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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to identify the basis of the aspiring principal preparation program (APPP) components Florida school districts provide to their aspiring principals and their relationship, if any, to the state and ISLLC Standards. A total of 50 school districts in Florida participated in this study. The research was guided by the following questions: (a) To what extent do the Florida school districts provide a formal APPP to their current assistant principals? (b) Upon what are the formal APPPs for current assistant principals based: the Florida Principal Competencies (FPCs), the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, or another source? (c) To what extent do the school district APPPs in the 67 Florida districts have component requirements that include professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience? and (d) Are there differences among the APPP components provided by Florida school districts of various sizes?

The findings of the study were found through an examination of quantitative and qualitative data that were collected from the Florida Aspiring Principal Program Assessment (FLAPPA) survey and the school districts’ APPP brochures located on their websites. This study supported the following conclusions: (a) 75% of the school districts in Florida do provide an APPP for their aspiring principals, (b) the FPCs and the ISLLC Standards are a part of the bases of the components found in APPPs provided by Florida school districts, (c) Florida school districts do provide APPPs that include components of a mentor principal, a performance-based experience, and professional development, (d) very large-sized school districts with a population over 100 thousand students contained the largest percentage of standards-based components in
the APPP; small-sized school districts with a population of under 7 thousand students contained
the least percentage of standards-based components in the APPP, (e) school districts in Florida
recognized the need to modify and were in the process of modifying their APPPs according to
the new Florida leadership standards, especially the component of technology, and (f) a lack of
funding, time, and assessment were identified as APPP weaknesses and components in need of
improvement.

Recommendations of this study included: (a) further research on Florida school districts
redesign of their APPP components to identify whether or not the components are based upon
the new Florida Leadership Standards, especially technology; and the ISLLC educational
standards; and (b) further research on Florida school districts providing a mentor principal and
support team; professional development, and a performance-based experience to their current
assistant principals who participate in an APPP, thus ensuring best practices in the APPP and
improving the quality of their future principals.
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CHAPTER 1
ASPIRING PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Introduction

School system leaders and the larger community clearly recognize that adequately educating principals and those aspiring to be principals for their changing and expanding roles and responsibilities is perhaps the single most important task facing the school district. Without a highly trained, competent corps of school-based leaders -- efforts to improve educational outcomes for students are doomed to failure (Shipman, Topps, & Murphy, 1998, p.20).

In July 2001, the Florida Legislature in Florida Statute 231.0861(2) reduced the certification and aspiring principal preparation requirements needed to obtain school principal licensure. The purpose of the study was to identify which aspiring principal preparation programs (APPPs) administered by Florida school districts provided a formal APPP to their current assistant principals based upon the Florida Principal Competencies (FPCs), the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISLLC), or another source. Professional development, mentoring, and performance-based experiences were included in the study as components of best practice found in a literature review of school district provided APPPs.

The Florida Perspective on Aspiring Principal Preparation Programs

Florida statute 231.087 mandated three laws that were in effect prior to July 2001. Florida statute 231.087(3) mandated the Florida Council on Educational Management (FCEM) to:

Identify those competencies which characterize high-performing principals and other managers in the public schools of this state.
Validate through scientific research the identified competencies.
Identify the training processes required for school managers to acquire the identified competencies and to develop training materials, which cannot be obtained from existing sources.
Identify the procedures necessary to develop and implement a program of competency certification for school managers.
Develop the policies and procedures necessary to adopt and implement a compensation program for school managers which is based on successful performance of the identified competencies, and
Develop and approve guidelines for the approval of school district training programs used for the certification of principals (Florida Department of Education [FLDOE], 1999, p. 112).

Nineteen Florida principal competencies were identified by the FCEM and were part of the training requirements to obtain principal certification. “The Florida Principal Competencies were developed to identify the leadership skills Florida principals should possess in order to be successful” (Owens, 2003, p. 24).

Florida Statute 231.087(4) created the Florida Academy for School Leaders (FASL). The purpose of the FASL was to “provide in-service training for school managers for the purpose of upgrading the quality of management at all levels of the public school system in the state” (FLDOE, 1999, p. 112). The FASL was charged with conducting training institutes on current needs and problems of school managers at all levels.

Florida Statute 231.087(5) mandated the district management-training program. The statute allowed each school board:

To submit to the commissioner a proposed program designed to train district administrators and school-based managers, including assistant principals, and persons who are potential candidates for employment in such administrative positions, in the
competencies which have been identified by the Florida Council on Educational Management as being necessary for effective school management (FLDOE, 1999, p.112).

On July 1, 2001, the Florida statutes reduced the mandated criteria required for principal preparation and certification. Chapter 1012 of the K-20 education code, School Community Professional Development Act 1012.98 (5)(a) stated, “the Department of Education shall provide a system for the recruitment, preparation, and professional development of school administrative personnel” (FLDOE, 2002c, p.2). The code allowed for an alternative means for the preparation of school administrative personnel that could be designed and provided by the school districts. The district administrative preparation programs would still “require approval of the Department of Education” (FLDOE, 2002c, p.472). The change in legislation gave the districts greater flexibility in the selection, hiring and training of their principals.

According to the Florida code, Archer (2002a) reported that “districts can now set their own minimum requirements for filling such positions, hiring as principals candidates who lack the state’s traditional school-administration credentials” (May 15, p.22). To recruit more principals, “the legislature decided that any proven professional manager could apply to be a principal; the standard school leadership certification no longer was required” (Alan, 2002, p.122).

Florida Statute Chapter 1012 of the 2002 K-20 education code made Florida one of the least restrictive states for administrator licensing. “Under the new legislation, the state education department would continue to offer administrator credentials to individuals who applied, but the districts would no longer be obligated to hire only those who held them” (Archer, 2002a, p.23).
Fryer, Superintendent of Florida’s Duval County School District, in opposition to the new legislation stated, “district leaders and school leaders need different kinds of skills” (Archer, 2002a, p. 3). Fryer pointed out that instructional leaders have to be principals who are experts on instruction.

If participation in a formalized standards-based principal preparation program with the goal of developing leadership skills was mandated by statute and helped to increase the quality of a principal candidate (Anderson, 1988; FLDOE, 1999), then there was a need to discover if the school districts were continuing to provide APPPs based on the FPCs and/or the ISLLC Standards. Graham, past Florida Governor and President of the Education Commission of the States wrote, “It is well known that effective and efficient management of schools requires a blend of skills, experiences, and academic background, rarely provided through baccalaureate or graduate programs in education” (Patterson, 1983, p. 19).

Since June 30, 2003, a team of Florida educators and community members have been working on developing a new set of principal leadership standards based upon the old state FPCs, the ISLLC Standards, NCATE, ISTE (International Society for Technology in Education, 2001), and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) standards. Their results were recommended to the Council of Educational Change in collaboration with the Florida Board of Education who prepared the draft of the ten new Principal Leadership Standards (Appendix I). The new Principal Leadership Standards are described in more detail in Chapter 2.
The National Perspective on Aspiring Principal Preparation Programs

In 1987, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration had recommended that “administrative preparation programs should be like those in professional schools which emphasize theoretical and clinical knowledge, applied research, and supervised practice” (Green, 2001, p.1). Shibles (1988) wrote, “Dramatic changes are needed in programs to prepare school administrators if they are to lead their schools and faculties rather than just manage them” (p. 1). Shibles goes on to state that preparation programs in schools, colleges, and departments of education do not respond to calls for change in preparing school administrators for professional leadership functions.


The University Council for Educational Administration and the National Board for Educational Administration, both university based programs, encouraged a redesigning of principal preparation programs to address the changing role of the school leader from the manager of the school, to the expanded role as an instructional leader. The improvement of pre-service and in-service principal preparation became part of the reform agenda (Donohue, 1995, p. 66).
In 1998, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) asked the Educational Research Service (ERS) to conduct a study to identify the problems associated with the lack of high-quality persons available to school districts to fill their principal vacancies. After a literature review and national survey sent to superintendents and other central office administrators across the county, ERS affirmed the “anecdotal information that there is a shortage of qualified candidates for principal vacancies in the United States” (NAESP, 1988, p.5).

School districts were contacted by ERS and questioned about their programs to develop candidates for the principalship. One of the questions asked by ERS was “Does your district have an aspiring principals program to recruit and prepare candidates for these positions from among current district staff?” (NAESP, 1988, p.8).

The results of the ERS study found that few of the school districts surveyed had an aspiring principals preparation program. The researchers also found that “it was more likely for an urban district to have a principal preparation program than a rural or suburban district” (NAESP, 1988, p.10). The data showed that a quarter of the total districts had an APPP and half of the urban districts reported providing a program. Several recommendations were made in the ERS report including the need for more study about school districts that are currently providing APPPs to their own candidates.

According to Goodlad (1983) in A Place Called School, “there should be a continuous district-wide effort to identify employees with leadership potential. Districts must be willing to make an investment to pay off in the future” (as cited in NAESP, 1988, p.6).
Tirozzi, Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, thought that there was a need to do a much better job in the APPPs across the country. Tirozzi believed that not only is there a need to give principals more course content, but also a need to provide for viable intensive internships in schools so the principals can learn to become leaders. He stated “we can not just turn people loose and expect them to be instant successes” (as cited in Borja, 2001b, p. A1).

Borja (2001a) presented another contributing factor to the crisis in school leadership. Borja believed that the principal shortage was not because there were not enough qualified people to step up to the plate. Nearly 50 percent of all teachers had a master’s degree, but fewer “wanted to take on the added responsibilities of a job that had become more stressful, time-consuming and frustrating” (p. A1). According to Borja, along with the projected shortage of highly qualified school administrators in the country, school districts were also dealing with many other issues including high stakes accountability, principal certification, and teacher shortages.

Bishop (2003), of the Baltimore Sun Newspaper, reported that Mary Cary, Assistant State Superintendent for Leadership Development in the state of Maryland, felt that the portion of the principal’s duties unrelated to instructional leadership needed to be reduced. “Anne Arundel County is working to clarify the role of principals and take away some of their non-instructional, building-management burdens, and increase staff development opportunities through an Aspiring Administrator program” (Bishop, 2003, p.2).
Rosa (2003b), senior research fellow at the Center on Reinventing Public Education, found that for many school districts with a fairly stable supply of principal candidates, quality of candidates was the issue, not quantity. The problem was the need to distribute principals from school districts with an overabundance of candidates to districts with fewer applicants. Rosa stated that, “not surprisingly, districts with the fewest applicants are typically those with high poverty, higher concentrations of poor and minority students, low per-pupil expenditures, and low principal salaries” (Rosa, 2003a, p. 2). Rosa recommended that, “school districts should consider redefining the principal position and its necessary qualifications, experimenting with alternative leadership arrangements” (Rosa, 2003a, p.2).

Fitzgerald, director of education programs for the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund, stated that many factors have contributed to a crisis in school leadership:

There is a looming job-vacancy problem because so many administrators are near retirement age, reluctance by educators to enter administration because of increasing pressure to produce academic results, insufficient pay and respect, and little preparation for the complex financial and political challenges of running a school or a school district (Gewertz, 2000, p. 15).

Petzko, Clark, Valentine, Hackman, Nori, and Lucas (2002), found in a study on middle level principals that there was a “compelling mandate for enhanced recruitment, high-quality administrator preparation programs, on-the-job training programs, and professional development for current and future middle level principals” (p.7). Petzko et al. recommended that, “school district personnel who are sincere about shaping the preparation of leaders must ensure that middle level assistant principalship positions provide extensive professional development for aspiring principals” (p.8).
Statement of the Problem

Prior to July 2001, all school districts in the state of Florida were mandated by Florida statute 231.087(3) to include the 19 principal competencies developed by the Florida Council on Educational Management (FCEM) as part of a state approved Human Resource Management Development (HRMD) APPP (FLDOE, 2002a). The problem was the new legislation mandated after 2001 reduced the criteria needed to obtain school principal certification and reduced the requirements needed to satisfy an APPP. The new statute allowed Florida school districts to hire employees to serve as school principals who had no educational leadership experience and who had not fulfilled requirements of an HRMD approved APPP.

The purposes of the study were to identify the basis of the required APPP components Florida school districts provide to their aspiring principals and their relationship, if any, to the state and the ISLLC standards. The research questions were designed to: (a) identify which school districts in the state of Florida provide an APPP for their current assistant principals; (b) determine if the required program components were based upon the FPCs, the ISLLC Standards, or another source; (c) determine if professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience were included as components of the APPP; and (d) determine if the percentage of components included in each APPP differ according to school district size.

Research Questions

The following questions guided the research:
1. To what extent do the Florida school districts provide a formal APPP to their current assistant principals?

2. Upon what are the formal APPPs for current assistant principals based: the Florida Principal Competencies, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s Standards, or another source?

3. To what extent do the school district APPPs in the 67 Florida districts have component requirements that include professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience?

4. Are there differences among the APPP components provided by Florida school districts of different sizes?

Definition of Terms

These definitions are offered in this chapter, as they may be useful to the reader in understanding the terms used within the literature review contained in Chapter 2.

Aspiring Principal: a current assistant principal.

Aspiring Principal Preparation Program (APPP): a formal school district provided HRMD principal preparation program based upon competencies and standards.

Consortium: a group of smaller sized school districts that set policies and procedures together as a single entity.

Florida Principal Preparation Assessment (FLAPPA): a survey developed to gather data about the APPP components provided by Florida school districts for their aspiring principals.
Florida Principal Competencies (FPCs): the 19 job targets that must be mastered by principals in Florida (Croghan & Lake, 1984). See Appendix A.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC): a nationwide organization comprised of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five extra state jurisdictions.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards: a common core of standards that can be used to inform program instructional content, as well as assessment tools for awarding new principal licensure, and advanced certification. The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium has developed six standards that focus on the knowledge, performance, and disposition of school leaders (Green, 2001). See Appendix B.

Mentor Principal: a high performing principal selected to work with the participants in a district provided aspiring principal preparation program in order to provide coaching and guidance on an on-going basis.

Performance-Based Requirements: on-the-job experiences or an internship completed by the aspiring principal as part of the aspiring principal program.

Professional Development: coursework or in-service opportunities specifically focused upon developing leadership skills.

Research Design

Combined quantitative and qualitative methods and procedures were used in this study. A descriptive approach using logical analysis and a modified triangulation method was employed.
The data sources included the Florida Aspiring Principal Preparation Assessment (FLAPPA) survey and the Florida school district’s Aspiring Principal Preparation Program (APPP) documentation. The triangulation process helped to ensure the validity of the data by corroborating survey responses and reducing the possibility of researcher biases (Gay & Airasian, 2000; Nitko, 2004; Popham, 2000).

Study Participants

The study was comprised of the sample of HRMD employees who were responsible for the APPPs in the Florida 67 school districts. The participants were identified in the employee listings found in the Florida Education Directory by Florida Association of School Administrators, 2003-2004 School Year (Florida Association of School Administrators (FASA), 2003). The criteria for selection of the HRMD employee responsible for the APPP were: (a) the HRMD employee who administered the APPP in their school district; (b) the employee who was recommended by the HRMD contact person to be the most knowledgeable about the APPP curriculum; or (c) the employee who was responsible for the coordination of the professional development, mentoring, and performance-based experiences for the school district APPP.

Instrumentation

The Survey

The instrument was designed from a literature review of best practices found in APPPs. The development and construction of the FLAPPA survey (Appendix D) had three phases: the
literature review, the investigation of the Florida school district websites to locate APPP documentation, and the development and construction of the survey items. Thirty-seven quantitative questions with closed-end responses were designed to collect data about the status of each of the 19 FPCs as identified by the FCEM, the six ISLLC Standards, professional development, principal mentoring, and a performance-based experience. Also included were four open-ended qualitative questions designed to gather information about the strengths and areas for improvement in each school district’s provided APPP. The development and construction of the survey instrument is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

Pilot Sample

To ensure higher validity and reliability of results, the FLAPPA survey was administered on subject matter experts and educational leaders to elicit their recommendations about the survey contents and format (Borg & Gall, 1989). The FLAPPA survey was piloted in a two-step process with subject matter experts and experienced educational leaders to elicit their recommendations so that their feedback could be reconciled for producing another draft of the questionnaire. In step one, the FLAPPA survey in the mailout envelope (Dillman, 2000) was administered in an interactive setting to individuals who had experience administering APPPs. The purpose of the informal interactive meetings was for the researcher to obtain in-depth, precise feedback and recommendations about the content and structure of the research questions.

In step two, the FLAPPA survey was administered to a graduate class of 22 educational leaders who worked in the field of education as administrators. The purpose of the educational
leadership group session was to determine if the survey questions were asking what they were intended to ask.

All of the feedback provided was carefully studied and considered. The instrument and cover letter were revised where appropriate. The piloting process is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

Data Collection and Analyses

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the FLAPPA surveys. Qualitative data were collected from the school district’s APPP websites (Appendix K). School district brochures that described the APPP were returned with the surveys and were used to verify and confirm the survey data.

On February 1, 2004, the correspondence was initiated by mailing a preletter (Appendix F; Dillman, 2000) to the contact person in each Florida school district, asking them to identify the HRMD person responsible for the APPP. The preletter gave notice that the FLAPPA survey was being mailed on February 9 and emphasized the importance of the study. The FLAPPA survey and cover letter detailing the directions and importance of the study were then mailed on February 9, 2004 to the identified HRMD employee.

A second distribution of the FLAPPA survey was mailed on February 26, 2004 to those HRMD administrators who had not yet returned the survey. The second mailing was followed up with a thank you card sent on March 14 to all the administrators. The card was a gentle reminder to those who had not yet returned the survey.
On March 15, a third mailing of the survey was sent to those who had not yet responded. On March 30, telephone calls were placed to the respondents who had not yet returned the survey to encourage them to please do so. A follow-up email was sent to the respondents to collect demographic data about the participant’s experience and training.

The collected quantitative data were entered into a spreadsheet using Microsoft Access 2000 and database Excel 2000. SPSS version 10.0 was used for the data analyses of research questions to determine percentages about the quantitative data. Using logical analysis, the qualitative data were logged verbatim and sorted by school district sizes.

First, an analysis measured the percentage of Florida school districts that were providing APPPs to their current assistant principals. Second, data were collected and calculated separately to identify which districts did not provide an APPP, programs provided by a consortium, or another venue. Third, the percentages of the program components that were based upon the 19 FPCs, the six ISLLC Standards, or another source were determined. Fourth, the percentages of programs that included components of professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience were calculated. Fifth, an analysis was completed to determine the bases of the APPP components according to school district size. Lastly, the researcher analyzed the demographic data and identified patterns of participant’s perspectives from the sorted qualitative responses.
Summary of Survey Questions

Question 1 was designed to elicit responses about whether or not each individual Florida school district provided an APPP to their current assistant principals. If the school district did not provide an APPP, questions 2 to 4 were designed to elicit responses about whether or not the current assistant principals participated in another district’s program, a consortium’s program, or another source's program. Question 5 asked the respondents if there was a document or brochure describing the district APPP that could be returned with the survey. Questions 6 through 9 were designed to collect data about the inclusion of components that addressed the current assistant principals' understanding and implementation of the FPCs and the ISLLC Standards. Questions 10, 11 and 12 were derived from review of literature and asked if the APPP required professional development, a mentor, and a performance-based experience as components of the program. Questions 13 through 37 were designed to gather data about whether or not the individual 19 components of the FPCs and the six ISLLC Standards were included in the APPP. Open-response questions 39 to 41 included at the end of the FLAPPA survey provided the respondents with an opportunity to share additional thoughts and perspectives about the APPPs. The study presented the following delimitations, limitations, and assumptions:

Delimitations

This study focused on the school district APPPs in the state of Florida and should not be generalized to other programs or states.
Limitations

1. APPPs in the state of Florida may be in flux due to the recent changes in statute and lack of funding.

2. Social desirability may be a hidden factor in the study and skew the data.

Assumptions

1. Survey responders provided accurate responses to survey items.

2. The survey responders did not view the survey as a threatening or political instrument, but rather as a tool to gather important data about the basis of the APPPs in their school district.

Significance of Study

The significance of the study was to provide information to educational leaders about the status of the Florida school district’s formal APPPs and the professional development component requirements provided to aspiring principals as they relate to the FPCs and the ISLLC Standards as of February 2004. The data provided a foundation for further research for educational leaders across the country on school district provided competency and standards-based APPPs, professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience.

Summary

Prior to July 1, 2001, Florida statutes 231.087 and 231.0861 mandated school districts to provide APPPs based upon the 19 FPCs to their aspiring principals. The APPP was part of the
requirements mandated for obtaining school principal certification. As of July 1, 2001, the Florida legislative statute Chapter 1012 of the K-20 Education code, allowed for changes to the APPPs that resulted in a reduction of the requirements needed to obtain school principal certification.

The descriptive study identified the Florida school districts that were providing formal APPPs for their current assistant principals who aspired to become principals as of February 2004. The quantitative and qualitative data were collected primarily on surveys and secondarily on websites and measured if the APPPs components were based on the FPCs, the ISLLC Standards, or another source. The study results also found if professional development, mentoring, and performance-based experiences were part of the requirements of the APPPs (Petzko, Clark, Valentine, Hackman, Nori, & Lucas, 2002). Finally, the results were analyzed by school district size to determine if there were any differences in the basis of the APPP components provided by small, medium small, medium, large, or very large sized districts (NAESP, 1988). Chapter 2 provides the literature review for the study.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of literature on APPPs was organized into sections. Section 1 examined the background and development of the state of FPCs. Section 2 reviewed the No Child Left Behind legislation that mandated the school leadership program, principal training, and state responsibilities and obligations. Section 3 described the background and development of the ISLLC Standards (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2001) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) recommendations for administrative preparation programs.

Section 4 focused on: (a) studies about APPPs provided by school districts in Florida, (b) described research about APPPs provided by school districts in states other than Florida, and (c) described studies on APPPs that were collaborations between school districts and universities or academies. Chapter 2 concludes with a summary.

Section 1: The Florida Principal Competencies

As early as 1980, the Florida legislature recognized the key role of the principal in school leadership, that principal preparation programs were not substantively vigorous enough to meet the challenges facing American education, and that principals were not adequately prepared to assume the responsibilities of leading effective schools (Mitchell, 1988 as cited in Christy, 1993, p.3).
In 1980, the Florida Legislature created the FCEM for the purpose of making recommendations and implementing programs that would improve the management of Florida’s public schools (Christy, 1993). The Council included 17 members who were appointed by the Governor, Senate, and House of Representatives.

