth of knowledge that I could speak about it…it came from the heart, it came from who I was…I think that was a huge strength in preparing me since in the interview process you have to be able to speak with conviction and passion, and there is only one way to do it, is to live it and breathe it. Somehow to get from a compliance model where it's like, "here it is, I've done it, I've satisfied that requirement" to asking yourself "did I actually accomplish something and become better in the process". I actually like that part of the doctoral program and maybe we could bring some of that work into the PNPP.

Interviewee 5

Transcription of Interview with PrElem3 on December 12, 2012

Consented to the interview and signed the consent form.

1. What professional learning requirements do you think could be added to PNPP?

The one I think needs to be added is more time on budget. On how to prepare a budget, I think that is the one that needs to be done. Also, I think one on FTE, only because as an Assistant Principal, you don't get involved with that too much unless the principal actually sits down with you to do that and with the other duties, I don't think you get too much hands on experiences with that as an Assistant Principal.

2. What professional learning requirements do you think should be dropped from PNPP?

I think there are some courses that could be condensed or maybe added onto, like the one about Media, that's important, but I think that it could possibly be one that could be added onto another area and not spend as much time on that.

3. What types of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?

What I liked the most was the job shadows. I thought that great because not only were you able to see how different schools operate, but you get to know those principals and later on when you meet them, you will feel more comfortable talking to them. Not only that, but every principal has their own style and I think when you see that you try to look at them and try to blend it into your own. I thought that was very beneficial and I would like to see more of that. I want to suggest to people, I didn't just stay in elementary, I went to both elementary and middle school. I wish I would have had one in high school and I actually went to a high school, but it wasn't a complete job shadow. I feel those were great experiences.

4. What would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like?

I think the first thing you have to do is make sure there is complete confidence because if you have a mentor and you feel like you cannot talk to that mentor, or don't feel comfortable around that mentor you are not going to want to reveal being a stranger and also being in the same area of school administration, you are not going to want to reveal what you don't know. There may be things that perhaps you should know, that you don't know. If you don't feel comfortable, you are not going to want to talk about that. And for the mentor, I think it's someone that can just sit

down and talk about the experiences they have had and what they feel successful with and what they are not successful with and maybe what they didn't know when they were an AP and what they needed to learn and tell them that first to build that bond.

Any additional thoughts you would like included?

Not really any suggestions, but I have been in different counties in Florida, XYZ county and QRX county, and based on my own personal opinion, I thought PNPP was great. Because even in QRX county it was um…what I liked about School District A is that every Assistant Principal had that opportunity, I know Assistant Principals who have gone through PNPP and they don't want to ever be a principal, they enjoy being an Assistant Principal, but at least they had the training. In QRX county, as large as that district is, they would have a select group of 20 to 25 on different levels who would be, this is going to sound sarcastic, almost privileged to be in the program. To me that was terrible that you would have someone who wanted the chance to be a principal and to go through the program and couldn't and it divided them up into the "haves" and the "have nots". It's almost like applying to be a principal, you had to apply and then have the backing and state why you think you should be allowed into the program and to have the training. It caused a big division among the Assistant Principals because after meetings you would have the chosen ones stay to have their training and the others were shuffled out of the room and some of those wanted to be in the training, so it was almost like the privileged and the not. Then there was always the discrepancy in how those people were chosen. So, when I came here and I saw that we all had the opportunity, I thought that was great. I thought the training and the instructors were great.

In QRX county I did interview and never made it. Got to the finals a few times. What is interesting is that I moved to PA and up there I was able to become a principal, but I was never able to get into the program in QRX county. It was very different.

Interviewee 6

Transcription of Interview with APrElem1 on December 18, 2012

Consented to the interview and signed the consent form.

1. What professional learning requirements do you think could be added to PNPP?

Well I finished PNPP in 2008 so it's getting to the back of my memory. I think more of developing personal connections would have been good. Some types of round tables or discussions or other opportunities for me to connect with principals or other leaders from different levels and different learning communities. I think that would have been helpful and insightful for me. I know we did get to do the shadows, and maybe even more of those would be good. Those for me were good learning experiences and writing the reflections based on those. Especially with the drive toward more instructional leadership. Today I am sure they are doing more involving iObservation , I would think that would be a requirement now. Getting familiar with the elements and the design questions and the observation process.