The FCEM was mandated through Florida statute 231.087 “to identify the competencies, standards, training, and performance measures for school managers” (Barry & Griffin, 1986, p. 3). In 1984, it was the only legislation in the nation that “prescribed a comprehensive plan to improve the management skills of school leaders” (Patterson, 1983, p.13).

The purpose of the 1984 legislation was to focus on school based management. Due to the fact that school principals were not trained to handle school-based management and their changing role, “districts were encouraged to submit programs focusing on competencies appropriate to make the necessary managerial and budget decisions required for effective school-based management” (Christy, 1993, p.65). The FCEM’s responsibilities included Florida’s management training program.

The duties of the Florida Council on Educational Management were to identify relevant management competencies of school managers; standards and procedures for evaluating manager performance; training needed for developing competent school managers; manager screening and selection criteria; procedures for school manager certification; and procedures for compensation of school managers (Barry & Griffin, 1986, p.4).

The FCEM conducted a study to identify the competencies of high-performing principals (Croghan & Lake, 1984). Boyatzis (1982) defined a competency as “a complex set of relationships between the principal’s intent and action and the resulting intended and unintended
outcomes of that action” (Boyatzis, 1982; Boyatzis & McClelland, 1982; as cited in Christy, 1993, p.78).

The identification of the competencies was based upon three factors. First, the FCEM conducted an assimilation of data on all 2,200 schools in the state and analysis of individual student performance founded upon five indicators of socio-economic status. Second, 23 of the 67 Florida school districts became the study sample. The superintendents of the study sample were asked to rank-order their principals in terms of their over-all effectiveness. “With the added criteria of student performance data on national tests, the pool of high and moderate-performing principals was created” (Croghan & Lake, 1984, p.3). Third, behavioral event indicator interviews were conducted with the principals to select 14 high and 14 moderate performers. Seven of the essential competencies were identified from the interview data: (a) a high concern for school mission, (b) a concern for the school’s image, (c) an ability to manage by consensus, (d) an ability to direct quality management, (e) analytic ability, (f) a strong sense of control, and (g) the ability to be objective in their perceptions. “The high performers also were persuasive, had a high commitment to quality, and were able to bring about focused change in the schools as needed” (Croghan & Lake, 1984, p.5).

In 1984, three Florida counties, Lee, Broward, and Dade, were using 14 different assessment dimensions to assess principals. The FCEM completed a comparison of the competencies of high-performing principals and the unidimensional competencies of Lee, Broward, and Dade counties. The study by the FCEM validated information gathering, concept
formation, conceptual flexibility, organizational sensitivity, and proactive orientation as five competencies to be included as part of the FPCs (Croghan & Lake, 1984).

In a study completed in 1984, Boyatzis, Croghan, and Lake found cross-validation of some competencies. Decisiveness, oral communication, and managing interaction were competencies added to the list of FPCs from the Boyatzis study (as cited in Croghan & Lake, 1984).

The following list of high-performing competencies were proposed in Barry and Griffin’s 1986 study: proactive orientation, decisiveness, interpersonal search, information search, concept formation, conceptual flexibility, managing interaction, persuasiveness, achievement motivation, management control, organizational ability, and self-presentation. The basic competencies identified “which were required to perform the role of principal adequately” (p.40) were: commitment to school mission, concern for image, tactical adaptability, developmental orientation, delegation, written communication, and organizational sensitivity. In total, there were 19 competencies with behavioral indicators identified and adopted by the FCEM as part of the legislation. Included were training, selection, and evaluation procedures for high-performing principals in the state of Florida (Barry & Griffin, 1986). See Appendix A for a complete list of the 19 FPCs.

After defining the characteristics desired of an educational manager, the FCEM developed a Managerial Effectiveness Plan, consisting of five components from the FCEM’s 1984 study (as cited in Barry & Griffin, 1986). One of the components was a “training program to be conducted by the individual districts” (p. 7). The FCEM used its funds to set up projects in
the school districts demonstrating how to select principals more systematically using targeted selection and assessment centers. The FCEM also “supported intern programs and training development grants to translate competencies into training programs” (Croghan & Lake, 1984, p.58). Lashway (1999) referred to the period after 1986 as the “dialectic period characterized by highly critical evaluations of administrator preparation programs and persistent efforts to transform the profession” (p.23).

On July 1, 1986 and prior to July, 2001, Florida statute 231.0861(2) mandated district school boards to adopt and implement a process for screening, selecting, appointing, evaluating, assessing and training assistant principals and principals (Florida Department of Education [FLDOE], 1999). The program had to meet “the criteria approved by the State Board of Education’s Florida Council on Educational Management Act in Chapter 231.087” (FLDOE, 1999, p.111). Two of the twelve duties that the Council was charged with were: (a) “identifying those competencies that characterized high-performing principals and other managers in the public schools of this state, and (b) developing and approving guidelines for the approval of school district training programs used for the certification of principals” (FLDOE, 1999, p.112).

In 1984, the Florida Academy of School Leaders (FASL) was also “created by the Florida legislature through Section 231.087 of the Management Training Act” (Barry & Griffin, 1986, p. 3). The FASL was designed to complement the traditional APPPs offered by the universities. In 1984, the legislature described the duties of the principals as “primarily supervision of operation and management of the schools and property as the school board deemed necessary” (Christy, 1993, p. 65).
The FCEM served as the Board of Directors of the FASL. The purpose of the FASL was to provide in-service training for school managers for the purpose of upgrading the quality of management at all levels of the public school system in the state. The FASL conducted training institutes on current needs and problems of school management at all levels. The district management-training program was adopted by the State Board of Education and “allowed each district school board to propose a training program based on the FCEM identified competencies” (FLDOE, 1999, p.112).

The school board programs were designed to train district administrators, principals, assistant principals, school site administrators, and persons who were potential candidates for employment in such administrative positions. “The Florida Department of Education and school district shared the cost of the program” (FLDOE, 1999, p.112). Christy (1993) stated several reasons why staff development for assistant principals and principals did not develop the needed management competencies.

First, management competencies such as the Florida Principal Competencies were often poorly understood by those who designed the training; second, the design for principal training typically included only the first and second steps of the competency acquisition process; and third, no support system for making on-the-job practice with feedback was established at the school site. (p.84)

The program was phased out in 1994, and the repeal and review of the Management Act became effective on June 30, 2000.

As of July 1, 2001, changes were made to the Florida statutes regarding school principal certification and preparation. Chapter 1012 of the K-20 education code, School Community Professional Development Act 1012.98(5)(a) stated, ”the Department of Education shall provide
a system for the recruitment, preparation, and professional development of school administrative personnel” (FLDOE, 2002c, p.2). The code allowed for an alternative means for preparation of school administrative personnel that could be designed and provided by the school districts. “The district administrative preparation programs would still require approval of the Department of Education” (FLDOE, 2002c, p.472), but the change in legislation gave the districts greater flexibility in the selection, hiring and training of their principals.

Archer (2002a) reported that, according to the Florida code, “districts can now set their own minimum requirements for filling such positions, hiring as principals candidates who lack the state’s traditional school-administration credentials” (May 15, p.22). To recruit more principals, “the legislature decided that any proven professional manager could apply to be a principal; the standard school leadership certification no longer was required” (Alan, 2002, p.122).

According to Archer (2002a), the legislative change presented two arguments. One argument was presented by the supporters of the legislation, such as business leaders and Florida Republican Senate leader James E. King, Jr., in favor of loosening the state’s licensing rules, which “have kept otherwise qualified candidates out of the field, while doing little to ensure the competence of principals” (as cited in Archer, 2002a, p. 1). The new legislation “provided for alternate means for preparation of school administrative personnel which may include programs designed by school districts and postsecondary institutions pursuant to guidelines developed by the commissioner. Such preparation programs shall be approved by the Department of Education” (FLDOE, 2002c, p. 3). Senator King (as cited in Archer, 2002a, p. 3) stated “If it
works like we think it might, we can get some really talented folks in young retirement age to step forward and take over these positions.”

The other side of the argument was presented by those in opposition to the new Florida legislation, like school principals, who believed the legislative changes lowered the standards for school-level leaders. In the past, the Florida level-two, school principal’s certificate required “only individuals who held a School Principal’s Certificate to be appointed as a school principal” (Barry & Griffin, 1986, p.9). The principal candidates were required to hold a “valid educational leadership or administration certificate, complete an approved district management internship program, demonstrate the behaviors which depict the 19 FCEM competencies, and be recommended by a superintendent” for a principalship (Barry & Griffin, 1986, p.9). A formal professional development program where the supervised principal candidate took on all the responsibilities and duties of the principal was also required as part of the program.

The legislation in Florida approved on July 1, 2001, made Florida one of the least restrictive states for administrator licensing. “Under the new legislation, the state education department would continue to offer administrator credentials to individuals who applied, but the districts would no longer be obligated to hire only those who held them” (Archer, 2002a, p.23). John C. Fryer, Jr., superintendent of Florida’s Duval County district, in opposition to the legislation stated “that district leaders and school leaders need different kinds of skills” (Archer, 2002a, p. 3). Fryer pointed out that instructional leaders have to be principals who are experts on instruction.
As of June 30, 2003, a team of Florida educators was asked by the Council of Educational Change, formerly the non-profit organization South Florida Annenberg Challenge, to help evaluate a draft set of standards for Educational Leadership (W. Hall, personal communication, March 25, 2004). “The FLDOE has established partnerships among several organizations and non-profit organizations to enhance our efforts for school leaders” (A. Byrne, personal communication, July 25, 2004). The development team represented the contributions of Florida K–20 principals, Florida Association of School Administrators; Florida Association of Professors of Educational Leadership; Florida School Boards Association and the Florida Association of School Superintendents; and the Council of Educational Change. The development process included a survey of literature in the fields of education, business, and the military. Additionally, a crosscheck of the standards developed by national organizations was prepared and compared with early drafts of the Florida standards.

The Principal Leadership Standards Feedback Survey collected data about leadership behaviors, standards and key indicators (Council of Educational Change, 2003). The team was asked to rate: (a) how competent they were in each behavior using a ten-point nominal scale, and (b) should the behavior be included in the standards. The evaluation used a five point Likert scale.

The standards will be finalized during the summer of 2004 and presented to the Florida Board of Education as the basis for Educational Leadership training, development, selection, and evaluation (A. Byrne, personal communication, June 6, 2004). The document standards (Appendix I) were taken from the ISLLC, NCATE, ISTE
(International Society for Technology in Education, 2001), and NAESP (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2004) standards as well as some from the previous standards – the 19 Florida Competencies. Later in the year, where appropriate, parallel Sample Key Indicators will be developed for Beginning and Mid-Career Principals (A. Byrne, personal communication, June 5, 2004).

The 10 newly proposed Florida Principal Leadership Standards are:

1. **Vision**: High Performing Leaders have a personal vision for their school and the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop, articulate and implement a shared vision that is supported by the larger organization and the school community.

2. **Instructional Leadership**: High Performing Leaders promote a positive learning culture, provide an effective instructional program, and apply best practices to student learning, especially in the area of reading and other foundational skills.

3. **Managing the Learning Environment**: High Performing Leaders manage the organization, operations, facilities and resources in ways that maximize the use of resources in an instructional organization and promote a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

4. **Community and Stakeholder Partnerships**: High Performing Leaders collaborate with families, business, and community members, respond to diverse community interests and needs, work effectively within the larger organization and mobilize community resources.

5. **Decision Making Strategies**: High Performing Leaders plan effectively, use critical thinking and problem solving techniques, and collect and analyze data for continuous school improvement.

6. **Diversity**: High Performing Leaders understand, respond to, influence the personal, political, social, economic, legal, and cultural relationships in the classroom, the school and the local community.

7. **Technology**: High Performing Leaders plan and implement the integration of technological and electronic tools in teaching, learning, management, research, and communication responsibilities.

8. **Learning, Accountability, and Assessment**: High Performing Leaders monitor the success of all students in the learning environment, align the curriculum, instruction, and assessment processes to promote effective student performance,
and use a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations, and feedback measures to ensure accountability for all participants engaged in the educational process.

9. Human Resources Development: High Performing Leaders recruit and select effective personnel, develop mentor and partnership programs, and design and implement comprehensive professional growth plans for all staff—paid and volunteer.

10. Ethical Leadership: High Performing Leaders act with integrity, fairness, and honesty in an ethical manner (A. Byrne, personal communication, June 5, 2004).

Section 2: No Child Left Behind Legislation

On January 8, 2002, President Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The Act was the most sweeping reform of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) since ESEA was enacted in 1965. The Act redefined the federal role in K-12 education, providing states funding based upon an application and accountability criteria.

The reform of the principal certification requirements and professional development aligned with the state standards were part of the No Child Left Behind Act, Title II, Part A (USDOE, 2002). The School Leadership Program was a new discretionary grant program that supported efforts to recruit, retain, and provide training and continuing professional development to principals and assistant principals to create a high-quality school leadership force. “The School Leadership Program filled the need for high-quality principals by supporting the recruitment and professional development of effective school leaders who guided their teachers and helped their students to achieve success” (USDOE, 2002, II-A-5-2151 (B), p.1).

A key requirement to the program was that activities to recruit, retain, and train principals and assistant principals had to include providing a financial incentive to aspiring new principals, provide stipends to principals who mentored new principals, had to provide professional development in instructional leadership and management, and had to provide
effective incentives for the recruitment and retention of individuals who wanted to become principals. (USDOE, 2002, II-A-5-2151 (B), p.1)

Title II Part A, of the No Child Left Behind Act (2002), as compiled by Phyllis McClure of the CCSSO, provided a description of how the state’s activities must comply with the new federal legislation. The Council “responded to a broad range of concerns about education and provided leadership and technical assistance on major educational issues” (CCSSO, 2002, p. ii). According to the report, the state’s activities were required to be based upon scientific research and would receive allocated funds to improve the quality of principals. The report stated that the state’s activities had to offer professional development that coordinated with other federal, state, and local programs, and be aligned with the state standards and assessments. The activities also had to “provide professional development for principals so that they become exceptional managers and educational leaders” (CCSSO, 2002, p. 28). The document goes on to define a highly qualified teacher by listing the requirements needed for certification, but it does not define the requirements needed to be considered a highly qualified principal or to obtain principal certification.

Title II sub-grants were made available to the states from the United States Department of Education and required the local educational agencies to provide activities that included “ways to help schools recruit and retain highly qualified principals, provide professional development to improve the knowledge and skills of principals, and offer professional development academies for principals and superintendents and individuals aspiring to those positions” (CCSSO, 2002, p. 32). The professional development was based upon the state content and achievement standards.
Funding was provided through partnership sub-grants for professional development of principals to develop the principals’ instructional leadership skills. Funds were also provided to individuals who were trained as mentors to deliver professional development at the schools (CCSSO, 2002).

Section 3: The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards

The ISLLC, is a “nationwide organization comprised of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense Education Activity, and five extra state jurisdictions” (Green, 2001, p.1). ISLLC, chaired by Murphy in 1996, developed six national standards for school leaders that focused on the knowledge, performance, and disposition (Shipman, Topps, & Murphy, 1998). Shipman, Topps, & Murphy (1998) presented the idea that the “intent of ISLLC was to raise the bar for the effectiveness of school leaders” (p.7) so that a person who completes an APPP based on the standards will “look forward to the 21st century” (p.7).

“The ISLLC team crafted a comprehensive strategy to employ the standards to reach the goal of changing the focus of the principalship from management to learning” (Murphy, 2002, p. 22). The ISLLC standards are based upon a common core of standards that can be used to inform program instructional content, assessment tools for awarding new principal licensure, and advanced certification (ISLLC, 1997). Each of these standards has indicators of effectiveness in each of the identified areas (Green, 2001).

ISLLC member states and associations recognized that use of the standards to strengthen the professional development of school leaders was a logical extension of the
Consortium’s work, and requested the director of ISLLC to pursue funding for a project to link the standards to professional development (Shipman, Topps, & Murphy, 1998, p. 2).

In 1998, four of the ISLLC states, Kentucky, Illinois, Mississippi, and North Carolina, plus the District of Columbia joined together to fund the Educational Testing Services’ (ETS) development of a performance assessment instrument. The examination, used in 10 states in 1998, was designed to evaluate candidates who had completed their APPP. The School Licensure Assessment ensured that “individual school leaders had the right stuff to lead a school where children are successful, and it encouraged universities to highlight the themes of learning and school improvement in their preparation programs for school administrators” (Murphy, 2002, p. 23).

The six ISLLC Standards are:

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

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

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

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

5. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (ISLLC of the Council of Chief State School Officers, 1997, p.5).

An analysis of these standards revealed a number of principles that guided their development:

1. They are anchored on values ends or outcomes rather than on functions and tasks.
2. They privilege student learning and demand success for all youngsters.
3. They shift the center of gravity in school leadership from management and administration to learning and school improvement.
4. They underscore the collaborative nature of school-based leadership, stressing the importance of access, opportunity, and empowerment for teachers, parents, and all members of the school community.
5. They establish an integrated and coherent framework for action. Instead of the usual laundry list of everything a principal might do, they present a tightly focused set of ideas that help refocus the principalship on learner-centered leadership.
6. They are designed to shape and direct action of those who are in a position to do the heavy lifting in the reshaping of the principalship (Murphy, 2002, p. 22).

The reform design called for the adoption of the ISLLC standards throughout the nation.

Section 4: School District Provided Aspiring Principal Preparation Programs

APPPs are administered through universities, leadership academies, and school districts. This study focused on APPPS provided by the Florida school districts. The literature supported APPPs include competency and standards-based program components (Abernathy, 2000; Fluth, 1986; FLDOE, 2003; Hall, 1989; Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993; Hughes-James & McCauley, 1994; Lashway, 2003; Milstein, 1993; Rice, 1991). The components of professional

Aspiring Principal Preparation - School District Programs in Florida

In a 1988 study at the University of Miami, doctoral student, Offerle, researched what experiences, settings, situations or activities promoted the development of six of the Florida Principal Competencies: decisiveness, information search, management interaction, management control, organizational ability, and self presentation (Offerle, 1988, p. 101). Only the high performing competencies were selected for the study due to time restraints. The research was completed in Dade County, Florida with administrative interns who were participating in an intern principalship during the 1986 to 1987 school year. Offerle reported in her findings that being coached or mentored and attending professional development workshops were both identified as basic acquisition methods. The competency acquisition method found “to be used the most frequently was when aspiring principals participated in professional development...
coursework. Being mentored was found to be the least used method of competency acquisition” (p. 104).

Another finding that assisted in competency acquisition was the principal intern being able to participate in an internship or performance-based experience. “Each intern functioned fully as a principal. The regular building principal physically left the site so the intern could grow and function” (Offerle, 1988, p.108). Offerle recommended that management-training departments should incorporate the methods of competency acquisition and participation in a performance-based experience as part of a “training ground for the principalship” (p. 109).

In a 1993 study completed about a principal preparation program in a large urban school district in Florida, Christy recommended that:

- a study of programs using the 19 Florida Principal Competencies for preparing principals in other Florida school districts needs to be conducted to determine the relative effectiveness of various models used in other districts. Such a study would add to the literature on effective principalship training and help improve principalship training in Florida (Christy, 1993, p. 142).

Winn (1993), a doctoral student at the University of Central Florida, conducted a study to identify the perceptions of participants in the Preparing New Principal programs from three school districts in Florida. Winn’s research questions focused on several areas of the program including mentoring and professional development. Influential mentoring was found to be an important factor in the progression and preparation of the program participants. However, mentoring was “the second most frequently identified career barrier from a list of 18 choices” (Winn, 1993, p.82). This was due to the lack of influential mentors. Winn suggested that
“training in mentoring by districts, universities, and professional organizations should be investigated” (p. 95).

Winn (1993) found professional development to be the one most significant factor in the program. When asked to what degree does the training in the Preparing New Principals Program meet perceived needs of participants in preparing them to be principals, the data identified the “training segment as the most helpful part of the Principal Preparation Programs” (p.84). When asked to identify the primary factor in helping them to develop competence in the seven clusters of competencies identified by the Florida Council of Educational Management, “the most frequently identified source for developing the Florida Principal competencies was on-the-job training” (p. 87).

Cox (1998) completed a qualitative study on the effectiveness of principal preparation in three Florida school districts as perceived by selected superintendents, first-year principals, and other key informants. Cox collected data from superintendents, assistant superintendents, HRMD coordinators, a consultant, one interim principal, and 18 first-year principals by administering a survey and conducting semi-structured interviews. “To represent the variation in size by student population in the 1996 to 1997 school term” (Cox, 1998, p.10), Cox selected three school districts of varying sizes, small, medium and large, located in the state of Florida in which to complete her study.

The purpose of Cox’s 1998 study was to examine the perceptions of first year principals’ value of the training received from each of the school district’s HRMD principal preparation
program. The study design focused on four areas: demographic data, program content and processes, value and transfer of training, and program content and articulation (p. 9).

The FCEM (1984) stated that, “the professional development plan is an individualized program of study based upon the needs of the learner when compared to the demands of the job” (cited in Cox, 1998, p. 27). Cox’s research identified the relative strengths and weaknesses of preparation experiences as perceived by first-year principals, superintendents and other key informants.

Cox (1998) also found that the programs provided by small districts were more individualized than the other larger districts. In the small district, one principal’s perception “was that the quality depended on the emphasis placed by the support team” (p. 50).

In the small district, a professional growth plan was developed for the assistant principal based on the assessment of the FPCs, a self-assessment and a supervisor assessment. In-basket activities, conferencing, and assessment procedures were included in the individualized professional development program. Although the small district did provide mentors to the aspiring principals, it did not provide a formal professional development program, a released-time internship, or a performance-based experience as part of the program.

The small district lacked the state funding to provide its own professional development program so the small district participated in a regional network. “The district took advantage of workshops offered by the state associations, the regional networks and other organizations” (Cox, 1998, p. 63). According to the small district’s plan “the assistant principalship is considered an internship” (p.50). The lack of state funding for the regional network in which the
small district participated was a concern expressed by the district coordinator. Another concern was the more than two hours distance participants had to travel in order to complete professional development workshops.

Cox (1998) found that all the districts regardless of size provided APPPs to their aspiring principals based on the FPCs. Each program involved on-the-job training, a support team, and a supervising principal. A finding participants revealed from the interviews was that “the supervising principal held the key to the comprehensive duties of the principalship and thereby controlled the opportunity to learn” (p.178). The medium and large sized districts’ APPPs included mentors, a formal professional development program, an internship or performance-based experience, and portfolio documentation of the FPCs acquisition.

Cox (1998) recommended from the findings of her study that the ideal process for training new principals would include: (a) a full-time internship with increased responsibilities for school management over time, (b) the selection and development of the participants based on the Florida Principal Competencies, (c) supervising principals and mentors experienced and trained in the content of adult learning theory and the competency-acquisition model, and (d) funding retained for providing assistance to districts in principal preparation. Cox recommended further research be completed “regarding the content of principal preparation programs from a larger sample of school districts in the state to determine the variety of practice and to identify best practices” (p. 197). Cox also recommended that, “a study of curricular offerings for potential administrators in each district could reveal quality programs and reduce the need to create programs that already have been developed” (p. 197).
Robinson (2001) completed a case study narrative about the Sarasota County Florida School District Leadership Academy Model. As a senior staff member of the Sarasota School District in 1996, Robinson designed a program for aspiring administrators, assistant principals, new principals, and experienced principals that provided for systemic leadership change. Robinson surveyed the academy participants at the end of their academy year to identify areas for improvement and participant perceptions.

The new program included components of “instructional leadership skills acquisition, identification and development of aspiring administrators, and high performance expectations” (Robinson, 2001, p. 29). Robinson stated that “there was a need to change the way principals ran their schools and that principals needed to function as instructional leaders, not just building managers” (p. 29). The principals needed training in the concepts of effective schools research and total quality management concepts. There was a need to improve the community’s low regard for the principals, to address the principals’ request for improved staff development, and to recruit and train aspiring principals because of the projected high retirement rate of principals within the next three years. All of these factors led up to the designing of a four-tiered Sarasota School District Leadership Academy Model.

The Sarasota County Florida School District Leadership Academy was designed from the following recommendations found from Robinson’s research:

1. Design a multilevel program, covering personnel from aspiring principals to experienced administrators.
2. Develop a selection process for entry-level administrators.
3. Provide a program that encourages and inspires minority participation.
4. Base a great deal of the training on effective schools research.
5. Seek out the concerns of district administrators, issues, concerns, and needs.
6. Develop executive summaries for building administrators from research-based topics and blue ribbon reports.
7. Utilize performance simulation activities to help administrators gain skills and knowledge.
8. Establish an on-going mentoring program for aspiring and new administrators.
9. Prepare all administrators to work with difficult parents and community leaders.
10. Design units and workshops to cover components of effective teaching.
11. Provide annual in-services for administrators on the concepts of implementing and managing change (Robinson, 2001, p.34).

The final proposed program centered on a leadership academy model that included professional development components of “classroom curriculum, competency-based field simulations, assigned reading, case studies, portfolios, coaching, networking, and mentoring” (Robinson, 2001, p.36).

The Transitional Leadership Program and the Assistant Principals Program were funded and operating based upon Robinson’s research. Robinson’s (2001) study mentioned the FPCs as “part of the tier three New Principals Program designed as an induction program for new principals to the district” (p. 39). Tiers three and four, at the time, were not implemented.

Robinson concurred that:

a number of states established principal training programs, but disappointingly the results of these state-based initiatives led researchers to conclude that such programs needed to be district based and district administered so the training content could be tailored to the needs of the district, and local administrators would have a sense of ownership and control over their programs (Robinson, 2001, p. 21).
Robinson recommended that further research was needed “to explore the advantages, disadvantages, and practicality of partial or total state funding of district-based administrator training programs” (p. 63).

Aspiring Principal Preparation - School District Programs in States Other Than Florida

Lovely (1999) researched the principal leadership program of the Capistrano Unified School District in California. An interrelated four-tiered system of leadership development, the program included a teaching assistant principal model, an assistant principal model, a principal mentoring model, and a veteran principal program. The veteran principal mentored aspiring principals through regular phone contact, site visits, and job shadowing. Peer support, coaching, monthly workshops, teambuilding, a resource binder, area planning meetings, and group problem-solving sessions were included in the mentoring part of the program. Encouragement, counseling, feedback, formal site visits, and personal contacts were provided from the veteran principals. Leadership happy hours were held periodically to allow cohorts to share successful programs, discuss ways to better delegate, and to strategize about building leadership capacity in their schools.

In 1999, three collaborative principal preparation programs were studied in Texas, with the purpose of documenting and describing the structure, successful practices, and problems or obstacles encountered in the establishment of collaborative, field-based APPPs. The qualitative study completed by Jones in 1999 as part of her doctoral degree requirement:
described: (a) each of the principal preparation programs, (b) determined what was being done in these programs that brought success, such as mentoring, (c) determined what problems were present which could be overcome, such as site-based mentoring, (d) determine what is being done in these programs that worked against success, and (e) determined the key factors or unique aspects of each of the collaborative field-based principal preparation programs (Jones, 1999, p. 157).

Using a qualitative naturalistic inquiry research designed to collect data, Jones (1999) found:

1. Effective principals impact student performance and there must be quality training for the leadership necessary at the campus level.
2. Data consistently indicated that interns developed most from the varied, intensive, and full-time, field-based experiences prior to actually being employed as a principal.
3. An engaging relationship with a trusting mentor must be provided on a regular basis. The selection of dynamic principal mentors is critical when planning a program because this choice will strongly impact the quality of the experience for the interns.
4. Effective principal preparation programs stress a strong, cohort-bonded support system providing time for group reflection to internalize skills and knowledge, which then provided structure for success.
5. Effective use of music, rituals, and ceremonies helped to create and enhance the emergence of a supportive culture and are elements of successful principal preparation programs.
6. Universities and other collaborative agencies are not adequately funded to provide field-based administrator instruction without external funding. (Jones, 1999, p. 161)

Jones (1999) recommended that “performance criteria such as that established in the 21 performance domains of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) and the seven standards for the principal certification in Texas may be used to observe performance criteria” (p. 167).
Daresh, Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Texas - El Paso, presented a paper at the annual meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration in Houston, Texas on August 7 – 11, 2001. Daresh described the problems in the Socorro Independent School District of student growth, mobility, low socio-economic status, and limited English proficiency. As well as dealing with student related problems, the district school board also had the increasingly difficult problem of “finding and retaining educational leaders to serve as principals in the schools” (Daresh, 2001, p.4). Daresh reported, “the El Paso area and the entire nation face the task of recruiting, preparing, and retaining capable educational leaders” (p. 4).

The Socorro Independent School District developed the Assistant Principals Academy (AP Academy) in 1998 as a solution to the lack of people prepared to serve as school administrators. An Area Executive Director from the Socorro Central Office, a retired Superintendent of the Socorro district, and a professor of Educational Leadership at a local university served as the staff of the AP Academy.

The two-year program of professional development was based upon the Learner-Centered Leadership Standards adopted by the Texas Education Agency and the State Board for Educator Certification. These standards were based upon the ISLLC Standards (Daresh, 2001, p. 12).

As part of the professional development of the AP Academy, the assistant principals attended monthly meetings, read books dealing with educational issues and reported back to the group in a discussion forum, and “prepared an individual educational platform to describe personal beliefs and values related to the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders (p.10).
As the AP Academy received feedback from the participants, changes to the monthly agendas were made to include discussion about current problems and solutions to school issues. The assistant principals’ feedback became an important part of the learning process for the participants. Daresh (2001) stated that a “commitment to effective administrator development is a way to ensure that the Board of Trustees and the district will have a ready supply of strong and effective school leaders to accept the challenges that are sure to follow growth and expansion” (p. 19).

Aspiring Principal Preparation - School District Collaborative Programs

Archer (2002b) in an Education Week article dated May 29, 2002, described challenges to the New York City schools because “about half of the city’s public schools are led by someone with less than three years’ experience on the job” (p. 1) and many principals were retiring in the near future. Archer stated that New York City had instituted a Principals’ Institute where improvement in training initiatives included mentoring programs, coaching programs, counseling sessions, cohort meetings and a summer institute for rookies. There was also a new pre-service training program for administrators that focused upon the skills needed to run a school.

The New Leaders for New Schools organization offered their services to train the New York City Schools principals. The New Leaders for New Schools provided a program for preparing new leaders for urban public schools (Archer, 2002b). The program included a one-year residency or performance-based experience where the aspiring principal shadowed an
experienced administrator. The experienced administrator acted as a mentor to the aspiring principal providing guidance and support.

Two colleges, Baruch and Hunter, partnered with the New York City Schools to provide administrator preparation programs jointly taught by college faculty and school principals. Although the collaborative programs helped to train new principals, the programs only produced a total of fifty candidates over three years. There were over 200 principal positions that had needed to be filled in the previous eight months (Archer, 2002b). “Given the magnitude of the challenge we are confronted with, we need to do more,” stated Robert Hughes, the president of New Visions for Public Schools (as cited in Archer, 2002b, p. 1). Despite the efforts to expand the leadership development programs in the New York City schools, the problems of too little money from the board of education and private donations, and not enough available time, hampered the initiatives.

According to Hansen and Matthews (1994), mentoring is a tool to make the operation of a principalship more reflective and productive. The principal can accomplish this goal through writing, goal setting, conferring, and participating in professional activities. An integrated practicum guided by a mentor, must be a part of the principal preparation training and coursework (Sharps, 1993). Principals should share problems and concerns with the goal of helping each other to establish solutions to the complex problems. Through mentoring, principals gain feedback and reflection (Ashby, 1991; Lachman, 1992).
Pence in a 1989 report, described the Oregon School Study Council’s administrators’ mentoring program. Pence suggested that confidentiality and trust are two vital ingredients to a successful formal mentorship program.

Bush and Chew (1999) found in a comparative study completed in Singapore that mentoring was a necessity for effective training for the next generation of school principals. Bush and Chew compared a principal training program in Singapore that included mentoring with a principal training program in England and Wales without a mentoring component. The authors noted that the objective of self-management in the United Kingdom had been to increase the pressure of public accountability for better standards and to increase the principals’ freedom to respond to that pressure. In Singapore, principals were schooled in school management, but lacked the necessary autonomy to make timely decisions, deploy their resources more effectively, or respond to the needs of their pupils. What developed in Singapore was a unique professional development program targeted at potential principals who were sponsored for a year of full-time pre-service training. Mentor principals experienced in school leadership were then identified and appointed to serve as mentors to each principal trainee for eight weeks. The program was expanded to include training and mentoring in effective leadership skills for the experienced principals.

Bush and Chew (1999) found that mentoring programs required considerable planning, creativity, resources, and a high level of commitment to ensure positive outcomes. The criteria for selection of a mentor principal needed to include principals who were assessed as high performers as school leaders, considered prestigious, and highly visible in the eye of their peers.
and teaching staff. Mentor principals needed to possess the skills to motivate first-year principals, take the role seriously, read the literature about honing the strengths and leadership qualities of the protégé, and develop a relationship between the mentor and the protégé.

Summary

The literature review showed that APPPs included professional development that was based on standards and competencies, such as the 19 FPCs and the six ISLLC Standards (Harrison, 1993; Henwood, 2000). A quality program provided the opportunity for educators to obtain the necessary knowledge, behavioral skills and competencies required for assuming principalships (Davis, 1997; Tucker & Codding, 2002).

Researchers Cobble (1993) and Keller (1994) found that the mentoring component allowed time for the mentor to share leadership activities with the person being mentored. The leadership activities included time for various activities like reflection, goal and objective setting, open communication, feedback sessions, visitations, planning, and job shadowing (Bush & Chew, 1999; Hansen & Matthews, 1994; Pence, 1989).

Researchers Mercado (2002) and Theobald (1991) found that performance-based experiences were included in the APPPs. The aspiring principal needed to be given an opportunity to participate in performance-based experiences at different school and district sites, and job shadow with experienced administrators (Adams, 1994).

In summary, the literature review supported the policy that a current assistant principal who is aspiring to become a principal should participate in a school district provided APPP based
on competencies and standards. As legislation changed the requirements of principal certification and APPPs in Florida, the research questions purposes were to identify if standards-based professional development components continued to be the basis of the APPPs provided by Florida school districts. According to recommendations found from the literature review, the APPP requirements should be tailored to the school district needs; should include professional development, mentoring and a performance-based experience; and should be based upon the Florida Principal Competencies and the ISLLC Standards.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

Chapter three describes the combined quantitative and qualitative methods and procedures used in this study. A descriptive approach using logical analysis and a modified triangulation method was employed. The data sources included the Florida Aspiring Principal Preparation Assessment (FLAPPA) survey and the Florida school district’s Aspiring Principal Preparation Program (APPP) documentation. The triangulation process helped to ensure the validity of the data by corroborating survey responses and reducing the possibility of researcher biases (Gay & Airasian, 2000; Nitko, 2004; Popham, 2000).

The combined quantitative and qualitative methods included defining a problem, developing the research questions, and completing a review of related literature. After the methods and procedures of the study were determined, a survey instrument was developed. Data were collected, analyzed, and the results interpreted. Finally, conclusions and implications were stated (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

Data were collected from two sources: the quantitative and qualitative questions included on the FLAPPA survey and district documentation located on the district website. The quantitative questions provided for the collection of data from the responses of 37 closed-ended items. Data analysis of the quantitative data were completed to find what percentage of school districts provided an APPP to their current assistant principals; what was the bases of the APPPs
components; and whether or not mentoring, professional development, and a performance-based experience were included as components. Follow-up comparative analyses were completed according to the student enrollment size of the school districts (Florida Department of Education, 2002b) and whether or not the school districts provided a competency and/or standards-based APPP to their aspiring principals.

Data were also collected from the school district documentation located on the district’s websites. The researcher read each survey item and then examined the APPP documentation for a match. The comparison of the survey items to the APPP components was completed in a one-to-one analysis. If the survey item was found in the website documentation, then the component was identified as being “Included”. If not found, then the component was identified as “Not Included”.

Four qualitative questions located at the end of the survey were used to collect data emphasizing the perspectives of the participants (Gay & Airasian, 2000). Questions were designed to gather more specialized information and understanding about each individual Florida school district’s APPP. Responses were logged verbatim and sorted by question number and then by school district size. Data interpretation of these questions were “based on induction; the researcher discovers patterns that emerge from the data and makes sense of them” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 239). Therefore, as suggested by Gay and Airasian “a process of organizing, categorizing, synthesizing, interpreting, and writing about the qualitative data was developed once the data was collected” (p.239).
The questionnaire and cover letter were field tested in a two part pilot study “using respondents who were similar to those who were later asked to respond to the questionnaire” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 316). Revisions to the questionnaire and cover letter were made based upon the suggestions and feedback of the pilot participants before the documents were used in the actual study. The rationale for choosing the development and construction of the survey items, the specific methods and procedures of the study, and the data collection and analysis procedures are explained in more detail later in this chapter (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

Prior to July 2001, all school districts in the state of Florida were mandated by Florida statute 231.087(3) to include the 19 principal competencies developed by the Florida Council on Educational Management (FCEM) as part of a state approved Human Resource Management Development (HRMD) APPP (FLDOE, 2002a). The problem was that new legislation mandated after 2001 reduced the criteria needed to obtain school principal certification and reduced the requirements to satisfy an APPP. The new statue allowed Florida school districts to hire employees to serve as school principals who had no educational leadership experience and who had not fulfilled requirements of an approved APPP.

The purposes of the study were to identify the bases of the required APPP components Florida school districts provide to their aspiring principals and their relationship, if any, to the state and ISLLC standards. The research questions were designed to: (a) identify which school districts in the state of Florida provide an APPP for their current assistant principals, (b)
determine if the required program components were based upon the FPCs, the ISLLC Standards, or another source; (c) determine if professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience were included as components of the APPP; and (d) determine whether or not the percentage of components included in each APPP differ according to school district size. The research questions were developed from components of best practice found in the APPP literature review (Archer, 2002a, 2002b; Daresh, 1992; Daresh & Playko, 2001; Lovely, 1999). Table 1 shows the relationship between the research questions and the survey items.
Table 1

Research Questions and Corresponding Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent do the Florida school districts provide a formal aspiring principal preparation program for current assistant principals?</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Upon what are the formal aspiring principal preparation programs for current assistant principals based: the Florida Principal Competencies, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s Standards, or another source?</td>
<td>5 – 9; 13 - 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent do the school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the 67 Florida districts have component requirements that include professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience?</td>
<td>10 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there differences among the principal preparation components provided by differently sized school districts?</td>
<td>10 - 41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

The study participants were comprised of the sample of HRMD employees who were purposively selected as those responsible for the APPPs in the 67 school districts of Florida in February 2004. The participants were identified through the employee listings found in the Florida Education Directory by Florida Association of School Administrators, 2003-2004 School Year (FASA) (Florida Association of School Administrators, 2003).

The FASA Directory (2003) provided the contact information for each school district and their HRMD employee. The contact information included the telephone number, mail
address, and sometimes, the email address of each employee. Refer to Appendix E for a list of the Florida school districts contact information.

The criteria for identifying the HRMD employees were tiered according to three characteristics. The challenge was to identify the employee most responsible for the administration of the APPP in each school district. If criterion one was met, then that employee was selected. If not, then the selection process moved to criterion two, and then, if needed, criterion three. Table 2 summarizes the three criteria for the selection process of the HRMD participants and the number of participants who were identified using each criterion.

Table 2
The Selection Criteria and Corresponding N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The HRMD employee who administered the APPP in their school district.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The employee who was recommended by the HRMD contact person to be the most knowledgeable about the APPP curriculum.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The employee who was responsible for the coordination of the professional development, mentoring, and/or performance-based experiences for the school district APPP.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In districts where no employee with a HRMD title was found in the FASA Directory (2003) listing, the researcher first contacted the person responsible for personnel; next the
researcher contacted the staff development coordinator; and in two instances, the researcher contacted the administrative assistant of the personnel director. The respective employee was asked to identify the person in their district who best fit the selection criteria. If there was not an APPP in the school district, or if the aspiring principals participated in another district’s program, then that information was documented. After the participants were identified, the next steps were to develop and construct the mailout package that included the cover letter and the survey instrument, the Institutional Review Board letter, and the return envelope. The development and construction of these items follows.

**Instrument Development and Construction**

“The goal of writing a survey question is to develop a query that every potential respondent will interpret in the same way, be able to respond accurately, and be willing to answer” (Dillman, 2000, p. 32). The cover letter and the FLAPPA survey were designed using standard instrument development procedures (Dillman, 2000; Nitko, 2004; Popham, 2000). The purpose of developing the FLAPPA survey was to collect data about the basis of the APPPs provided by school districts in Florida. As recommended by Gay & Airasian (2000) piloting sessions, editing, and item analysis were performed before the end product was finalized and mailed to the study participants.

The FLAPPA survey (Appendix D) was developed to address research questions in a manner that will allow validity and reliability of results. The development had three phases: the
literature review, the development and construction of the survey items, and the investigation of the Florida school districts’ websites to locate APPP documentation.

Phase one included a thorough review of the research literature. The review identified the bases of the components of the APPPs in Florida and in other states. Twenty-eight leadership component variables were identified and categorized into five domains. The five domains identified were: the 19 FPCs, the six ISLLC Standards, mentoring, professional development, and performance-based experiences. Refer to Chapter 2 literature review for the foundation of the study domains and variables.

Phase 2 involved the development and construction of the FLAPPA survey, cover letter, IRB letter, and mailout package. The design concepts included Dillman’s (2000) recommended physical format concerns, the ordering of questions, and the principles for deciding on the layout and design of the individual questionnaire. The survey design included item design, response scale selection, item-grouping decisions, and formatting concerns.

Phase 3 included the investigation of the 67 Florida school districts’ websites to locate APPP documentation. The investigation included searching each school district’s website, locating the HRMD WebPages, and identifying the APPP documentation. The APPP documentation was downloaded and the FLAPPA survey items matched to the components of each APPP, if available. Refer to Appendix K for a list of the school districts that provided APPP information on their websites.
Validity

Content validity of the items ensured “the degree to which a test measures an intended content area” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 163). In phase three, forty-one survey questions were designed to collect data on the basis of the APPP components in each of the Florida school districts as they related to the FPCs (Appendix A) (Florida Department of Education, 2003), the ISLLC Standards (Appendix B) (Educational Testing Service, 2003; Kramer & Conoley, 1992), or another source; professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience. These components were deemed valid from a literature review where they were found to be included as components of best practice in APPPs. Table 3, Survey Blueprint, contains the 28 variables and shows the link between each item and its origin. Table 3 also lists whether the item is considered an abstract or a concrete component based upon the researcher’s decision to categorize each competency acquisition through behaviors that could be measured, performed, demonstrated, or not.
Table 3

Survey Blueprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Text of Item</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Abstract/Concrete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Lit Rev</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Performance-based Exp.</td>
<td>Lit Rev</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Lit Rev</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>ISLLC 6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>ISLLC 4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Advocating</td>
<td>ISLLC 2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Information Search</td>
<td>FPC 5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Concept Formation</td>
<td>FPC 6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Conceptual Flexibility</td>
<td>FPC 7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>FPC 16</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Managing Interaction</td>
<td>FPC 8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Self-Presentation</td>
<td>FPC 17</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>FPC 18</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Organization Sensitivity</td>
<td>FPC 19</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>ISLLC 1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>FPC 12</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>FPC 13</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Development Orientation</td>
<td>FPC 14</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Organizational Ability</td>
<td>FPC 15</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Impact/Persuasiveness</td>
<td>FPC 9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>School’s Reputation</td>
<td>FPC 10</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Tactical Ability</td>
<td>FPC 11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>FPC 4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Managing Organization</td>
<td>ISLLC 3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Vision/Mission</td>
<td>FPC 3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Acting with Integrity</td>
<td>ISLLC 5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>FPC 2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Proactive Orientation</td>
<td>FPC 1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. FPC=Florida Principal Competency; ISLLC=Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium; C=Concrete; A=Abstract.
Item Design

The first question of the 37 quantitative closed-ended survey items was applicable to everyone and requested information about whether or not the districts provided an APPP to their current assistant principals. The response choices were “Yes, No, or Do Not Know.” If the “No or Do Not Know” response was selected, questions 2 to 4 were designed to collect data about whether or not the current assistant principals participated in another district’s program, a consortium’s program, or another source’s program.

Each quantitative question stated the competency or standard and then included its definition. The questions addressed only one issue at a time and the writing structure was clear and consistent (Dillman, 2000). Refer to Appendix D for a copy of the survey questions.

Survey item 5 collected data about whether or not there was a document or brochure describing the district APPP that could be returned with the survey. Survey items 6 through 9 were questions designed to collect data about the inclusion of the APPP components that addressed the current assistant principal’s understanding and implementation of the FPCs and the ISLLC Standards.