2. What professional learning requirements do you think should be dropped from PNPP?

Thinking back, I remember one year we took these tests and either you passed the test or you wrote a plan. I was fortunate I guess and I passed 3 or 4 of the tests, it made it easier for me, I was able to take a quicker path to get out. I don't know if I lost out on some knowledge I might have gained by not having to do the plans, but at the same time by looking at the plans my peers were doing, I almost think what they were doing was a waste of time in some ways, at least in the way they were expressing it to me and I was thankful I wasn't having to do them. I don't know if I can think of anything specific, other than it would be nice if we could tailor the process to more individual needs, I don't know how that would be done, it would be very labor intensive, but it would be nice if somehow there was almost like a graduate course plan, where there were requirements and then electives that would tailor to your needs where you could choose what you needed.

3. What types of experiences are the most beneficial to preparing for the principalship?

Well the job shadows I thought were very helpful. In general, beyond PNPP, really just the day to day running of the school, but also being able to work in different schools and different environments and to see really different principals and leadership styles. I have worked in 3 different schools under 4 different principals and I could write a book just on the 4 of them. That

I think has been good. Working with several of my colleagues, other APs, mostly, and that is always a personality thing, some are willing to work more closely with you and some aren't, but the ones I've worked closest with still to this day we will call each other and discuss items and things and say "Hey what about this or did you get this email and what are you doing with that?". So those connections are important and the experiences you can get from learning and working with other people. Also being able to work directly with teachers to move students and get students learning and increasing scores and looking at data. When you make those opportunities for yourself or you get them I think those are good learning experiences as well.

4. What would a strong mentor/mentee relationship look like and sound like?

Well, let's see, I think a good mentor is somebody who is able to put themselves in the mentees position and certainly ask the right questions like what is it you are looking to do, what are your goals. Also be able to take their knowledge and experience and help the person become ready for whatever their goals are. It involves getting to know somebody on a somewhat personal level, I think it also involves meeting with them regularly, finding out their professional goals, being able to help them make connections not just to other people but also to suggest and help them think of things they maybe wouldn't have thought of otherwise. Help them to do things you know based on your experience , know the latest buzz word, point out the things you know they need to know, the things you know they need to be trained in or aware of, this is a good person to go to their school and watch the way they are doing things. Help them gain that knowledge and experience, that is what a good mentor should do for them.

Any additional thoughts you would like included?

I know when I was in PNPP there were a lot of different trainings and workshops we had to go to and now when I look back, a lot of them I really can't remember. A few of them stick out, like Ruby Payne, but really I don't remember them. I wonder to what extent did they really help me, beyond just, oh this is some good information that just got filed away. I don't know how useful it was to really running a school, or to learning how to run a school, or working with parents or students or teachers or safety or data or any of the other things that are on our plates daily.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(2), 303-333. doi:10.3102/0002831210380788.

Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2009). *Estimating principal effectiveness* (Working Paper 32). Retrieved from the National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER) website: http://www.caldercenter.org/publications.cfm#2009.

Caldwell, B. J. (2003). A blueprint for successful leadership in an era of globalization in learning. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective* (pp. 23-39). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Corcoran, S. P., Schwartz, A. E., & Weinstein, M. (2009). *The New York City aspiring principals program: A school-level evaluation.* New York, NY: Institute for Education and Social Policy, New York University. Retrieved from: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/scmsAdmin/uploads/003/852/APP.pdf.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008 as adopted by the national policy board for educational administration.* Retrieved from: http://www.ccsso.org.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development*

programs. Stanford, CA: Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, Stanford University. Retrieved from: http://srnleads.org.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley & Sons.

English, F. W. (2006). The unintended consequences of a standardized knowledge base in advancing educational leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(3), 461-472. doi:10.1177/0013161X06289675.

English, F. W. (2012). Bourdieu's misrecognition: Why educational leadership standards will not reform schools or leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 44*(2), 155-170. doi:10.1080/00220620.2012.658763.

Florida Department of Education (2010). *Florida's race to the top application for initial funding* (CFDA 84.395A). Retreived from: http://www.fldoe.org/arra/pdf/rttt-apbud.pdf.

Florida Department of Education (2006). *Florida school leaders: The William Cecil Golden school leadership development program*. Retreived from: http://www.floridaschoolleaders.org.

Florida Department of Education (2012). *Florida turnaround leader program*. Retreived from: http://www.floridaschoolchoice.org.