Survey items 10, 11 and 12 were derived from the literature review and collected data about the inclusion of professional development, a mentor principal, and a performance-based experience as components of the APPP. Survey items 13 through 37 were designed to gather data about whether or not the individual 19 components of the FPCs and the 6 ISLLC Standards were included in the APPP.
Four qualitative open response questions (38 - 41) were included at the end of the FLAPPA survey (Appendix I). The four questions were equally spaced on the page to give the respondent room to respond immediately under each question. All the questions were “short, specific, and avoided bias” (Dillman, 2000, p. 51). If relevant to the districts, qualitative question 38 asked the reason why the school districts did not provide their own APPPs. Questions 39 and 40 gathered individualized information from the respondents about their perceptions of the school districts APPPs strengths and areas of needed improvement. Question 41 provided the respondents the opportunity to add any additional comments about their school district’s APPP.

Response Scale

The unordered category response scale provided the respondent with three consistent answer choices for each quantitative question (Dillman, 2000). In the first section, the response choices were: “Yes, No, and Do Not Know.” In the next sections’, the response choices were: “Included, Not Included, and Do Not Know.” If the APPP included or addressed the component, then the respondents were asked to check the “Yes” or “Included” response box. If the APPP did not include or address the component, then the respondents were asked to check the “No” or “Not Included” response box. The third choice was the “Do Not Know” category which was included on the FLAPPA instrument to give the respondents an answer if they were “not sure if the component was included in the program or not” (Dillman, 2000, p.141).
**Item Grouping**

The items were grouped into concrete and abstract sections. The purpose of grouping the items was to help avoid response set, to make the items as clear as possible, and for ease of readability for the respondents (Dillman, 2000). To better ensure item consistency, the components were grouped into sections according to levels of inference (more concrete or more abstract), and then separated by alternating grayscale and white backgrounds. The aim of separating the components into alternating grayscale and white sections was to ease the strain on the eyes of the respondent thereby decreasing the possibility of the reader inadvertently skipping a question.

In order for a component to be labeled as a concrete component, the competency acquisition had to be attained through behaviors that were measured, performed, or demonstrated. Examples of the concrete components were mentoring, professional development, and written communication.

Abstract standards or competencies were those that were not attainable by behaviors that were measurable, performed or demonstrated. Examples of abstract components were organizational sensitivity, interpersonal sensitivity, and proactive orientation. The respondent would have to make a subjective decision as to whether or not these elements were included as APPP components. All the items were randomly ordered within the concrete and abstract sections and not placed into “competency” or “standard” categories in order “to reduce the chance of response set and the respondents’ inclination to select all of one kind of answer” (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 306).
Arranging the items in groups according to abstract or concrete elements and including sections of alternating grayscale and white backgrounds addressed the response set limitation. Another strategy used was to include a statement of confidentiality and an emphasis on the importance of the study in the cover letter and in the directions.

Formatting the Instrument

Dillman (2000) suggested consistently formatting the survey layout. The portrait layout of the three sequentially numbered pages were supported by the cover letter. Each page of the FLAPPA survey began a new section with specific item directions for that section. The survey title was typed in all capitalized letters followed by an introductory paragraph that provided: (a) a definition of the APPPs, (b) a brief explanation of the purpose and importance of the respondents participation in the study, and (c) the directions for additional comments and returning the survey. Below the introductory paragraph, tables were designed in a chart format listing each competency, standard and its respective definition as survey component items.

The first four quantitative questions were broader topic questions that were separated from the more specific competencies and standards by a visual break (Dillman, 2000). At the break, the respondent had directions that explained a choice of either returning the survey or continuing to answer the items. This decision was dependent on the respondents’ answers to the first four questions.
The FLAPPA survey was organized into visually pleasing aspects of alternating grayscale and white sections. The sections provided a respondent-friendly layout designed “to increase the response rate and help avoid response set” (Dillman, 2000, p. 150).

The navigational paths for the information processed by the respondents were organized and clear (Dillman, 2000). For item one, if the respondents selected “Yes,” then the directions asked the respondents to skip to question five. If the response was either “No” or “Do Not Know,” then the directions asked the respondents to proceed to the next question. If all questions one through four were answered “No,” then the directions stated to stop and return the survey. No other navigational paths were used to skip questions on the survey.

The name and address of the researcher was provided at the end of the survey with directions for returning the survey in the stamped return envelope. A space was provided for the respondents to voluntarily include their employee position.

Survey Design

The survey design included 37 sequentially numbered quantitative closed-ended questions and four qualitative open-ended questions for a total of 41 questions. The respondents were able to respond to the survey items with more certainty because the instrument design provided clear directions and unambiguous items that were written with simple vocabulary and sentence structures, consistent and non-subjective scoring methods, and separate concrete and abstract items in alternating grayscale and white sections.
The larger font, bolded survey directions were placed at the beginning of every survey page and individual sections. The directions asked the respondents to check one of the three response boxes. The selected response boxes provided data about whether or not each component was included in the program, or if the respondents did not know if the component was included or not. All the questions were logically “ordered and grouped from most salient to least salient to the respondent” (Dillman, 2000, p. 87).

The back pages the FLAPPA survey were number coded so that the returned surveys could be logged and sorted by district size. This decision was made in order to keep track of the returned surveys.

Cover Letter

The FLAPPA cover letter (Appendix C) provided the date and salutation, what the study was about, why the request was important, who to contact to answer questions, and a thank-you with an original signature (Dillman, 2000). The directions enclosed in the cover letter stated that all answers were confidential and voluntary. The cover letter provided a brief description about the FPCs and the ISLLC Standards. This information was included to explain why the FPCs and ISLLC Standards were selected as survey items (Kramer & Conoley, 1992).

Mailout Package

A mailout package was designed based upon Dillman’s (2000) recommendations. The contents of the mailout package included the cover letter (Appendix C), the University of Central
Florida approved IRB letter (Appendix H), the FLAPPA survey (Appendix D), along with a stamped return envelope. After the mailout package, cover letter, FLAPPA survey, IRB letter, and return envelope were developed and constructed, they were piloted in a two-step process.

Pilot Procedures

To ensure higher validity and reliability of results, the FLAPPA survey was administered to subject matter experts and educational leaders to elicit their recommendations about the survey contents and format (Borg & Gall, 1989). This stage of pre-testing, which takes place after all of the questions have been written and ordered, was designed to elicit suggestions based on their administrative experience with APPPs and knowledge about the bases of APPP components (Dillman, 2000). Two documents, the Item Improvement Questionnaire For Content Experts and the Item Improvement Questionnaire For Students (Popham, 2000) were distributed with the surveys as part of the piloting process.

In step one, the administrative participants were selected based upon two criteria. The first criterion was to select participants who had experience as former administrators of a Florida school district provided APPP. The second criterion was to select the participants from differently sized Florida school districts who had subject matter experience working with the FPCs as curriculum designers and content experts.

One respondent each was selected from a large, a medium, and a medium/small sized school district that met the selection criteria. Dillman (2000) stated, “in some cases, one or two people have been able to provide all of the help that seemed necessary” (p. 141). Since there was
only one person per Florida school district who administered the APPP, the researcher contacted former program administrators from differently sized school districts so as not to use participants that would be included in the study. The administrator’s contact information was found in the FASA Directory (FASA, 2003).

The researcher requested permission to meet individually with each former program administrator. The survey in the mailout envelope was administered in an interactive setting. The purpose of the informal meetings was to obtain in-depth, precise feedback, and recommendations about the content and structure of the research questions “as they related to the survey items, the mailing package, and the cover letter” (Dillman, 2000, p.142). The goal with this stage of the pre-testing, according to Dillman, was to “finalize the substantive content of the questionnaire so the construction process can be undertaken” (p. 141).

The procedures for piloting the FLAPPA with former program administrators stressed confidentiality. First, the researcher met each participant’s secretary at his or her district office. Working with one secretary at a time, the researcher gave the piloting materials and directions to each secretary who then administered the piloting session to the administrator. The secretary was directed not to answer any questions about the mailout package and defer all questions to the researcher until after the materials were collected. The researcher then left the office area and the secretary went to administer the piloting session.

Second, the directions explained that the participant was to respond to the survey and mailout package first, hand it back to the secretary, and then get a second copy of the survey and respond to Popham’s (2000) Item Improvement Questionnaire For Content Experts (Appendix
O). The directions stated that the participant was to submit all the materials to the secretary, who would then return everything to the researcher.

The Item Improvement Questionnaire For Content Experts (Popham, 2000) asked the following questions:

Is the item congruent with its assessment domain?
Are there violations of standard item-writing guidelines?
Is the content of the item accurate?
Is the item ethnically, socio-economically, or otherwise biased (Popham, 2000, p. 316)?

After the secretary returned the mailout package, survey, and Item Improvement Questionnaire to the researcher, the researcher met one-on-one with each administrator. Questions were asked about the structure and content of the survey items and cover letter. “Questions were asked to gain insight into how the person viewed the entire mailing package” (Dillman, 2000, p. 141). Discussion from the content experts focused on the feedback about the survey and how best to make the suggested changes.

All three participants completed the survey and step one pilot session. The researcher listened carefully to the participants’ feedback for the improvement and clarification of the survey items, cover letter, and total mailout package. As a result of the step one pilot, some survey items were found to be confusing and were corrected. Some recommendations on syntax and format were noted and were changed where appropriate. Overall, the results of the pilot session helped to increase the instrument’s validity and reliability.
Appendix L, the Variable Distributions of the Summary of Responses to Survey Item Responses for the Administrative Pilot Group, shows the summary of responses to survey items for step one of the pilot procedure. No participant selected the “Do Not Know” response for any item on the survey because all the participants had experience as APPP administrators and therefore were certain about the inclusion, or not, of the program components. The variable distribution of responses for all items was “Yes” more than half the time and “No” about forty percent of the time. The total item response rate for all items selected was 100%. Survey questions 2, 3, and 4 were the alternative options if a school district did not provide an APPP. All the participants involved in the step one piloting session had been administrators of APPPs, so it made sense that the alternative items were answered as “No” responses. In sum, the items for the administrative pilot group behaved reasonably and logically.

In step two; the FLAPPA survey was administered to an available sample of 22 educational leadership graduate students who worked in the field of education as administrators. The purpose of the larger group session was to determine if the survey questions were asking what they were intended to ask.

The researcher contacted a university located in central Florida to request permission to administer the FLAPPA survey and mailout package to a class of educational leaders. The sample included 22 participants from very large, large, medium, medium/small, and small sized school districts. The participants fit the criteria of having experience as a Florida administrator and having participated in an APPP. Table 4 summarizes the ratio of the step two piloting
session participants from the school districts of different sizes to the ratio of the respondents from the school districts of different sizes in the total study.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th># N&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;=25</th>
<th>% of Pilot</th>
<th># N&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;=67</th>
<th>% of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/Small</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N<sup>a</sup> values are the actual number of pilot participants in each size category and the Pilot column values are percentages of each school district by size category. N<sup>b</sup> values are the actual number of school districts in each category and the Study column values are percentages of each school district by size category.

The procedures for conducting the step two piloting session were as follows. First, the researcher called the professor and confirmed a date for the professor to administer the group piloting session to educational leaders. The researcher met the professor outside the classroom on the agreed upon date, gave the professor the directions and the mailout package, the cover letter, the FLAPPA survey, and the Item Improvement Questionnaire (Popham, 2000), and then left the area. The professor was directed not to answer any questions from the educational leaders and defer all questions to the researcher. The professor gave the instructions that the researcher
would address all questions after the materials were collected. The participants were also asked not to talk or share their thoughts with anyone until all the materials were collected.

The professor handed out the directions, FLAPPA survey, and mailout package to the educational leaders. The directions explained that the participants were to respond to the survey first, hand it back to the professor, get a second copy of the survey and respond to the Item Improvement Questionnaire For Students (Appendix P; Popham, 2000), and then return everything to the professor. The Item Improvement Questionnaire For Students suggested by Popham (2000) asked the following questions:

If any of the items seemed confusing, which ones were they?
Did you think any items had more than one correct answer? If so, which ones?
Did you think any items had no correct answers? If so, which ones?
Were there words in any items that confused you? If so, which ones?
Were the directions for the survey, or for particular subsections of the survey, unclear? If so, which ones (Popham, 2000, p. 318)?

After the respondents completed the exercise and the professor collected all the materials, the researcher was asked to return to the classroom.

As a result of the step two pilot session, the participants asked the researcher questions about the purpose of the study, how the results would be used in the future, the survey directions, and recording procedures. Discussion centered on the survey construction, structure, and how best to make the participant’s suggested changes. “Having reviewers examine the completeness of the questionnaire is one way to determine its content validity” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 289).
Appendix M, the Variable Distributions of the Summary of Responses to the Survey Item

Responses for the Educational Leaders Pilot Group showed the variable distributions of the summary of responses to the survey item responses. About 41% of the selected responses for all the questions were “Do Not Know.” The “Do Not Know” responses were reasonable and logical because the respondents either had not had much experience with the competency or standards-based APPP curriculum, or they had not progressed far enough along as participants in their school districts’ APPP program. The group of educational leaders provided the best available pilot sample even though it closely matched the survey group. The total item “Yes” responses were about 25% and the total item “No” responses were about 32%. The total item response rate for all items was 100%. Refer to Appendix M for more detailed data about the variable distributions.

The feedback from the piloting session was carefully studied and considered. The results of the pilot made sense and the mailout package, cover letter, FLAPPA survey, and return envelope were revised where appropriate.

Reliability

“Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it is measuring” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 167). Cronbach’s alpha was determined to be the most appropriate reliability estimate for this instrument because each survey item had three answer choices. The decision was based on a recommendation from a measurement expert and suggested by Gall, Gall, and Borg (1999). Gay and Airasian (2000) recommended the procedure be used “to
estimate the internal consistency reliability when items have more than two answer choices” (p. 174).

Cronbach’s alpha provided “an index of how each of the items on the instrument related to all the other items and to the total instrument” (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 261). The internal consistency estimate of reliability was within the acceptable range of values for internal consistency.

**Procedures**

According to Dillman (2000), a tailored design to increase the response rate included five elements. “These elements include: a) a respondent-friendly questionnaire, (b) up to five contacts with the questionnaire recipient, (c) inclusion of stamped return envelopes, (d) personalized correspondence, and (e) a token financial incentive that is sent with the survey request” (p. 150). The study followed Dillman’s (2000) suggested tailored design method for surveys with the exception of replacing the financial token with a copy of the study results.

On February 1, 2004, the correspondence was initiated by mailing a preletter (Appendix F) to the contact person in each Florida school district, asking them to identify the HRMD employee responsible for the APPP (Dillman, 2000). The preletter gave notice that the FLAPPA survey was to be mailed on February 9, 2004, and emphasized the importance of the study. If there was no response from the pre-letter, then within the week, a follow up telephone call was placed. In six cases, the contact people emailed or called the researcher during the week of February 1 and identified the HRMD employee in their school district. By February 7, 2004, the
person responsible for the APPP in each school district had been identified. Appendix E lists the Florida school districts’ contact information.

According to Dillman (2000), “the mere fact of switching modes tends to emphasize the importance of the study, perhaps encouraging thoughts along the lines of if this weren’t important, they wouldn’t be trying to reach me in a different way” (p.240). Dillman stated that, “switching modes is effective in improving response rates beyond those that can be obtained from reliance on a single method” (p.240). Therefore, the follow up telephone calls sparked interest in the study.

On February 9, 2004, the respondent-friendly FLAPPA questionnaire (Appendix D), the IRB approved letter (Appendix H), and survey cover letter (Appendix C) were personalized and mailed with a return addressed stamped envelope to the identified person in each of the 67 school districts in Florida with a requested return date of two weeks. The cover letter described the purpose and importance of the APPP study and “why a response was important” (Dillman, 2000, p.151). On February 26, 2004, respondents who had not returned the surveys were contacted and then sent a second copy of the survey with the follow-up letter.

On February 29, 2004, one respondent who returned an incomplete survey was contacted to verify missing data. “Correspondence to the respondent was repeated until the data was verified and to increase the survey response rate” (Dillman, 2000, p. 242). On March 14, 2004, the third contact in the form of a thank you postcard (Appendix G) was mailed two weeks after the questionnaire had been sent to express gratitude for responding. The correspondence also
served as a reminder to the respondents if the survey had not yet been returned. One hundred percent of the districts received the thank-you/reminder postcard.

On March 15, 2004, for the forth contact, 26 non-respondents received a replacement questionnaire two to four weeks after the previous questionnaire mailing. If there was still no response, the researcher made additional contacts (Appendix J) by telephone on March 30, 2004, two weeks after the fourth contact (Dillman, 2000, p. 151).

The fifth contact used a telephone protocol and was repeated as a last chance to respond effort. The telephone protocol was identical for each call. The procedure was to: (a) place the call to the APPP administrator according to the pre-determined criteria in Table 1, and (b) ask if they had received and returned the study. If they had not received the survey, then their help was requested in completing the survey and another copy of it was immediately forwarded to them. If they had received the study, but not returned it, then a gentle reminder was made about the importance of the school districts’ participation as part of the total study. The researcher also offered to provide the study results after the completion of the study as an incentive to return the survey.

Demographic information about the participant’s number of years in their present position, the number of years of experience as an APPP Administrator and building-level Principal, training, and if they were aware of the new Florida Leadership Standards was collected via a follow-up email. All the correspondence with the respondents during the study was logged in a database and the comments documented.
The researcher was aware of the possibility of sampling bias. Having a small sample size can create bias (Airasian & Gay, 2000). In this case, the sample consisted of the one HRMD employee from each school district who administered the APPP. All 67 school districts in Florida were to be represented in the study. To help reduce the possibility of sampling bias, a high response rate of at least 70% was set as a goal.

**Data Collection and Analyses**

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the FLAPPA survey and the school districts’ APPP information found on the websites (Appendix K). A spreadsheet Microsoft Access 2000 and verbatim log were used to track all returned surveys, brochures, and website information for the quantitative and qualitative data. The analyses of the data were completed during the summer of 2004. The two different methods and procedures that were used to analyze and interpret the data are described below.

The quantitative data were entered into a database using Excel 2000. SPSS version 10.0 was used for the data analyses of research questions to determine the percentages of Florida school districts that provide a competency and standards-based APPP to their aspiring principals. The procedures included measuring the percentage of each component’s contribution to the APPP and then categorizing the percentages by school district size.

LaCap, Program Specialist at the Florida Department of Education’s Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services, verified the school district sizes. LaCap stated that “the Bureau roughly groups districts as follows: very large districts PK-12 populations more
than 100,000; large districts 40,000-100,000 students; medium districts 20,000-40,000 students; medium/small districts 7,000-20,000 students; small districts under 7,000 students” (M. LaCap, personal communication, December 23, 2003).

The APPP competencies listed in the brochures were cross-referenced with the collected quantitative survey data. Any discrepancies were logged and triggered a call to the respondent to verify which competencies were included in the APPP.

If returned surveys had missing data on some items and not on others, the data were collected from the responses provided and then the missing data were crosschecked with the components in the APPP brochure, if available. If the data were still not found, then the researcher contacted the respondent and asked the respondent to provide the missing data. Missing surveys were reported as data of districts that did not return a survey.

Logical analysis was used in the analysis of the qualitative research questions responses (Wolcott, 2001). The overall pattern of data analysis was inductive, moving from specifics to generalizations (Hatch, 2002). Creswell’s (1998) data analysis spiral procedure was followed to create and organize files in order to manage the qualitative data. The process included five steps: reading through the survey responses making margin notes and formulating initial codes; describing the meaning of the content for the researcher; classifying the categories; interpreting for comparisons in order to identify patterns of relationship among the participants’ perspectives; and presenting a table of statements (Creswell, 1998). The researcher was then responsible for what Wolcott calls “mindwork -- the making sense of qualitative data” (as cited in Hatch, 2002, p. 148).
Credibility as defined by Gay and Airasian (2000) is “to demonstrate that the inquiry was conducted in such a manner as to ensure that the subject was accurately identified and described” (p. 252). To ensure the credibility of the interpretations and conclusions of the qualitative data in the study, the researcher designed a triangulation approach to the research that employed varied data sources. The strategy was used to improve validity and reduce bias (Gay and Airasian, 2000).

Chapter 3 discussed how and why the participants were selected, why particular data collection methods were chosen, and how data were collected. The responses from the FLAPPA survey provided both the primary quantitative and qualitative data for the study. The school district websites also provided secondary qualitative data for analysis. A verification of the survey data was made by comparison of the survey data to the brochure data. Different from the collected quantitative data, the qualitative responses were read through by the researcher, coded, and then classified into categories using the constant comparison method of analysis for qualitative data. The constant comparison method “involves the constant comparison of identified topics and concepts to determine their distinctive characteristics so they can be placed in appropriate categories. The goal of the constant comparison method is to understand and explain the qualitative data” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 243). Next, the researcher interpreted patterns of relationship from the categories. The researcher looked for links or connections among the categories to identify patterns.

Chapter 4 describes the results of the quantitative data and how the qualitative data were organized and analyzed. According to Gay and Airasian (2000) some strategies that can help
guide data interpretation are: (a) pay attention to the topic or research focus; (b) examine closely categories that contain large amounts of data; (c) look within the categories for links or sequences; (d) identify the interrelations between the categories that are linked to the pattern for meaning; (e) examine existing studies related to your topic; (f) talk with colleagues about the data and its meaning, focusing on areas of agreement and disagreement; and (g) take the time to reflect on what you’re seen and thought about the data.

Summary

The combined quantitative and qualitative study methods and procedures were presented in Chapter 3. The statement of the problem and the selected participants were identified. Next, the development and construction of the FLAPPA survey were explained. The methodology and procedures of the research study design were described as well as the methods of data collection, analyses, and interpretation. Chapter 4 presents the results of the research study. Chapter 5 presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSES

Introduction

Chapter 4 presents the analyses of data collected in a study that combined quantitative and qualitative methods and procedures. A descriptive approach using logical analysis and a modified triangulation method was employed in the study. The data sources included the Florida Aspiring Principal Preparation Assessment (FLAPPA) survey and the Florida school districts Aspiring Principal Preparation Program (APPP) documentation. The purposes of the study were to identify the bases of the APPP components Florida school districts provide to their aspiring principals and their relationship, if any, to the Florida Principal Competencies (FPC) and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards.

The research questions were designed to: (a) identify school districts in the state of Florida that provided an APPP for their current assistant principals; (b) determine if the required program components were based upon the FPCs, ISLLC Standards, or another source; (c) determine if professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience were included as components of the APPP; and (d) determine whether or not the percentage of components included in each APPP differed according to school district size. The research questions were developed from components of best practice found in the APPP literature review (Archer, 2002a, 2002b; Daresh, 1992; Daresh & Playko, 2001; Lovely, 1999).
The 37 quantitative and 4 qualitative survey questions were designed to elicit responses about whether or not the Florida school district’s APPPs including the components of the FPCs, the ISLLC Standards, professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience.