Florida State Board of Education. (2005). *Florida principal leadership standards* (SBE Rule 6A-5.080). Retrieved from: http://www.flrules.org/.

Florida State Board of Education. (2007). *Approval of school leadership programs* (SBE Rule 6A-5.081). Retrieved from: http://www.flrules.org/.

Florida State Board of Education. (2011). *Florida principal leadership standards* (SBE Rule 6A-5.080). Retrieved from: http://www.flrules.org/.

Florida Statutes, K-20 Education Code § 1012.986 (2012), William Cecil Golden Professional Development Program for School Leaders. Retrieved from: http://www.flsenate.gov/laws/statutes.

Hallinger, P. (2003). The emergence of school leadership development in an era of globalization: 1980-2002. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective* (pp. 3-22). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Heck, R. H. (2003). Examining the impact of professional preparation on beginning school administrators. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective* (pp. 237-255). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Hitt, D. H., Tucker, P. D., & Young, M. D. (2012). *The professional pipeline for educational leadership.* Charlottesville, VA: University Council for Educational Administration. Retrieved from: http://www.ucea.org/pipeline.

Kowal, J., Hassel, E. A., & Hassel, B. C. (2009). *Successful school turnarounds: Seven steps for district leaders.* Retrieved from the Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement website: http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/CenterIssueBriefSept09.pdf.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2009). *Methods of educational and social science research: The logic of methods* (3rd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610.

Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007). An array of qualitative data analysis tools: A call for data analysis triangulation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 22*(4), 557-584. doi:10.1037/1045-3830.22.4.557.

Lomax, R. G. (2007). *An introduction to statistical concepts* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning.* St. Paul, MN: The Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, University of Minnesota. Retrieved from: http://www.cehd.umn.edu/CAREI/.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mitgang, L. (2012). *The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training.* New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.wallacefoundation.org.

Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 41*(1), 154-191. doi:10.1177/0013161X04269580.

New Leaders for New Schools. (2009). *Principal effectiveness: A new principalship to drive student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and school turnarounds.* Retrieved from: http://issuu.com/newleaders/docs/principal_effectiveness_nlns/1.

Reeves, D. B. (2002). *The daily disciplines of leadership: How to improve student achievement, staff motivation, and personal organization.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Assessing educational leaders: Evaluating performance for improved individual and organizational results.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Reeves, D. B. (2011). *Finding your leadership focus: What matters most for student results.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ritter, L. A., & Sue, V. M. (2007a). Questions for online surveys. *New Directions for Evaluation, 2007*(115), 37-45.

Ritter, L. A., & Sue, V. M. (2007b). The survey questionnaire. *New Directions for Evaluation, 2007*(115), 29-36.

Sanders, N. M., & Kearney, K. M. (Eds.). (2008). *Performance expectations and indicators for education leaders: An ISLLC-based guide to implementing leader standards and a companion guide to the educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Retreived from: http://www.ccsso.org.

Simmons, J. C., Grogan, M., Preis, S. J., Matthews, K., Smith-Anderson, S., Walls, B. P., & Jackson, A. (2007). Preparing first-time leaders for an urban public school district: An action research study of a collaborative district-university partnership. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*(5), 540-569.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2007). *Good principals aren't born-they're mentored: Are we investing enough to get the school leaders we need?* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved from: http://www.sreb.org.

Steinberg, W. J. (2011). *Statistics alive!* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

The Wallace Foundation. (2007). *Getting principal mentoring right: Lessons from the field.* New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.wallacefoundation.org.

The Wallace Foundation. (2012). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning.* New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.wallacefoundation.org.

University of Virginia Darden School of Business. (2011). *Darden/Curry partnership for leaders in education: School turnaround program.* Retrieved from: http://www.darden.virginia.edu/web/Darden-Curry-PLE/UVA-School-Turnaround.

Vanderhaar, J. E., Munoz, M. A., & Rodosky, R. J. (2006). Leadership as accountability for learning: The effects of school poverty, teacher experience, previous achievement, and principal preparation programs on student achievement. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 19*(19), 17-33. doi:10.1007/s11092-007-9033-8.

Vitaska, S. (2008). *Strong leaders strong schools 2007 state laws*. Denver, CO: National Conference of State Legislatures. Retrieved from: http://www.ncsl.org/print/educ/strongleaders.pdf.

Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.