The 19 FPCs are:

1. **Proactive orientation**: the inclination and readiness to initiate action and to accept responsibility for leading and enabling others to improve the circumstances being faced or anticipated.
2. **Decisiveness**: the readiness and confidence to make or share decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken and commitments made by self and others.
3. **Commitment to vision and mission**: a pledge to develop and act in accordance with the shared vision, mission, and values of the school.
4. **Interpersonal sensitivity**: the ability to discover, understand, verbalize accurately, and respond empathetically to the perspectives, thoughts, ideas and feelings of others.
5. **Information search and analysis**: the gathering and analysis of data from multiple sources before arriving at an understanding of an event or problem.
6. **Concept formation**: the ability to see patterns and relationships and form concepts, hypotheses, and ideas from the information.
7. **Conceptual flexibility**: the ability to use alternative or multiple concepts or perspectives when solving a problem or making a decision.
8. **Managing interaction**: getting others to work together effectively through the use of group process and facilitator skills.
9. **Impact/persuasiveness**: influencing and having an effect upon the school stakeholders by a variety of means—persuasive argument, setting an example or using expertise.
10. **Concern for the school’s reputation**: caring about the impressions created by self, the students, the faculty, the staff, and parents, as well as how these impressions are communicated both inside and outside the school.
11. **Tactical adaptability**: the ability to adapt one’s interaction and behavior to fit the situation.
12. Achievement orientation: doing things better/different than before by setting goals that encourage self and others to reach higher standards and results.

13. Management control: the establishment of systematic processes to receive and provide feedback about the progress of work being done.

14. Development orientation: holding high and positive expectations for the growth and development of all stakeholders through modeling self-development, coaching, and providing learning opportunities.

15. Organizational ability: the know-how (knowledge and skill) to design, plan and organize activities to achieve goals.

16. Delegation: entrusting of jobs to be done, beyond routine assignments, to others, giving them authority and responsibility for accomplishment.

17. Self-presentation: the ability to clearly present one’s ideas to others in an open, informative, and non-evaluative manner.

18. Written communication: the ability to write clearly and concisely using good grammar.

19. Organizational sensitivity: an awareness of the effects of one’s behavior and decisions on all stakeholders both inside and outside the organization (FLDOE, 2003).

The six ISLLC Standards are:

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

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

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

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

5. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (ISLLC, 1997).

Chapter 4 contains five sections: (a) participants and demographic characteristics, (b) study procedures, (c) data collection, (d) research questions and results, and (e) the summary of the findings.

Participants and Demographic Characteristics

The participants included in the study were the 67 HRMD employees who administered the APPP in their respective Florida school district. As discussed in Chapter 3, the method used to identify the APPP administrators was to search the Florida Education Directory by Florida Association of School Administrators, 2003-2004 School Year (Florida Association of School Administrators, 2003) and then select the HRMD participants who met certain criteria.

One HRMD employee was selected from each school district and represented 100% of the 67 Florida school districts. The criteria for selecting the employee most responsible for the APPP in each school district were:

1. The HRMD employee who administered the APPP in their school district.
2. The employee who was recommended by the contact person to be the most knowledgeable about the APPP’s curriculum.
3. The employee who was responsible for the coordination of the professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience for the school district APPP.
Table 5 illustrates the demographics of the selected study participants. The data in Section I were collected from the FASA Directory and the participant contact information. The data in Section II were collected via a follow-up email sent to all participants of whom 33 returned the information.
Table 5

Study Participants: Present Position, Gender, Experience, and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of Participants</th>
<th>Mean # Years in Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent/Director of Personnel/HR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent for Instruction &amp; Personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional/Staff Development/HRMD</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instruction/Curriculum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IIa: Experience and Training (N=33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present: APPP Administrator/Director</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past: Building-level principal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPCs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC standards</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPP participant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult learning theory</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMD coordinator/ team leader</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Florida leadership standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of new Florida standards</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. An additional contact was made to the respondents after the surveys were returned requesting this data.
Study Procedures

The study procedures were designed in three parts. The first part of the study procedures followed Dillman’s (2000) recommended tailored design method for surveys sent by mail and included five elements. The second part of the study procedures was designed to collect data from the APPP documents posted on the Florida school district’s websites. The third part of the study procedures was to verify the survey data by confirming it with the school district brochure data. The three parts of the study procedures and corresponding response rates follow.

Part 1

A preletter (Appendix F) was mailed in February 2004 to each of the 67 HRMD participants notifying them about the study and pending survey. In order to gather data, the FLAPPA survey (Appendix D) was then mailed to the 67 HRMD participants along with a cover letter (Appendix C). The cover letter explained the reason why the participants were selected to be included in the study, described the study, and requested them to participate in the study. By February 25, 2004, 20 of the mailed 67 surveys were returned. The response rate for the first mailing of the survey was 30%.

A second distribution of the survey package was mailed within two weeks with a follow-up letter (Appendix G) to the respondents who had not returned a survey. After the second mailing, 11 more surveys were returned for a response rate of 16%, increasing the total survey response rate to 31 (46%). One incomplete survey was returned and the researcher contacted the respondent and asked the respondent to verify the missing data. One survey of 67 or 1.5% had
missing data. With the missing data provided, the total survey response rate increased to 32 (48%).

A third mailing was in the form of a thank you/reminder postcard. The postcard was designed to serve as a thank you notice to the respondents who had returned the surveys. One hundred percent of the districts received the thank-you/reminder postcard.

The fourth contact was the third distribution of the survey that was sent to the non-respondents. Three more completed surveys were returned increasing the total returned surveys to 35 or a total survey response rate of 52%. In the 32 school districts where surveys were still not returned, the fifth contact was a telephone call to the participants as a final request to participate (Appendix J). The telephone contacts increased the survey response rate by 10 school districts. Survey data were collected from 45 of the 67 school districts for a total survey response rate of 67%.

Part 2

The second part of the study procedures was to collect APPP data from the school districts that did not return a survey, but had information located on their school district websites. The survey items were compared to the downloaded information to identify if the survey item was included or not in the website APPP documentation. The website data were collected from a total of 15 websites, but 10 school districts data that had returned their surveys were not included in the study and only served to confirm the returned survey data. This step in the procedures eliminated duplicating the data. A more detailed description of the qualitative data analysis and
the results occurs later in this chapter after the section about research question 4. Table 6 lists the study’s different data sources; the number of districts (respondents) per each data source; and the corresponding response rates.

Table 6
Response Rates per Data Sources and Districts (N=50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3

The purpose of part 3 was to verify and confirm the survey data with the brochure information returned along with the surveys. As Best and Kahn (2003) reported the process of triangulating by which the data are “verified by agreement with other data obtained from other sources … and different procedures of collecting the data” helps to ensure the internal and external validity of the quantitative and the qualitative research. (p. 259)

Internal validity is concerned with the accuracy of the information and how it matches reality. External validity means the researcher needs to discuss the limited generalizability of the findings and the need, if possible, to replicate the study and its findings. (p. 259)
The information from brochures was compared to the survey data to verify if the survey components were “Included” or “Not Included” in the brochure. No discrepancies were found between the survey data and the brochure data. The response rate for 17 of possible 45 APPP brochures that were returned with the surveys was 38%.

**Data Collection**

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the FLAPPA surveys and the APPP documentation found on the school district’s websites. All 67 school district websites were examined to collect APPP data and compare it to the survey data. The triangulated process (Hatch, 2002) of data collected from the 45 surveys and the 5 websites were then analyzed and interpreted separately.

Descriptive statistics and logical analysis were used to determine the percentage of the bases between the independent factor and each of the dependent variables. The independent factor was the Florida school district. The 28 dependent variables included the 19 FPCs, the six ISLLC Standards, professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience. Data were analyzed using SPSS 10.0 and logical analysis.

The first 37 items on the FLAPPA survey were quantitative questions designed with a closed-ended response format. The choices of the responses were “Yes, No, or Do Not Know.” The response scores (0 to 2) for each item measured whether or not the competency, standard, or component was included in the APPP. Numerical weightings were assigned to the options with the highest number (2) reflecting the answer choice “No,” that the competency was not included
in the APPP; (1) reflecting the answer choice “Yes,” that the competency was included in the APPP; and the lowest number (0) reflecting a “Do Not Know” if the competency was included or not in the program.

The FLAPPA survey requested that the brochure describing the APPP be included with the returned package, if available. The brochure’s data were used to verify the survey data.

The website data were collected and compared to the survey questions. If the survey component was found to be included in the website data, then the component was included in the data analysis.

The last four items on the FLAPPA survey were qualitative questions designed to elicit patterns from the perspective of the participant’s responses. The process included five steps: reading through the survey responses making margin notes and formulating initial codes; describing the meaning of the content for the researcher; classifying the categories; interpreting for comparisons in order to identify patterns of relationship among the participants’ perspectives; and presenting a table of statements (Best & Kahn, 2003; Creswell, 1998). Lastly, patterns of commonality and issues of difference were identified among the quantitative and the qualitative data results.

School District Sizes and Response Rates

The data collected from each source were further analyzed according to five different district size categories. The Florida Department of Educations’ Bureau of Instructional Support and Community Services determined the size categories of the school districts. The Bureau
roughly groups districts as follows: very large districts PK-12 populations more than 100,000; large districts 40,001-100,000 students; medium districts 20,001-40,000 students; medium/small districts 7,000-20,000 students; small districts under 7,000 students (M. LaCap, personal communication, December 23, 2003). Table 7 presents the Florida school districts by size categories; the number of school districts in the state in each size category; the corresponding percentage of each district size category in the state; and the non-response rates per district size categories.

Table 7
School District’s Size and Non-Response Rates (N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th>% of Districts</th>
<th># of Survey Non-Respondents</th>
<th># of Non-Respondents, but data collected on Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/Small</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response rates by school district size of the respondents are presented in Table 8.
Table 8
Response Rates by District Size, Number, and Data Sources (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th># of Survey Data</th>
<th># of Website Data</th>
<th>Response Rate (Survey) %</th>
<th>Response Rate (Website) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium/Small</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 8 show that both Very Large and Medium sized districts provided APPP component data in the form of a survey and documentation located on their websites. Large, Medium/Small and Small sized districts provided survey data only.

Research Questions

This section, research questions and results, is presented in two parts: (a) an analysis of the quantitative data compiled from the Human Resource Management Development (HRMD) administrator responses on the FLAPPA survey, and (b) the data collected from the school district’s websites, plus the researchers interpretation of patterns that emerged from the verbatim responses (Appendix I) collected from the FLAPPA survey qualitative questions that provided a more individualized perspective about each school district’s APPP. The description of each research question provides the number of survey items used in its evaluation, describes the
Research Question 1

To what extent did the Florida school districts provide a formal aspiring principal preparation program for current assistant principals? The data used in evaluating Research Question 1 were collected from the responses of four survey items using a response scale with 1 = “Yes,” 2 = “No,” and 0 = “Do Not Know.”

1. Survey item 1: “Does your school district provide an aspiring principal preparation program for current assistant principals?”

2. Survey item 2: “If your district does not provide an APPP, do your current assistant principals participate in another district’s APPP?”

3. Survey item 3: “If your district does not provide an APPP, do your current assistant principals participate in a consortium provided APPP?”

4. Survey item 4: “If your district does not provide an APPP, do your current assistant principals participate in another APPP provided through another venue?” If yes, what source?
Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 1 - 4 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP. Table 9 presents the results of question 1 for the 50 school districts where data were collected.

Table 9
Florida School Districts that Provide an APPP (N=50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presents the Florida school districts where data were collected either from a returned survey or on their district website, but not both; and their size category according to student population.
Table 10

Florida School Districts and Size Categories (N=50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sumter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Suwannee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wakulla</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 5=Very Large; 4=Large; 3=Medium; 2=Medium/Small; 1=Small
Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 2 - 4 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP. Table 11 presents survey questions 2, 3, and 4’s results.

Table 11
Percentages of APPPs Provided by Another District, Consortium, or Venue (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of Districts</th>
<th>% of Districts “Yes”</th>
<th>% of Districts “No”</th>
<th>% of Districts “Do Not Know”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Another District’s APPP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consortium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Another Venue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data were collected from the surveys.

The data collected from the websites resulted in no school districts providing an APPP by another district, consortium, or venue.

Research Question 2

Upon what were the formal aspiring principal preparation programs for current assistant principals based: the Florida Principal Competencies, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s Standards, or another source? The data used in evaluating Research Question 2
were collected from the responses of 30 survey items 5 - 9 and 13 – 37. Using a response scale with 1= “Yes,” 2 = “No,” and 0 = “Do Not Know,” respondents answered survey items 5 - 9. Survey items 13 - 37 provided a response scale with 1= “Included,” 2 = “Not Included,” and 0 = “Do Not Know.”

1. Survey item 5: “Is there a document, brochure, or other printed material about the district’s aspiring principal preparation program?”

2. Survey items 6 and 7: “Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to understand the Florida Principal Competencies?” and “Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to document the implementation of the Florida Principal Competencies?”

3. Survey items 8 and 9: “Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to understand the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards?” and “Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to document the implementation of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards?”

Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 5 - 9 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP. The results for question 5 show that of the 50 Florida school districts, 28 (62%) of survey data and 1 (2%) of websites data show that a document, brochure, or other printed material is a component of the APPP. Survey data showed 16 (36%) responded “No” and website data showed zero districts do not provide any documentation; and 1 (2%) of survey data and 4 (80%) of website data showed
“Do Not Know.” Table 12 presents the results of survey questions 6 – 9 for data collected from the surveys.

Table 12

Bases for APPPs from Survey Data (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th># Yes</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th># No</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th># Do Not Know</th>
<th>% Do Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Understand FPCs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Implement FPCs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Understand ISLLC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implement ISLLC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 presents the results of survey questions 6 – 9 for data collected from the school district websites.
Table 13

Bases for APPPs from Website Data (N=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th># Yes</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th># No</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th># Do Not Know</th>
<th>% Do Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Understand FPCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Implement FPCs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Understand ISLLC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implement ISLLC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey questions 6 through 9 results found strong support that the understanding and implementation of the FPCs are a part of the basis of the components found in Florida school district provided APPPs. The understanding and implementation of the ISLLC Standards are considered less of a program basis.

Survey questions 13 - 37 provide data that show what percentage of each FPC and/or ISLLC Standard component is included in the Florida school district APPPs.

1. Survey item 13: “Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.”

2. Survey item 14: “Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.”

3. Survey item 15: “Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional development.”
4. Survey item 16: “Information search and analysis, the gathering and analysis of data from multiple sources before arriving at an understanding of an event or problem.”

5. Survey item 17: “Concept formation, the ability to see patterns and relationships and form concepts, hypotheses, and ideas from the information.”

6. Survey item 18: “Conceptual flexibility, the ability to use alternative or multiple concepts or perspectives when solving a problem or making a decision.”

7. Survey item 19: “Delegation, entrusting of jobs to be done, beyond routine assignments, to others, giving them authority and responsibility for accomplishment.”

8. Survey item 20: “Managing interaction, getting others to work together effectively through the use of group process and facilitator skills.”

9. Survey item 21: “Self-presentation, the ability to clearly present one’s ideas to others in an open, informative, and non-evaluative manner.”

10. Survey item 22: “Written communication, the ability to write clearly and concisely using good grammar.”

11. Survey item 23: “Organization sensitivity, an awareness of the effects of one’s behavior and decisions on all stakeholders both inside and outside the organization.”

12. Survey item 24: “Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.”

13. Survey item 25: “Achievement orientation, doing things better/different than before by setting goals that encourage self and others to reach higher standards and results.”
14. Survey item 26: “Management control, the establishment of systematic processes to receive and provide feedback about the progress of work being done.”

15. Survey item 27: “Development orientation, holding high and positive expectations for the growth and development of all stakeholders through modeling self-development, coaching, and providing learning opportunities.”

16. Survey item 28: “Organizational ability, the know-how (knowledge and skill) to design, plan and organize activities to achieve goals.”

17. Survey item 29: “Impact/persuasiveness, influencing and having an effect upon the school stakeholders by a variety of means--persuasive argument, setting an example or using expertise.”

18. Survey item 30: “Concern for the school’s reputation, caring about the impressions created by self, the students, the faculty, the staff, and parents, as well as how these impressions are communicated both inside and outside the school.”

19. Survey item 31: “Tactical adaptability, the ability to adapt one’s interaction and behavior to fit the situation.”

20. Survey item 32: “Interpersonal sensitivity, the ability to discover, understand, verbalize accurately, and respond empathetically to the perspectives, thoughts, ideas and feelings of others.”

21. Survey item 33: “Managing the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.”
22. Survey item 34: “Commitment to vision and mission, a pledge to develop and act in accordance with the shared vision, mission, and values of the school.”

23. Survey item 35: “Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.”

24. Survey item 36: “Decisiveness, the readiness and confidence to make or share decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken and commitments made by self and others.”

25. Survey item 37: “Proactive orientation, the inclination and readiness to initiate action and to accept responsibility for leading and enabling others to improve the circumstances being faced or anticipated.”

Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 13 – 37 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP. The origin of the APPP components as well as whether or not each component was considered an abstract or concrete item is presented. Table 14 presents the results of survey questions 13 – 37 from the collected survey data.
Table 14

The Bases of APPP Components from Survey Data (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>% Responded “Yes”</th>
<th>% Responded “No”</th>
<th>% Responded “Do Not Know”</th>
<th>Concrete Item</th>
<th>Abstract Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ISLLC 6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ISLLC 4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ISLLC 2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>FPC 5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FPC 6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>FPC 7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FPC 16</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>FPC 8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>FPC 17</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>FPC 18</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FPC 19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ISLLC 1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FPC 12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>FPC 13</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>FPC 14</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>FPC 15</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>FPC 9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>FPC 10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>FPC 11</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>FPC 4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ISLLC 3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>FPC 3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ISLLC 5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>FPC 2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>FPC 1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 presents the results of survey questions 13 – 37 from the collected website data.
Based on the results presented in Tables 14 and 15, the results from research question 2 indicate that the six ISLLC Standards are included as a basis of the APPP components less than the FPC components.
Research Question 3

To what extent did the school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the 67 Florida districts have component requirements that included professional development, mentoring, and/or performance-based experiences? The data used in evaluating Research Question 3 were collected from the responses of 3 survey items. Using a response scale with 1 = “Included,” 2 = “Not Included,” and 0 = “Do Not Know,” respondents responded to the following survey items:

1. Survey item 10: “A mentor principal - a high performing principal assigned or selected to work with the participant in order to provide coaching and guidance on an on-going basis.”

2. Survey item 11: “Performance-based requirements - on-the-job experiences or internships the aspiring principal completes as part of the aspiring principal program.”

3. Survey item 12: “Professional development - coursework or in-service opportunities specifically focused upon developing leadership skills.”

Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 10 – 12 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP. Table 16 presents the results of survey questions 10, 11, and 12 for the survey data.
Table 16

Response Rates for Mentor Principal, Performance-Based Experience, and Professional Development as Components of APPPs for Survey Data (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th># of APPPs</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>% Do Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mentor Principal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Performance-Based Experience</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 presents the results of survey questions 10, 11, and 12 for the website data.

Table 17

Response Rates for Mentor Principal, Performance-Based Experience, and Professional Development as Components of APPPs for Website Data (N=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th># of APPPs</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>% Do Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mentor Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Performance-Based Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results from questions 10, 11, and 12 present that a mentor principal, a performance-based experience, and professional development are included as components in more than 71% of Florida school district provided APPPs.

Research Question 4

Were there differences among the aspiring principal preparation program components provided by differently sized Florida school districts? The data used in evaluating Research Question 4 were collected from the responses of 28 quantitative and four qualitative survey items. The data from the two research methods were analyzed and interpreted separately. The quantitative data analysis and results are presented first, followed by the qualitative data analysis and results. The quantitative survey items 10 - 37 provided a response scale with 1 = “Included,” 2 = “Not Included,” and 0 = “Do Not Know.” The survey items can be found in the previous sections under Research Questions 2 and 3.

Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 10 – 37 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP. Table 18 presents the results of the survey data for survey questions 10 - 37.
Table 18

Inclusion Rates for APPP Components by District Size for Survey Data (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Very Large N=3</th>
<th>Large N=5</th>
<th>Medium N=10</th>
<th>Medium/Small N=11</th>
<th>Small N=16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LitRev</td>
<td>Mentor Principal</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LitRev</td>
<td>Performance-Based Experience</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LitRev</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 1</td>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 2</td>
<td>Advocating</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 3</td>
<td>Managing Organization</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 4</td>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 5</td>
<td>Acting with Integrity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 6</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 1</td>
<td>Proactive Orientation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 2</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 3</td>
<td>Vision/Mission</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 4</td>
<td>Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 5</td>
<td>Information Search</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 6</td>
<td>Concept Formation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 7</td>
<td>Conceptual Flexibility</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 8</td>
<td>Managing Interaction</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 9</td>
<td>Impact/Persuasiveness</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 10</td>
<td>School’s Reputation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 11</td>
<td>Tactical Ability</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 12</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 13</td>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 14</td>
<td>Development Orientation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 15</td>
<td>Organizational Ability</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 16</td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 17</td>
<td>Self-Presentation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 18</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 19</td>
<td>Organization Sensitivity</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Values are percentages.*

Table 19 presents the results of website data for questions 10 - 37.
Table 19

Inclusion Rates for APPP Components by District Size for Website Data (N=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Very Large N=3</th>
<th>Large N=0</th>
<th>Medium N=2</th>
<th>Medium/Small N=0</th>
<th>Small N=0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LitRev</td>
<td>Mentor Principal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LitRev</td>
<td>Performance-Based Experience</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LitRev</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 1</td>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 2</td>
<td>Advocating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 3</td>
<td>Managing Organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 4</td>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 5</td>
<td>Acting with Integrity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSLC 6</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 1</td>
<td>Proactive Orientation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 2</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 3</td>
<td>Vision/Mission</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 4</td>
<td>Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 5</td>
<td>Information Search</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 6</td>
<td>Concept Formation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 7</td>
<td>Conceptual Flexibility</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 8</td>
<td>Managing Interaction</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 9</td>
<td>Impact/Persuasiveness</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 10</td>
<td>School’s Reputation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 11</td>
<td>Tactical Ability</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 12</td>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 13</td>
<td>Management Control</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 14</td>
<td>Development Orientation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 15</td>
<td>Organizational Ability</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 16</td>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 17</td>
<td>Self-Presentation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 18</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC 19</td>
<td>Organization Sensitivity</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values are percentages.
The data displayed in Tables 18 and 19 were analyzed and interpreted by the researcher to discover what amount each component contributed to each APPP according to the differing school district sizes. The component means of each district size category were then calculated to find which district APPP size category was based more upon the FPC and ISLLC Standards than the other sized categories. The order of the categories of the school district size that contained the most amount of components based upon FPCs and ISLLC Standards to the school district size that contained the least amount of components that were based upon FPCs and ISLLC Standards is: first, the very large sized school districts with a population of over 100 thousand students; second, the large sized school districts with a population of 40 - 100 thousand students; third, the medium sized school districts with a population of 20 – 40 thousand students; fourth, the medium/small sized school districts with a population of 7 – 20 thousand students; and fifth, the small sized school districts with a population of under 7 thousand students.

Examining the survey data, all 5 differently sized Florida school district’s data show that the 28 components are included in the provided APPPs. The very large sized school district’s APPPs included a higher percentage of the FPC, ISLLC, performance-based experience, and professional development components than the other sized school districts with the exception of the components of mentor principal and ISLLC Standard 4, Collaborating.

Examining the website data, the very large school district’s APPP data were based upon the FPCs, but not the ISLLC Standards. The components of mentor principal, performance-based experience, and professional development were included in the Very Large sized district data on
the websites, but not the Medium sized district’s data. The Medium sized district’s data presented no FPC components on their websites.

Overall, of the three components derived from the literature review, professional development contributed the most to the APPP in each different size category. Seventeen FPCs contributed more than 69% in all categories. They are: proactive orientation, decisiveness, vision/mission, interpersonal sensitivity, information search, concept formation, conceptual flexibility, managing interaction, impact/persuasiveness, school’s reputation, achievement orientation, development orientation, organizational ability, delegation, self-presentation, written communication, and organization sensitivity. The survey results show that FPC 6, concept formation was the least included FPC component; and ISLLC 6, understanding followed by ISLLC 4, collaborating, were the least included ISLLC components. ISLLC Standard 3, managing organization, was the one ISLLC Standard that contributed the most percentage across all five district size categories.

Table 20 shows the relationship among the grouping component categories, the school district sizes, and their respective means for survey data.
Table 20

Grouping Components, District Sizes, and Means for Survey Data (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping Component Category</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Medium-Small</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Total Grouping Category Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPCs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>81.05</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>89.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC Standards</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>81.67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td>79.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review Components</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62.67</td>
<td>84.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Items</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>84.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Items</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 shows the relationship among the grouping component categories, the school district sizes, and their respective means for website data.

Table 21

Grouping Components, District Sizes, and Means for Website Data (N=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping Component Category</th>
<th>Very Large N=3</th>
<th>Large N=0</th>
<th>Medium N=2</th>
<th>Medium-Small N=0</th>
<th>Small N=0</th>
<th>Total Grouping Category Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPCs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC Standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit Review Components</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Items</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract Items</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the survey data show that the FPC components contributed more than the ISLLC Standards and the literature review components. The abstract items contributed more than the concrete items in the survey data, but not in the website data. Refer back to Table 14 for the list of abstract and concrete items.

Qualitative Data

The survey also asked, “If your school district does not provide a principal preparation program, but your assistant principals participate in a consortium or another districts’ program, please tell me why your district does not provide their own program? What are the areas that need improvement of your principal preparation program? What are the areas of strength of your principal preparation program? Is there anything else you would like to say about your principal preparation program?”

The data used in evaluating the qualitative questions were collected from the responses of four open-ended response survey questions. Three stages of logical analysis were employed in the analysis of the qualitative data: organizing the data, describing the data, and the interpretation of the data (Best & Kahn, 2003). The summary of the findings follows this section.

Organizing the Data

As discussed earlier, data for the study were collected from two sources. The purpose of collecting data from multiple sources as explained by Hatch (2002) is that “We are searching for patterns that repeat in the data and for patterns that show linkages among different parts of data.”
(p. 173). In the first stage of analyzing the qualitative data, organizing the data, the researcher sorted the returned surveys and brochures from the website documents, and placed them in three separate files. The files were labeled A, B, and C. The data collected from the brochures and websites were considered “unobtrusive because their collection does not interfere with the ongoing events of everyday life” (Hatch, 2002, p. 116). Hatch (2002) believed that documents are (a) powerful indicators of the value system operating within institutions, (b) provide a behind-the-scenes look at institutional processes and how they came into being, and (c) give the researcher a sense of history related to the contents being studied. Hatch reported that, “triangulating unobtrusive data with data from other sources is one way to improve confidence in reporting findings based on such information” (p. 121).

The surveys in file A were organized into numerical order according to the code printed on the last page of each survey. The hardcopy and website brochures were organized into alphabetical order by school district name and placed in their respective files. The data in the brochures were used to verify the quantitative survey data only.

A spreadsheet was created using Microsoft Access and logged: the arrival date of the survey and brochure; the respondent’s name, employee position, gender, telephone number, and email; the district’s name, size, and address; and any other included documents provided by the respondent. Logged also were the dates of follow-up notices, thank you/reminder notices, contact dates, and subsequent mailing dates.

After the two data sources had been separated by type, each data were read through and sorted by alphabetical district name; coded for regularities and patterns (Bogdan & Biklen,
and initially grouped by question number and district size into analyzable parts or frames of analysis (Hatch, 2002). Next, from the coded data emerged domains based on the relationships within the frames of analysis.

Table 22 presents the domains: the strengths, weaknesses, and concerns of the participants. The next step was to create three lists of the components that emerged, one list for each of the domains. The data were analyzed and then placed in the appropriate category. Finally, the components were grouped together by similar type while also looking for differences among the individuals’ perspectives.

A simple approach of counting the number of occurrences of each event was used to tally the number of times the participants included the component in their responses. Table 22 shows the domains and the lists of components that emerged from the responses to the qualitative questions.
Another step was to identify those top components that emerged in all domain categories, those that emerged in two domain categories, and then those that emerged in only one domain category. The purpose was to identify the similar or common components as themes according to the amount of percentage of strength, weakness, or concern. Table 23 shows the themes that emerged from questions 39, 40, and 41 and the respective amount that each contributed to the data responses.
The strongest themes that emerged were professional development, modifying the APPP, and support team. The themes needing improvement that emerged were professional
development, mentor principal, and the FPCs. The FPCs also were the participant’s greatest concern. Overall, the need for more professional development was the theme that contributed in every domain.

Description of Data

The viewpoints, concerns, and effects on the participants are discussed below (Best & Kahn, 2003). Please refer back to the beginning of this chapter for a description of the participants and the process used in their selection.

The researcher designed the study to be administered in February 2004 so that the distribution and collection of the surveys would be completed prior to the starting of the standardized state testing in the schools. As Bogdan and Biklen (2003) stated, “Time affects the nature of the data collected” (p.61). The researcher felt that with the increased amount of work and stress involved in the school district’s administration of the state test that the survey might not be returned if sent closer to the testing time period. Therefore, the study mailout procedures and turn-around time was designed to be completed before state testing began.

The participants from the larger school districts returned the surveys in less time than did the participants from the smaller districts. A viewpoint that was expressed by one participant from a smaller school district was that “she handled multiple tasks and the APPP survey might not be a priority in the list of things to accomplish.” The researcher was careful to write a short cover letter and survey so the impact would be user-friendly and the effect of the administration of the survey would be received as an important study in which to participate. The researcher
received comments from smaller district participants about “how busy they were…overloaded with responsibilities.” However, one larger school district participant replied with an email comment “I can’t wait to see the results…this is a very important study.”

Interpreting the Data

According to Creswell (1998), interpreting the data includes describing what happened, describing how it happened, and describing the overall experience or essence. Several of the themes that were closely related were combined and developed into patterns. One example is the combination of mentor principal, support team and feedback. The researcher felt that these three themes were all part of the support team provided by a school district and therefore combined the components. Table 24 shows the patterns that emerged from the themes and the supporting origination data sources.
Table 24

Patterns for Qualitative Questions and Corresponding Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Website Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification of APPPs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Principal/ Support Team/Feedback</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based Experience/ Internship</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion &amp; Implementation of Standards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Florida Leadership Standards</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPCs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLLC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More funding, time, &amp; assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number one pattern that surfaced from the quantitative data was that more than half of the Florida school districts recognize professional development and training as a very important component of their APPP and 20% perceive it as a concern or needing improvement.

The first finding from the qualitative data supports the research literature and a participant from a very large sized school district’s suggestion that APPPs need to have “a job embedded with professional development throughout the 2-year program.” As another participant from a medium-sized school district stated, “on-going professional development, job-embedded learning experiences such as book study groups and classroom walk-through training” should be an integral part of any APPP. “Having the assistant principals document all one hundred fifty-seven of the items listed in the Function/Task Analysis requires that they become involved in all aspects of running a school.”
The second finding that emerged as an overall pattern was the need to modify their APPPs according to the new Florida leadership components and the ISLLC leadership standards. Respondents in all five Florida school district size categories felt that keeping their APPPs up-to-date with the new standards and components “was very beneficial” and added to the “on-the-job real life experiences.”

The third finding from the qualitative data was that the school district’s APPPs were strongly supported by a support team that was a combination of mentor principals, district staff, and team members. One participant from a small school district explained that their APPP required “mentoring by a support team of three educational leaders, shadowing high performing principals at another district for two weeks, and serving as the intern principal for 25 days at the site that they are AP while the principal is assigned to a different site.” A few caveats were shared with the researcher about principal mentoring: “The mentor principal may not always be a high performing administrator” and “Currently, mentor principals are under a tremendous amount of pressure to perform (accountability). They are sometimes reluctant to let an aspiring principal handle high staked responsibilities.”

A performance-based experience was the fourth finding that emerged as an important component of APPPs. The results were generally supported in the literature even though the time and expense of providing this component usually was a district issue. One large district stated that they provided, “the internship – with both a supervising principal (mentor) and a clinical supervisor” who meet on a scheduled basis throughout the school year. Another expressed a
concern that “true intern experiences” were needed “with more screening for the applicants that
are high performers, lots of time is wasted on candidates who never will be educational leaders.”

The fifth finding that emerged as a pattern from the qualitative data was that there was a
need to have more discussion and implementation of the FPCs in the APPPs. “We are currently
working with the old Florida Principal Competencies. The new competencies need to be
included, particularly technology.”

The sixth finding was that the program participants needed more frequent feedback from
their support team members, although how often feedback was preferred was not specified. “We
continuously survey and ask for feedback on the types of training, study groups, etc. that we
provide.”

The seventh finding from the qualitative data was that the school districts were aware of
the need to discuss and implement the ISLLC Standards, but the participants thought that, “the
ISLLC standards were not a strength in the basis of the APPP components.” The development of
the new Florida Leadership Standards supported the fact that the state of Florida was presently
modifying its state standards to be based on the ISLLC and other standards. As a participant
from a medium sized Florida school district stated, their APPP was in the process of being “re-
aligned with the new ‘Leadership Standards’ from DOE [Department of Education].”

The eighth, and final, pattern that emerged from the qualitative data was the lack of
funding, time, and assessment as APPP weaknesses and components in need of improvement.
“We are a small district with a very small pool of assistant principals. It is not cost effective to
provide a HRMD program, too expensive. In-house training only” is provided. Another small
district explained that, “We do not have a formal program. We are the smallest school district in the state with one elementary school and one middle/high school. We have only one assistant principal, therefore, we can tailor a program to his individual needs.” These participant responses concur with the research literature and the study results that the amount of time and money spent to support providing an APPP are dependent upon each district’s priorities and individual needs.

Synthesis of the Quantitative and the Qualitative Findings

“What does all this mean? How does all this fit together? How are the pieces related to the whole?” (Hatch, 2003, p. 173). In sum, the data results from the quantitative and the qualitative research study present the following themes of commonality and issues of difference:

The survey results show that a high percentage (90%) of school districts in Florida do provide an APPP for their aspiring principals based upon the FPCs and ISLLC Standards. Of the 90%, 84% provide their own district APPP and 16% have their assistant principals participate in another district’s (7%) or consortium’s (9%) APPP.

The results show that of the 50 Florida school districts, 62% of the survey data and 2% of the websites data show that the aspiring principal preparation program (APPP) and respective components are identified in a program brochure available either in hardcopy, or on the school district’s website, or both. The survey data showed that 82% of the APPPs did include the understanding and the implementation of the FPCs as components, but a lesser percentage of the APPPs included the ISLLC Standards. Sixteen percent of the school districts included the
components of understanding the ISSLC Standards and thirteen percent included the implementation of the ISLLC Standards.

The survey results show that the school district APPPs in the state of Florida include professional development (84%), a mentor principal (71%), and a performance-based experience (82%) as part of the program. The website results show that the school district APPPs in the state of Florida include professional development (73%), a mentor principal (73%), and a performance-based experience (73%) as part of the program.

The results show that the very-large sized Florida school districts with a student population over 100 thousand students provided an APPP with more components based upon competencies and standards than the other sized school districts. The results show that all Florida school districts do not provide an APPP based upon the FPCs and ISLLC standards to their current assistant principals that is formalized, individualized, and provides for continuous feedback.

In more detail, the results show that FPC 6, concept formation - the ability to see patterns and relationships and form concepts, hypotheses, and ideas from the information; ISLLC 6, understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context; and mentor principal were the least included components in the APPP across all district size categories.

The results of four of the five school district size categories ranked ISLLC Standard 3 - a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and
effective learning environment; followed by ISLLC Standard 5, a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner as the two highest included ISLLC components.

The results show that the percentage of each Grouping Component Category for the Large sized school district category exceeded the other school district size categories. The results show that of the Grouping Component Category, the abstract components were found to contribute more to the APPPs than the concrete components.

The results show that the limitations to the Florida school district provided APPPs, especially the small district programs, were a lack of funding, time, and assessment. The results show that the strength of the professional development components provided by the Florida school district APPPs and the need to modify the APPPs to meet the new Florida Leadership Standards, especially the component of technology, were the two issues that were addressed the most by the study participants.

Summary

Chapter 4 presented the analyses of data collected in a study that combined quantitative-qualitative methods and procedures. A descriptive approach using logical analysis and a modified triangulation method was employed in the study to evaluate the data gathered from 50 differently sized school districts located in Florida. The data sources included the Florida Aspiring Principal Preparation Assessment (FLAPPA) survey and the Florida school district’s Aspiring Principal Preparation Program (APPP) documentation.
Results of the data analyses demonstrated that a high percentage of Florida school districts do provide an APPP to their current assistant principals where the components are based upon the FPCs and upon the ISLLC Standards. Additionally, the components of professional development, a mentor principal and support team, and a performance-based experience were included in most APPPs; however, the percentage of inclusion differed according to the school district size. Florida school districts in the very large category with a student population of over 100 thousand included more components based upon Florida Principal Competencies and ISLLC Standards than did the other Florida school districts of other sizes.

Through qualitative data interpretation, the researcher discovered from a lengthy list of responses provided by the participants that the lack of funding, time, and assessment were the components suggested that needed the most improvement within the APPPs. An overarching pattern of responses that emerged from the qualitative data was that the participants felt the need for their APPPs to be modified to include the new Florida leadership standards that are being developed during the summer of 2004. Technology was repeatedly stated as the one component that needed to be included in the APPP. The finalized Leadership Standards will be recommended to the Florida Department of Education.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the first four chapters and a review of the data analyses submitted in Chapter 4. An introduction, summary of chapters, statement of problem, participants, data collection, summary and discussion of findings, discussion and implications, recommendations for school leaders, and recommendations for future research are included in Chapter 5.

Summary of Chapters

In Chapter 1, the researcher presented a framework of the variables examined in the study. The research was guided by the following questions: What percentage of the 67 Florida school districts provide a formal aspiring principal preparation program (APPP) to their current assistant principals in which the components are based upon the 19 Florida Principal competencies and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards? Are the components of professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience included in the APPP?

Chapter 1 presented an introduction that described the Florida and national perspectives on APPPs; the statement of the problem; the research questions; and definitions of terms used in the study. The research design included the study participants, the instrumentation, data
collection and analyses, delimitations, limitations, and assumptions. The significance of the study and the summary concluded Chapter 1.

In Chapter 2, the researcher provided a review of the literature based on the purpose of the study. The chapter presented an introduction and four sections. Section 1 provided an overview of the historical development of the Florida Principal Competencies and the legislation in Florida approved on July 1, 2001. The legislation made Florida one of the least restrictive states for administrator licensing. The proposed Florida leadership standards were introduced that are being developed as of July, 2004, and are based upon a crosswalk of state and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. Section 2 provided an explanation of the No Child Left Behind legislation and its mandates for educational leadership preparation, training, and certification. The School Leadership Program, a grant program, provided for the reform of the principal certification requirements and professional development that aligned with the state standards with the purpose of creating a high-quality school leadership force. Section 3 provided a description of the background and development of the ISLLC Standards and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) recommendations for administrative preparation programs. Section 4 was divided into three parts: the first part reviewed the literature on APPPs provided by school districts in Florida, the second part reviewed the APPP literature provided by school districts in states other than Florida, and the third part reviewed the APPP literature in school district collaborative programs. Chapter 2 concluded with a summary.

In Chapter 3 of this study, the methodology used for the research was presented. The chapter presented an introduction to the combined quantitative and qualitative research study and
the descriptive approach using logical analysis and the modified triangulation method that was employed. The data sources included the Florida Aspiring Principal Preparation Assessment (FLAPPA) survey and the Florida school district’s APPP documentation. The statement of the problem and the description of the criteria for the selection of the participants were presented. The instrument construction and development section included the following components: validity, item design, response scale, item grouping, formatting the instrument, survey design, cover letter, the mailout package, pilot procedures, and reliability. The study procedures, data collection and analyses; and summary concluded Chapter 3.

In Chapter 4, the researcher presented the analyses of data collected in a study that combined quantitative and qualitative methods and procedures. Data analyses were based upon the respondent’s answers to a survey that was developed by the researcher and documentation found on the school district’s websites. The chapter presented an introduction, the participants, the study procedures and the response rates. The data collection procedures and the respective response rates were explained as well as the four research questions. After providing separate sections of data analysis of the quantitative and the qualitative data, a synthesis of the combined quantitative and the qualitative data findings and a summary concluded Chapter 4.

Statement of the Problem

Prior to July 2001, all school districts in the state of Florida were mandated by Florida statute 231.087(3) to include the 19 principal competencies developed by the Florida Council on Educational Management (FCEM) as part of a state approved Human Resource Management
Development (HRMD) APPP (FLDOE, 2002a). The problem was that the new legislation mandated after 2001 reduced the criteria needed to obtain school principal certification and reduced the requirements needed to satisfy an APPP. The new statute allowed Florida school districts to hire employees to serve as school principals who had no educational leadership experience and who had not fulfilled requirements of an approved APPP.

The purposes of the study were to identify the basis of the APPP components Florida school districts provide to their aspiring principals and their relationship, if any, to the Florida Principal Competencies and the ISLLC Standards. The research questions were designed to: (a) identify which school districts in the state of Florida provide an APPP for their current assistant principals; (b) determine if the program components were based upon the FPCs, the ISLLC Standards, or another source; (c) determine if professional development, mentoring, and a performance-based experience were included as components of the APPP; and (d) determine if the percentage of components included in each APPP differed according to school district size.

**Participants**

The study was comprised of the sample of HRMD employees who were responsible for the APPPs in Florida’s 67 school districts. The participants were identified in the employee listings found in the Florida Education Directory by Florida Association of School Administrators, 2003-2004 School Year (Florida Association of School Administrators (FASA), 2003). The criteria for selection of the HRMD employee responsible for the APPP were: (a) the HRMD employee who administered the APPP in their school district; (b) the employee who was
recommended by the HRMD contact person to be the most knowledgeable about the APPP curriculum; or (c) the employee who was responsible for the coordination of the professional development, mentoring, and performance-based experiences for the school district APPP.

Demographics were collected and reported on the HRMD participant’s employee position, training, gender, and experience. In addition to training in adult learning theory, HRMD Coordination/team leader, and the FPCs, most had served as building-level principals prior to their district-level appointment. All study participants were employed as the APPP administrator in their school district and 90% were aware of the need to modify the APPP according to the Florida leadership standards that were being developed during the summer of 2004.

**Data Collection**

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the FLAPPA survey and the school districts’ APPP brochures found on the websites (Appendix K). A spreadsheet Microsoft Access 2000 and verbatim log were used to track the returned surveys, brochures, websites, and the quantitative and qualitative data. The analyses of the data were completed during the summer of 2004. The two different methods and procedures that were used in the analyses and interpretation of the data are described below.

The quantitative data were entered into a database using Excel 2000. SPSS version 10.0 was used for the data analyses of research questions to determine the percentage of Florida school districts that provide a competency and standards-based APPP to their aspiring principals.
The procedures included measuring the percentage of each component’s contribution to the APPP and then analyzing the results by the school district sizes.

Logical analysis was used in the evaluation of the qualitative research questions responses (Wolcott, 2001). The overall pattern of data analysis was inductive, moving from specifics to generalizations (Hatch, 2002). Creswell’s (1998) data analysis spiral procedure was followed to create and organize files to manage the qualitative data. The process included five steps: reading through the survey responses making margin notes and formulating initial codes; describing the meaning of the content for the researcher; classifying the categories; interpreting for comparisons in order to identify patterns of relationship among the participants’ perspectives; and presenting a table of statements (Creswell, 1998). The researcher was then responsible for what Wolcott calls “mindwork -- the making sense of qualitative data” (as cited in Hatch, 2002, p. 148).

**Summary and Discussion of Findings**

The study was guided by four research questions that examined the component bases of the Florida school district’s provided APPPs. The following sections will present the discussion of the findings for each of the research questions.

**Research Question 1**

To what extent did the Florida school districts provide a formal aspiring principal preparation program for current assistant principals? The data used in evaluating Research
Question 1 were collected from the responses of four survey items using a response scale with 1= “Yes,” 2 = “No,” and 0 = “Do Not Know.” Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 1 - 4 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP.

Survey question 1 survey results show that 90% of school districts in Florida do provide an APPP for their aspiring principals; however, the smaller school districts provide a program less often than larger districts due to a lack of money and time. Survey questions 2, 3, and 4 results show that a small percentage of the Florida school districts have their assistant principals participate in another district’s APPP or consortium, but not another venue. The smaller school districts were found to have pooled their resources that resulted in providing one program for several districts as a consortium.

Research Question 2

Upon what were the formal aspiring principal preparation programs for current assistant principals based: the Florida Principal Competencies, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s Standards, or another source? The data used in evaluating Research Question 2 were collected from the responses of 30 survey items: 5 - 9 and 13 - 37. Survey items 5 – 9 provided a response scale with 1= “Yes,” 2 = “No,” and 0 = “Do Not Know.” Survey items 13 - 37 provided a response scale with 1= “Included,” 2 = “Not Included,” and 0 = “Do Not Know.” Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 5 - 9 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP.
Survey question 5 results show that more than half of the Florida school districts do have hardcopy brochures that describe their APPP. Very few websites (5) contained the APPP documentation with the components listed. One respondent from a large-sized school district commented that, “the documentation aided his school district in communicating information about the APPP to the public and to other potential APPP candidates.”

Survey questions 6 and 7 results found strong support that the requirement to understand and implement the FPCs are a part of the basis of the components found in APPPs provided by Florida school districts. Survey questions 8 and 9 results found strong support that the requirement to understand and implement the ISLLC Standards are a lesser part of the basis of the components found in APPPs provided by Florida school districts. Therefore, the Florida school district’s APPP components are based upon the understanding and implementation of the FPCs more than they are based upon the understanding and implementation of the ISLLC Standards.

The higher percent of “Do Not Know” responses to the ISLLC Standards questions might suggest that the HRMD APPP administrators might not be as familiar with the ISLLC Standards as they are familiar with the FPCs. This conclusion is drawn from the responses of a number of participant’s who stated they were not familiar with the ISLLC Standards, “due to a lack of training and exposure to the ISLLC Standards.”
Research Question 3

To what extent did the school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the 67 Florida districts have component requirements that included professional development, mentoring, and/or performance-based experiences? The data used in evaluating Research Question 3 were collected from the responses of 3 survey items. Using a response scale with 1 = “Included,” 2 = “Not Included,” and 0 = “Do Not Know,” descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 10 – 12 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP.

The results from questions 10, 11, and 12 found that Florida school districts do provide APPPs that include components of a performance-based experience and professional development more often than the component of a mentor principal, except in the large sized districts where the components are equally represented. The literature review supports the inclusion of these components as part of an APPP; however, the inclusion of a mentor principal was strongly recommended in the literature.

Research Question 4

Were there differences among the aspiring principal preparation program components provided by differently sized Florida school districts? The data used in evaluating Research Question 4 were collected from the responses of 28 quantitative and four qualitative survey items, plus the district documentation found on their websites. The quantitative and qualitative
data from the two research methods were analyzed and interpreted separately. The quantitative data section is presented first; follow by the qualitative data section.

The quantitative survey items 10 - 37 provided a response scale with 1 = “Included,” 2 = “Not Included,” and 0 = “Do Not Know.” Descriptive analyses were completed for survey questions 10 – 37 where respondents were asked to select the one best response that applied to their school district APPP.

The data were analyzed and interpreted by the researcher to discover what percentage of each component was included in each APPP according to the differing school district sizes. The data and its description were presented from the school district size categories that contained the largest percentage of components in the APPP (the very large-sized school districts) to the school district size category that contained the least percentage of components (the small-sized school districts). The sizes of the school districts are: first, the very large sized school districts with a population of over 100 thousand students; second, the large sized school districts with a population of 40 – 100 thousand students; third, the medium sized school districts with a population of 20 – 40 thousand students; fourth, the medium/small sized school districts with a population of 7 – 20 thousand students; and fifth, the small sized school districts with a population of under 7 thousand students.

All the FPCs were included as a basis of the APPP components. Very Large and Large sized school districts included all 19 FPCs as a basis of their APPPs. Medium sized school districts included all the FPCs at the same percentage (100%) except FPC 6, concept formation, which was the least included FPC component in the Medium sized school district (90%).
Medium/Small sized school districts included all the FPCs at the same percentage (82%) except FPCs 5, information search, and FPC 6, concept formation, which were the least included components in the Medium/Small sized school district (73%). Small sized school districts included all the FPCs at the same percentage (69%), except FPC 11, tactical ability, and FPC 13, management control, which were the least included components in the Small sized school district (63%).

The ISLLC Standards were included at the same percentage for Very Large sized school districts except ISSLC 4, collaborating (67%). ISSLC 3, managing organization, and ISSLC 5, acting with integrity, were included 100% at the Large sized school districts while ISSLC 1, facilitating, ISSLC 2, advocating, and ISSLC 6, understanding, were included the least percentage (80%). Medium sized school districts included ISSLC 3, managing organization, at the highest percentage (100%); ISSLC 2, advocating and ISSLC 5, acting with integrity (90%); ISSLC 1, facilitating, and ISSLC 4, collaborating (80%); and ISSLC 6, understanding, at the lowest percentage (50%). Medium/Small sized school districts included ISSLC 3, managing organization, as the highest percentage (82%); ISSLC 1, facilitating, ISSLC 2, advocating, ISSLC 5, acting with integrity, and ISSLC 6, understanding (73%); and ISSLC 4, collaborating, as the lowest percentage (64%). Small sized school districts included ISSLC 1, facilitating and ISSLC 2, advocating, as the highest percentage (69%); ISSLC 3, managing organization, ISSLC 4, collaborating, and ISSLC 5, acting with integrity (63%); and ISSLC 6, understanding, as the lowest percentage (44%).

Overall, the results show that the least included APPP components were FPC 6, concept formation - the ability to see patterns and relationships and form concepts, hypotheses, and ideas from the information; and ISLLC 6, a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. A conclusion drawn from these results might be that more professional development components need to be provided to the aspiring principals that focus on developing the components of concept formation and promoting the success of children with the purpose of modifying the APPPs. The study data support the FPCs and ISLLC Standards as a basis for the APPPs. Educational leaders need to have the skills to be able to recognize patterns and relationships among information collected from many different sources in order to make appropriate judgments and decisions that will affect the best interests of their stakeholders.

All 19 FPC components ranked as a basis of the APPP at the same high percentage (100%) for very large and large sized districts. Three of the five school district size categories ranked the highest included ISLLC component as ISLLC Standard 3, a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; followed by ISLLC Standard 5, a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. This study’s findings support the concept that managing the organization as a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment and acting with integrity are two very important leadership skills for all
educational leaders. Educational leaders believe that success for the children, parents, faculty and staff will improve if the mission to promote the organization as a safe and secure learning environment managed by an ethical and fair leader is accomplished. Therefore, professional development based upon the Florida Principal Competencies and the ISLLC Standards that addresses these leadership skills needs to be an included APPP component.

The Grouping Component Categories contributed more to the APPP for the Large sized school district than to the other school district size categories. The Grouping Component Categories contributed less for the Small sized school districts than any other school district size. The origins of the APPP components as well as whether or not each component was considered an abstract or concrete item were analyzed. The abstract components were found to contribute more to the APPPs than the concrete components.

Qualitative Questions

The following four questions are the qualitative questions that were included on the survey: If your school district does not provide a principal preparation program, but your assistant principals participate in a consortium or another districts’ program, please tell me why your district does not provide its own program? What are the areas that need improvement of your principal preparation program? What are the areas of strength of your principal preparation program? Is there anything else you would like to say about your principal preparation program?

The data used in evaluating the qualitative questions were collected from the responses of four open-ended response survey questions. Three stages of logical analysis were employed in
the analysis of the qualitative data: organizing the data, describing the data, and the interpretation of the data (Best & Kahn, 2003).

The number one pattern that surfaced from the qualitative question responses was that more than half of the Florida school districts recognized professional development and training as a very important component of their APPP and 20% identified it as a concern or needing improvement. Another overall pattern that emerged was that the school districts in Florida recognized the need to modify and were in the process of modifying their APPPs according to the new Florida leadership and the ISLLC standards. The third finding from the qualitative data was that the support team made up of principals, district staff, and team members were supported by the school district’s APPPs. A performance-based experience was the fourth finding of the qualitative data that was discovered to be important as an included component of APPPs. The support of a performance-based experience as a component is a finding that is generally supported in the literature even though the time and expense of providing this component is usually a district issue.

The fifth finding from the qualitative data was a need to have more understanding and implementation of the Florida Principal Competencies in the APPPs. The sixth finding from the qualitative data was that a small percentage of districts were aware of the need to understand and implement the ISLLC Standards, however the ISLLC standards contributed less than the FPCs in the APPPs. The literature review suggested that the APPPs be based upon the ISSLC Standards and state standards, but the study results found that the ISLLC Standards were not universally implemented in the Florida school district’s APPPs. The seventh finding from the qualitative
data was that a lack of funding, time, assessment, and technology were identified as APPP weaknesses and components in need of improvement.

**Discussion and Implications**

The problem created by the new Florida legislation mandated after 2001 that reduced the criteria needed to obtain school principal certification and reduced the requirements needed to satisfy an APPP is an important concern for educational leaders. The 2001 statute allows Florida school districts to hire employees to serve as school principals who have no educational training, no educational leadership experience, no teaching experience, no school principal certification, and who have not fulfilled requirements of an HRMD approved APPP. As a result of the 2001 legislation, people who may be managing and leading our schools might not have the necessary educational training, experience, certification, or knowledge that is needed to lead a standards-based educational program that results in a quality standards-based education for our students. Today, when research emphasizes a standards-based quality education for children, this study’s findings support APPP requirements that are standard-based for aspiring principals as part of the criteria for obtaining school principal certification. The 2004 Florida legislation’s goal is to put into place a high quality teaching force by 2010 where all teachers will be highly qualified based upon educational and certification criteria, but at the same time the same statutes have lessened the requirements of education, experience, and certification needed to become a school principal.

The results of this study may prove fruitful for educational leaders and legislators who need research data in support of providing a standards-based APPP in their school district. While
the research study only dealt with APPPs provided by school districts in Florida, results of the research might spark interest in other educational leaders who are responsible for the development of APPPs in school districts across the country. With literature documenting the recruitment of educational leaders from the business community, educational leaders and those aspiring to become a school principal must continue to improve their own educational background, professional knowledge, and job-embedded experiences to keep abreast of new teaching, learning, and leadership methodologies for the success of their students. It behooves school districts to examine the APPPs they provide their current assistant principals and retool the program to include the components of the new Florida Leadership Standards as an investment in the leadership certification process and as an investment in the quality of their future educational leaders.

**Recommendations for School Leaders**

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the basis of the components of the Florida school district’s aspiring principal preparation programs and whether or not the components were based upon the Florida Principal Competencies, the ISLLC Standards, or another source. Based upon the findings in this study, the following recommendations are offered for consideration to assist in the improvement of APPPs:

1. It is suggested that all school districts, including Florida’s, include as a basis of the APPP a higher percentage of the professional development components based upon principles
of sound research such as the ISLLC Standards and the new Florida Leadership Standards.

2. It is recommended that the component of technology be included in the APPP as an investment in the future and quality of their educational leaders.

3. It is recommended that Florida school districts provide an APPP that is formalized, individualized, and provides for continuous feedback.

4. It is recommended that small and medium/small Florida school districts spend the time, assessment, and funding to provide an APPP as an investment in the future and quality of their educational leaders.

5. It is suggested that Florida school districts provide a brochure that describes their APPP in hardcopy and in an on-line website, thus ensuring best practices in the APPP to help improve communication and recruit participants for the APPP.

6. It is suggested that Florida school districts provide a mentor principal and support team to their current assistant principals who participate in an APPP, thus ensuring best practices in the APPP and improving the support system of their future principals. The Florida APPPs are encouraged to redesign their programs to include one mentor principal per APPP participant.

7. It is suggested that Florida school districts provide a performance-based experience or internship to the current assistant principals who participate in an APPP, thus improving the quality of the APPP and the hands-on and job-embedded experiences of their future principals.
8. It is suggested that Florida school districts provide more emphasis on developing the components of FPC 6, concept formation - the ability to see patterns and relationships and form concepts, hypotheses, and ideas from the information; and ISLLC 6, understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context; thus improving the quality of the APPP and the skills of their future principals.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are suggested as possibilities for future research in the area of educational practices for aspiring principal preparation programs:

1. It is recommended that further research be conducted on the new Florida Leadership Standards that are being developed at the moment. The study might be conducted after the new standards have been developed to investigate the basis of the APPP components to find out if and how the new standards were incorporated into the Florida school district provided APPPs.

2. It is recommended that further research be conducted in other states to investigate the basis of the school district provided aspiring principal preparation programs and their relationship, if any, to a sound research base.

3. It is recommended that further research take place that investigates if the legislative community perceives whether or not a standards and competency based APPP makes a
difference in the quality of leadership skills an aspiring principal develops and if the APPPs are fiscally worth the time and money.
APPENDIX A

THE FLORIDA PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES

PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2001
1. PROACTIVE ORIENTATION is the inclination and readiness to initiate action and to accept responsibility for leading and enabling others to improve the circumstances being faced or anticipated.

The principal with a PROACTIVE ORIENTATION:

1.1 takes full responsibility for work of the school
1.2 acquires and protects needed resources (time, talent, supplies, space, finances)
1.3 believes that he/she makes a difference
1.4 provides support for teachers, staff and parents as they take initiatives for school improvement; takes action to prepare the school for change
1.5 focuses the attention and energy of stakeholders on the tasks to be done
1.6 cuts through bureaucratic red-tape and other barriers to school improvement
1.7 takes risks by initiating meetings of stakeholders, by suggesting new curriculum based on data, and by meeting with politicians regarding school laws and regulations
1.8 anticipates new organizational or systems problems and initiates action
1.9 uses personal and positional power to protect the business of the school

INITIATIVE: Active attempts to influence events and achieve goals, self-starting rather than passive acceptance. Taking action to achieve goals beyond what is necessarily called for; originating action.

2. DECISIVENESS is the readiness and confidence to make or share decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken and commitments made by self and others.

The principal who exhibits DECISIVENESS:

2.1 determines quickly how and by whom decisions should be made in accordance with the time available and the school’s vision and mission
2.2 recognizes the importance of sharing decisions and judgment-making with stakeholders as an integral part of organizational learning and development
2.3 confronts issues and disagreements, investigates and defines problems, and directs the energies of self and others to productive resolutions
2.4 recognizes that decisions are made at several levels by different people
2.5 faces personnel problems as they occur, provides feedback on performance, and makes difficult personnel decisions when necessary
2.6 acts quickly to stop possible breaches of safety and/or interruptions in operations
2.7 exhibits self-confidence and courage
serves as the “final arbitrator” within the building for difficult discipline situations
decides to let others decide
2.10 uses multi-sources of data in the decision making process

DECISIVENESS: Readiness to make decisions, render judgments, take actions and commit oneself.
3. COMMITMENT TO VISION AND MISSION is a pledge to develop and act in accordance with the shared vision, mission, and values of the school.

The principal who exhibits COMMITMENT TO VISION AND MISSION:

3.1 establishes a vision and a statement of mission for the school in collaboration with key stakeholders
3.2 personally holds a set of values that are in harmony with the vision and mission of the school; e.g., respect and caring for each individual, belief that everyone can succeed
3.3 takes responsibility for how well students, faculty, staff, parents and the community understand the school’s mission
3.4 is purposeful about linking the school’s mission to expected behavior
3.5 aligns the school’s vision and mission with larger system
3.6 identifies, models and reinforces behavior that is congruent with the mission and goals of the school
3.7 when necessary, takes difficult and unpopular actions when the mission and welfare of the school are at stake
3.8 assumes moral leadership for the school
3.9 expects commitment and support of the school’s mission and goals by the school’s stakeholders as well as by the district and state

******************************************************************************DIMENSION******************************************************************************

INTEGRITY: Maintaining social, ethical, and organizational morals in job-related activities.

4. INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY is the ability to discover, understand, verbalize accurately, and respond empathetically to the perspectives, thoughts, ideas and feelings of others.

The principal who evidences INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY:

4.1 encourages others to describe their perceptions, thoughts, feelings and perspectives
4.2 listens attentively and accurately describes others’ behavior, expressed ideas, feelings, and perspectives
4.3 paraphrases, summarizes and checks own perceptions to test the accuracy of messages received
4.4 encourages individual expression, appreciates diversity, and avoids stereotyping
4.5 demonstrates awareness and sensitivity to the feelings, thoughts, and expressions of others

******************************************************************************DIMENSION******************************************************************************

SENSITIVITY: Actions that indicate consideration for the feelings and needs of others.
5. INFORMATION SEARCH AND ANALYSIS is the gathering and analysis of data from multiple sources before arriving at an understanding of an event or problem.

The principal displays the competence of INFORMATION SEARCH and ANALYSIS when she/he:

5.1 creates and manages a systemic informational gathering process among the various stakeholders of the school and community
5.2 insists that the best available data be analyzed and used in the decision-making process
5.3 creates and explains the methods or processes used in analyzing data
5.4 delays making decisions until pertinent data are analyzed
5.5 keeps up to date, striving to gather new information from research and other sources that can then be used by the school
5.6 collects, interprets and responds to data received through formal and informal conversations and oral reports
5.7 makes sure that all information is “on the table”
5.8 accesses and interprets data from computer and management information system
5.9 asks questions to clarify ideas and stimulate others to think about issues

**************************************************DIMENSION**************************************

ANALYSES: Relating and comparing data from different sources, identifying issues, screening relevant information, and identifying relationships.

6. CONCEPT FORMATION is the ability to see patterns and relationships and form concepts, hypotheses, and ideas from the information.

The principal evidences CONCEPT FORMATION when she/he:

6.1 processes data logically and intuitively to discover and/or create meaning
6.2 recognizes themes or patterns in events or data and uses them to interpret and/or discover meaning
6.3 presses self and others to define and understand issues so that problem solving techniques can be applied
6.4 recognizes and labels new insights
6.5 explains complex meanings by using analogies and metaphors
6.6 practices reflective thinking

**************************************************DIMENSION**************************************

JUDGMENT: Developing alternative courses of action and making decisions that are based on logical assumptions and that reflect factual information.
7. CONCEPTUAL FLEXIBILITY is the ability to use alternative or multiple concepts or perspectives when solving a problem or making a decision.

The principal demonstrates CONCEPTUAL FLEXIBILITY when she/he:

7.1 views the situation being faced and the events leading up to it from multiple perspectives
7.2 values divergent thinking and considers conflicting or differing views in the process of identifying options for action
7.3 appreciates different perspectives, and ensures that alternative courses of action and their consequences are considered before decisions are made
7.4 attends to multiple perspectives in developing options
7.5 makes comparisons and assesses the apparent consequences of adopting options, identifying advantages and disadvantages of each
7.6 searches for and recognizes causal consequences, develops hypotheses, and predicts subsequent events
7.7 makes decisions based upon an analysis of options
7.8 demonstrates contingency planning skills

****************************************DIMENSION****************************************

JUDGMENT: Developing alternative courses of action and making decisions that are based on logical assumptions and that reflect factual information.

8. MANAGING INTERACTION is getting others to work together effectively through the use of group process and facilitator skills.

A principal demonstrates MANAGING INTERACTION when she/he:

8.1 facilitates team and group membership
8.2 moderates group discussions and encourages consensus
8.3 intervenes, negotiates and resolves conflicts
8.4 facilitates interpersonal and inter-group communication
8.5 creates a non-judgmental atmosphere in order to stimulate open communication
8.6 personally facilitates individual and group problem-solving
8.7 identifies and draws upon recognized leaders among the group members
8.8 uses knowledge about how adults learn in working with the stakeholders
8.9 promotes collegial behavior

****************************************DIMENSION****************************************

GROUP LEADERSHIP: Utilization of appropriate interpersonal styles and methods in guiding groups toward task accomplishment.
9. IMPACT/PERSUASIVENESS is influencing and having an effect upon the school stakeholders by a variety of means—persuasive argument, setting an example or using expertise.

The principal demonstrates IMPACT/PERSUASIVENESS when she/he:

9.1 persists until ideas, beliefs, and goals are clear to all stakeholders
9.2 shows and builds enthusiasm for working on agreed upon goals of the school
9.3 builds support for ideas by linking these ideas to interests, desires, and goals of others
9.4 presents arguments and data concerning the school and succeeds in winning support from stakeholders
9.5 uses personal presence to influence others
9.6 maintains visibility and accessibility

***************************************************************DIMENSION***************************************************************

PERSUASIVENESS: Utilizing appropriate interpersonal styles and methods of communication to gain agreement or acceptance of an idea, plan, or product from clientele.

10. CONCERN FOR THE SCHOOL’S REPUTATION is caring about the impressions created by self, the students, the faculty, the staff, and parents, as well as how these impressions are communicated both inside and outside the school.

The principal who has CONCERN FOR THE SCHOOL’S REPUTATION:

10.1 advocates high student achievement and continuous school improvement
10.2 maintains a safe, orderly, and clean school and expects everyone to assume his/her responsibility for doing so
10.3 builds a school culture that provides the best possible teaching/learning environment
10.4 encourages teachers, students, and staff to display their accomplishments
10.5 releases positive information on student’s, staff’s, parent’s and school’s progress to appropriate media
10.6 invites the media to the school to report achievements
10.7 expects the adults in school to model respect, courtesy, and good manners in dealing with one another, as well as with students and parents
10.8 works with school improvement committees to develop a school marketing plan
10.9 controls the flow of negative information

***************************************************************************DIMENSION***************************************************************************

IMPACT: Creating a good first impression, commanding attention and respect, and showing an air of confidence.
11. TACTICAL ADAPTABILITY is the ability to adapt one’s interaction and behavior to fit the situation.

The principal who has TACTICAL ADAPTABILITY:

11.1 adopts various roles of leader, manager, listener, facilitator, and confronter as needed
11.2 finds ways to overcome barriers that impeded school progress
11.3 looks at problems as if there were no rules, then decides what to do to resolve the situation tactfully
11.4 understands how own behavior affects others and makes appropriate adjustments

******************************************************************************

ADAPTABILITY: Maintaining effectiveness in varying environments, tasks, responsibilities, or with people.
FLEXIBILITY: Modifying behavior to reach a goal.
INDIVIDUAL LEADERSHIP: Utilizing appropriate interpersonal styles to guide individuals to task accomplishment.

12. ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION is doing things better/different than before by setting goals that encourage self and others to reach higher standards and results.

The principal who has an ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION:

12.1 sets standards and insists that everyone participates in reaching them
12.2 shows appreciation for individual and group efforts and accomplishments
12.3 presses the faculty and staff to be clear about the evidence that will be acceptable (amount, kind, quality, etc.) for goal and student achievement
12.4 enjoys doing many things at once and draws personal energy from engaging in a dynamic school situation
    identifies discrepancies between goals and the current status in order to stimulate student, faculty, and staff achievement
    publicly celebrates the learning and the achievement of all who are affiliated with the school
    encourages moderate risk taking by making people comfortable with trying new approaches, making mistakes and learning from them
    uses criteria for effective schools and state standards to assess the status of the school as a basis for school improvement
    uses current research, sound educational principles, and best practices as a basis for instructional leadership
    measures achievement by using data that support results

******************************************************************************

WORK STANDARDS: Setting high goals and standards of performance for self, subordinates, others, and organization. Dissatisfied with average performance
13. MANAGEMENT CONTROL is the establishment of systematic processes to receive and provide feedback about the progress of work being done.

The principal who has MANAGEMENT CONTROL:

13.1 monitors the academic progress of students
13.2 has frequent contact with teachers
13.3 observes in classrooms frequently
13.4 monitors the effective use of instructional time on task
13.5 emphasizes the need for frequent evaluation and student progress reports
13.6 walks around campus purposefully to check the status of events
13.7 holds frequent conferences with staff about student progress
13.8 asks for feedback to see how well self is doing
13.9 responds to feedback on results of instructional efforts
13.9.1 seeks feedback from parents regarding the school and responds by taking corrective or school improvement initiatives
13.9.2 reconsiders, at least annually, the shared vision of the school, its mission and the stated goals
13.9.3 schedules follow-up for all delegated and assigned activities

***************************************************************************DIMENSION***************************************************************************

CONTROL: Establishing procedures to monitor and/or regulate processes, tasks or activities and responsibilities. Taking action to monitor the results of delegated assignments or projects.

14. DEVELOPMENT ORIENTATION is holding high and positive expectations for the growth and development of all stakeholders through modeling self-development, coaching, and providing learning opportunities.

A principal who has DEVELOPMENT ORIENTATION:

14.1 builds a school, community, and culture that support learning and growth for everyone including self
   Establishes and maintains individual professional development plans for each instructional employee that is linked to better student performance
14.3 provides immediate and specific feedback data to individuals and groups, and uses feedback to generate new opportunities for learning
14.4 looks for new or innovative ideas, methods and programs to meet developmental needs of students and stakeholders
14.5 expects everyone connected with the school to be engaged in a learning program of some kind
14.6 provides learning opportunities for stakeholders along with resources
14.7 recognizes that most learning occurs in a community of learners; therefore, encourages communication and sharing of ideas and resources among students, parents, faculty, and staff
14.8 encourages networking to support and follow up training
14.9 coaches and mentors individuals who aspire to serve as school leaders
14.10 enjoys seeing others grow and succeed
14.10.1 participates in professional development activities as a learner

***************************************************************************DIMENSION***************************************************************************

DEVELOPMENT OF SUBORDINATES: Developing the skills and competencies of subordinates through training and development activities related to current and future jobs.
15. ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY is the know-how (knowledge and skill) to design, plan and organize activities to achieve goals.

The principal with ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY:

15.1 develops action plans for goal achievement in collaboration with the school improvement team
15.2 recruits teachers whose goals align with the mission and goals of the school community
15.3 schedules and protects time for self and others, keeping deadlines in perspective
15.4 keeps self organized, establishes priorities and plans for contingencies
15.5 systematizes and schedules actions to avoid undue stress
15.6 uses technology to maintain records and information for quick reference
15.7 allocates resources (money, training, time, space, materials) in accordance with school goals

**************************************************************************DIMENSION**************************************************************************

PLANNING AND ORGANIZING: Establishing a course of action for self and/or others to accomplish a specific goal. Planning proper assignment of personnel and appropriate allocation of resources.

16. DELEGATION is entrusting of jobs to be done, beyond routine assignments, to others, giving them authority and responsibility for accomplishment.

The principal who has DELEGATION COMPETENCE:

16.1 determines the jobs and tasks that need to be done
16.2 assesses the expertise of self and others and, whenever possible considers the developmental needs and aspirations of others in relation to the jobs and tasks to be assigned
16.3 reassigns routine operations and functions to others, e.g. discipline, bookkeeping, when delegating new learning assignments
16.4 seeks outside help and assistance for tasks or jobs for which time and talents are not available within the school
16.5 gains understanding and acceptance for delegated tasks
16.6 specifies responsibility and authority for delegated tasks
16.7 establishes standards for task accomplishment along with time frame and check points
16.8 maintains accessibility and provides guidance and support in relation to individual need

**************************************************************************DIMENSION**************************************************************************

DELEGATION: Utilizing subordinates effectively. Entrusting decision-making and other responsibilities to the appropriate subordinates.
17. SELF-PRESENTATION is the ability to clearly present one’s ideas to others in an open, informative, and non-evaluative manner.

The principal has SELF-PRESENTATION competence when she/he:

17.1 communicates in an open, honest, and genuine way
    shares beliefs, ideas, and concepts using data-relevant, descriptive language such as analogy, metaphor and/or anecdotal materials
17.3 checks to see that messages are received, and persists until ideas, beliefs, and goals seem to be understood
17.4 models effective interpersonal communication skills
17.5 displays a sense of personal and professional efficacy
17.6 stimulates others to ask questions about their own issues
17.7 uses effective listening skills before responding to questions by others
17.8 uses visual or technical media to enhance understanding

***************************************************************************DIMENSION***************************************************************************
ORAL COMMUNICATION: Effective expression in individuals or group situations (including gestures and nonverbal communications).
LISTENING: Use of information extracted from oral communications.

18. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION is the ability to write clearly and concisely using good grammar.

The principal who has competence in WRITTEN COMMUNICATION:

18.1 expresses ideas in writing clearly, simply, and in correct grammatical form
18.2 adjusts writing styles and vocabulary to the audience being addressed
18.3 checks own written messages for correctness--spelling, punctuation, and syntax

***************************************************************************DIMENSION***************************************************************************
WRITTEN COMMUNICATION: Clear expression of ideas in writing and in good grammatical form.
19. ORGANIZATIONAL SENSITIVITY is an awareness of the effects of one’s behavior and decisions on all stakeholders both inside and outside the organization.

The principal with ORGANIZATIONAL SENSITIVITY:

19.1 considers the overall consequences to the school’s culture before initiating changes
19.2 responds to inquiries and comments about the school and its personnel with tact and patience
19.3 keeps individuals, both inside and outside the school, informed when data are relevant to them
19.4 considers the position, feelings and/or perspectives of other parts of the organization when planning, deciding, and organizing
19.5 develops and maintains a school climate conducive to learning, open to discussion and change
19.6 builds coalitions and seeks, secures, and recognizes allies
19.7 identifies and uses networks
19.8 maintains appropriate social distance so that messages can be received with relative objectivity
19.9 maintains an organizational perspective and a sense of humor

**************************************************DIMENSION**************************************************

ORGANIZATIONAL SENSITIVITY: Perceiving the impact and the implications of decisions on other components of the organization.
APPENDIX B

THE INTERSTATE SCHOOL LEADERS LICENSURE CONSORTIUM

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

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

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

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

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

6. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium of the Council of Chief State School Officers, 1997, p.5).
February 9, 2004

Debbie Juusela
615 Forest Lane
DeLand, FL 32724

Contact Person
Any District
Anytown, FL Zip

Dear

Your help is requested for a study about school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida. Your input is important because of the need to obtain accurate data about the components of the aspiring principal preparation programs.

The Florida principal preparation and certification laws have recently changed. In the past, principal preparation was mandated by statute to include professional development that was based on the Florida Principal Competencies. Present law has made Florida’s principal preparation and certification criteria one of the least restrictive in the nation.

I am researching whether or not your district provides a principal preparation program, and, if so, on what the professional development components are based. Do you include mentoring, a performance-based experience, or the training of the national Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium standards as part of your program? (The Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium or ISLLC standards are defined on the next page.) The information that you provide will yield an accurate picture about the status of the principal preparation programs in the state of Florida.

As you answer each question, please keep in mind that for the component to be included in the professional development part of the program means that the component was formally addressed and discussed. This could have happened in a variety of settings, such as an in-service class or as an on-the-job performance-based experience. If the component was only mentioned casually while walking down the hall, then it would not be considered formally addressed. If the component was not formally addressed, then you should mark the Not Included answer box. If you are not sure if the component was formally addressed, then please mark the Do Not Know answer box.

If you feel that the survey form does not provide adequate space for comments, feel free to expand your thoughts on the back of any page. Please take the time to fill out the enclosed survey and return it by February 23, 2004.
This survey is voluntary and confidential. Study results will be reported only as summaries in which no individual’s answers or specifics about a school district’s individual program will be identified. When you return the completed survey, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected to your answers in any way.

Thank you very much in advance for helping with this study about school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida. As a token of thanks, a copy of the study results will be provided to you after the completion of the study, if requested.

Sincerely,

Debbie Juusela, M.Ed.
University of Central Florida Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX D

THE FLORIDA ASPIRING PRINCIPAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT SURVEY
Aspiring Principal Preparation Programs are formal school district programs with the goal of assisting current assistant principals in acquiring the skills necessary to become successful principals. Your information about the Principal Preparation Program in your school district is very important for the objectives of this study. Please feel free to add any comments about the study on the back and return it in the stamped envelope provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTIONS: Please put an X in the box of the answer that applies to your school district.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Does your school district provide an aspiring principal preparation program for current assistant principals? If YES, go to question 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If your district does not provide an aspiring principal preparation program, do your current assistant principals participate in another district’s aspiring principal preparation program? If YES, then please provide the district’s name here:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If your district does not provide an aspiring principal preparation program, do your current assistant principals participate in a consortium provided aspiring principal preparation program? If YES, then please provide the consortium’s name here:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If your district does not provide an aspiring principal preparation program, do your current assistant principals participate in another aspiring principal preparation program provided through another venue? If YES, then please provide the venue’s name here:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Questions 1 - 4 are all answered No, please return the survey now in the stamped envelope provided. To help us gather more specific data about principal preparation programs in Florida, please identify the reasons why your district does not provide a program on any back page. MANY THANKS.

5. Is there a document, brochure, or other printed material about the district’s aspiring principal preparation program? If YES, please include the document in the return envelope.

6. Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to understand the Florida Principal Competencies?

7. Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to document the implementation of the Florida Principal Competencies?

8. Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to understand the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards?

9. Does your principal preparation program require aspiring principals to document the implementation of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards?

162
DIRECTIONS: Please put an X in the box that applies to your district’s aspiring principal preparation program. Are the following components provided or addressed as part of the principal preparation program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Not Included</th>
<th>Do Not Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. A MENTOR PRINCIPAL: a high performing principal assigned or selected to work with the participant in order to provide coaching and guidance on an on-going basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PERFORMANCE-BASED requirements: on-the-job experiences or internships the aspiring principal completes as part of the aspiring principal program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT coursework or in-service opportunities specifically focused upon developing leadership skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. UNDERSTANDING, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. COLLABORATING with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ADVOCATING, nurturing, and sustaining a SCHOOL CULTURE and INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM conducive to student learning and staff professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. INFORMATION SEARCH AND ANALYSIS: the gathering and analysis of data from multiple sources before arriving at an understanding of an event or problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. CONCEPT FORMATION: the ability to see patterns and relationships and form concepts, hypotheses, and ideas from the information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. CONCEPTUAL FLEXIBILITY: the ability to use alternative or multiple concepts or perspectives when solving a problem or making a decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. DELEGATION: entrusting of jobs to be done, beyond routine assignments, to others, giving them authority and responsibility for accomplishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. MANAGING INTERACTION: getting others to work together effectively through the use of group process and facilitator skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. SELF-PRESENTATION: the ability to clearly present one’s ideas to others in an open, informative, and non-evaluative manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION: the ability to write clearly and concisely using good grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ORGANIZATIONAL SENSITIVITY: an awareness of the effects of one’s behavior and decisions on all stakeholders both inside and outside the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. FACILITATING the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a VISION OF LEARNING that is shared and supported by the school community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Not Included</td>
<td>Do Not Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTATION: doing things better/different than before by setting goals that encourage self and others to reach higher standards and results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT CONTROL: the establishment of systematic processes to receive and provide feedback about the progress of work being done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT ORIENTATION: holding high and positive expectations for the growth and development of all stakeholders through modeling self-development, coaching, and providing learning opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY: the know-how (knowledge and skill) to design, plan and organize activities to achieve goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT/PERSUASIVENESS: influencing and having an effect upon the school stakeholders by a variety of means—persuasive argument, setting an example or using expertise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN FOR THE SCHOOL’S REPUTATION: caring about the impressions created by self, the students, the faculty, the staff, and parents, as well as how these impressions are communicated both inside and outside the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICAL ADAPTABILITY: the ability to adapt one’s interaction and behavior to fit the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY: the ability to discover, understand, verbalize accurately, and respond empathetically to the perspectives, thoughts, ideas and feelings of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGING the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective LEARNING ENVIRONMENT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITMENT TO VISION AND MISSION: a pledge to develop and act in accordance with the shared vision, mission, and values of the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTING with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISIVENESS: the readiness and confidence to make or share decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so that actions may be taken and commitments made by self and others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROACTIVE ORIENTATION: the inclination and readiness to initiate action and to accept responsibility for leading and enabling others to improve the circumstances being faced or anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. If your school district does NOT provide a principal preparation program, but your assistant principals participate in a consortium or another districts’ program, please tell me why your district does not provide their own program.

39. What are the areas that need improvement of your principal preparation program?

40. What are the areas of strength of your principal preparation program?

41. Is there anything else you would like to say about your principal preparation program?

Your assistance in providing this information is appreciated. Please return your completed survey in the stamped envelope to:
D. Juusela, 615 Forest Lane, Deland, FL 32724

Position of person completing this instrument: __________________________
ID Code _____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, Staff Development</td>
<td>Alachua County Schools</td>
<td>620 East University Avenue</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Supt. For Instruction &amp; Personnel Services</td>
<td>Baker County Schools</td>
<td>392 South Blvd East</td>
<td>MacClenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Staff Development</td>
<td>Bay County Schools</td>
<td>1311 Balboa Ave.</td>
<td>Panama City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Director</td>
<td>Bradford County Schools</td>
<td>501 W. Washington St.</td>
<td>Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Staff &amp; Professional Development</td>
<td>Brevard County Schools</td>
<td>2700 Judge Fran Jamieson Way</td>
<td>Viera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Leadership Development</td>
<td>Broward County Schools</td>
<td>600 SE 3rd Ave.</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instruction/Curriculum</td>
<td>Calhoun County Schools</td>
<td>20859 Central Ave. E., Rm.G-20</td>
<td>Blountstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Development Academy</td>
<td>Charlotte County Schools</td>
<td>Education Support Services, Murdock Center, 1445 Education Way</td>
<td>Port Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
<td>Citrus County Schools</td>
<td>1007 Main St.</td>
<td>Inverness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of School Improvement/Prof Development</td>
<td>Clay County Schools</td>
<td>900 Walnut St</td>
<td>Green Cove Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMD Training/CTAS/Staff Development</td>
<td>Collier County Schools</td>
<td>5775 Osceola Trail</td>
<td>Naples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of HRMD</td>
<td>Columbia County Schools</td>
<td>372 West Duval St</td>
<td>Lake City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Director, Training &amp; Development</td>
<td>Miami-Dade County Schools</td>
<td>1450 NE 2nd Ave</td>
<td>Miami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director of Support Services</td>
<td>DeSoto County Schools</td>
<td>530 LaSolona Ave.</td>
<td>Arcadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
<td>Dixie County Schools</td>
<td>PO Box 890</td>
<td>Cross City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Supt., Human Resource Services</td>
<td>Duval County Schools</td>
<td>1701 Prudential Dr</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Staff Development</td>
<td>Escambia County Schools</td>
<td>215 W. Garden St.</td>
<td>Pensacola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director of Instruction &amp; Curriculum</td>
<td>Flagler County Schools</td>
<td>POBox 755, Highway 100 East</td>
<td>Bunnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to Director of Administrative Services</td>
<td>Franklin County Schools</td>
<td>155 Ave. E.</td>
<td>Apalachicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant to Assistant Supt.</td>
<td>Gadson County Schools</td>
<td>35 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
<td>Gilchrist County Schools</td>
<td>310 NW 11th Ave</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Curriculum Services</td>
<td>Glades County Schools</td>
<td>400 10th Street, SW (PO Box 459)</td>
<td>Moore Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Human Resources</td>
<td>Gulf County Schools</td>
<td>150 Middle School Rd.</td>
<td>Port St. Jow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Coordinator</td>
<td>Hamilton County Schools</td>
<td>4280 S.W. County Road 152</td>
<td>Jasper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Staff Development</td>
<td>Hardee County Schools</td>
<td>1001-1009 North Sixth Ave PO Box 1678</td>
<td>Wauchula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Human Resources</td>
<td>Hendry County Schools</td>
<td>PO Box 1980, 25 E. Hickpochee Ave</td>
<td>LaBelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Coordinator</td>
<td>Hernando County Schools</td>
<td>991 Varsity Dr.</td>
<td>Brooksville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources/Staff Development Services</td>
<td>Highlands County</td>
<td>426 School St.</td>
<td>Sebring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Staff Development</td>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>901 E. Kennedy Blvd., PO Box 3408</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/6-12 Curriculum Administrator</td>
<td>Holmes County Schools</td>
<td>701 E. Pennsylvania Ave.</td>
<td>Bonifay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Development</td>
<td>Indian River County Schools</td>
<td>1990 25th St</td>
<td>Vero Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of ESE &amp; HRMD</td>
<td>Jackson County Schools</td>
<td>2903 Jefferson St., PO Box 5958</td>
<td>Marianna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Inst. Services &amp; Staff Development</td>
<td>Jefferson County Schools</td>
<td>1490 W. Washington St</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instructional &amp; Personnel Services</td>
<td>Lafayette County Schools</td>
<td>363 NE Crawford St</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, HRMD/Personnel</td>
<td>Lake County Schools</td>
<td>201 W. Burleigh Blvd</td>
<td>Tavares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Staff Development</td>
<td>Lee County Schools</td>
<td>2055 Central Ave</td>
<td>Fort Myers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Staff Development</td>
<td>Leon County Schools</td>
<td>2757 W. Pensacola St.</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, Director of Personnel</td>
<td>Levi County Schools</td>
<td>480 Marshburn Dr, PO Drawer 129</td>
<td>Bronson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to Director of Instruction</td>
<td>Liberty County Schools</td>
<td>PO Box 429</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Human Resources</td>
<td>Madison County Schools</td>
<td>312 NE Duval St</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Development &amp; Training</td>
<td>Manatee County Schools</td>
<td>215 Manatee Ave., W., PO Box 9069</td>
<td>Bradenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director, Staff Development</td>
<td>Marion County Schools</td>
<td>512 SE 3rd St</td>
<td>Ocala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Supt, Leadership Services &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Martin County Schools</td>
<td>500 E. Ocean Blvd.</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Of Human Resources</td>
<td>Monroe County Schools</td>
<td>241 Trumbo Rd., PO Box 1788</td>
<td>Key West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Staff &amp; Program Development</td>
<td>Nassau County Schools</td>
<td>1201 Atlantic Ave.</td>
<td>Fernandina Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director, Staff Development</td>
<td>Okaloosa County Schools</td>
<td>120 Lowery Place, SE</td>
<td>Fort Walton Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Human Resources</td>
<td>Okeechobee County Schools</td>
<td>700 SW 2nd Ave</td>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrator, Leadership Dev &amp; PNPP</td>
<td>Orange County Public Schools</td>
<td>445 W. Amelia St</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Development</td>
<td>Osceola County Schools</td>
<td>817 Bill Beck Blvd.</td>
<td>Kissimmee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Staff Development/HRMD</td>
<td>Palm Beach County Schools</td>
<td>3300 Forest Hill Blvd.</td>
<td>West Palm Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Development</td>
<td>Pasco County Schools</td>
<td>7227 Land O'Lakes Blvd.</td>
<td>Land O'Lakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor, Human Resources (Prof Dev)</td>
<td>Pinellas County Schools</td>
<td>301-4th St. SW, PO Box 2942</td>
<td>Largo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management Development Coordinator</td>
<td>Polk County Schools</td>
<td>1915 South Floral Ave., PO Box 391</td>
<td>Bartow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Human Resources &amp; Staff Development</td>
<td>Putnam County Schools</td>
<td>200 South 7th St.</td>
<td>Palatka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, Staff Development</td>
<td>St. Johns County Schools</td>
<td>40 Orange St.</td>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Staff Development</td>
<td>St. Lucie County Schools</td>
<td>2909 Delaware Ave</td>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Inservice &amp; instructional Technology</td>
<td>Santa Rosa County Schools</td>
<td>Support Complex, 6556 Firehouse Rd.</td>
<td>Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator on Assignment, Leadership Development</td>
<td>Sarasota County Schools</td>
<td>1960 Landings Blvd.</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Professional Development</td>
<td>Seminole County Schools</td>
<td>400 E. Lake Mary Blvd.</td>
<td>Sanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal on Assignment of Human Resource Dev</td>
<td>Sumter County Schools</td>
<td>2680 W. County Rd. 476</td>
<td>Bushnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Human Resources</td>
<td>Suwannee County Schools</td>
<td>702 2nd St, NW</td>
<td>Live Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Personnel/Special Programs</td>
<td>Taylor County Schools</td>
<td>318 N. Clark St.</td>
<td>Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instructional &amp; Personnel Services</td>
<td>Union County Schools</td>
<td>55 SW Sixth St.</td>
<td>Lake Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, Human Resource Assessment &amp; Dev</td>
<td>Volusia County Schools</td>
<td>200 N. Clara Ave., PO Box 2118</td>
<td>Deland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Special Programs</td>
<td>Wakulla County Schools</td>
<td>PO Box 100</td>
<td>Crawfordville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Personnel</td>
<td>Walton County Schools</td>
<td>Tivoli Administrative Complex, 145 Park St.</td>
<td>DeFuniak Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Administrative Services</td>
<td>Washington County Schools</td>
<td>652 Third St.</td>
<td>Chipley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

PRELETTER
Dear Contact Person,

Your help is requested for a study about school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida. Your input is important even if your school district does not provide a principal preparation program because of the need to obtain accurate data about the status of school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida.

Within the week you will be receiving a survey to gather data about your principal preparation program. If you do not provide a principal preparation program or your assistant principals participate in another districts program, consortium, or venue, please provide that information on the survey.

This survey is voluntary and confidential. Study results will be reported only as summaries in which no individual's answers or specifics about a school district’s individual program will be identified. When you return the completed survey, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected to your answers in any way.

Thank you very much in advance for helping with this study about school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida.

As a token of thanks, a copy of the study results will be provided to you after the completion of the study, if requested.

Sincerely,

Debbie Juusela, M.Ed.
University of Central Florida Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX G

THANK YOU/REMINDER LETTER
Dear Contact Person:

About a week ago we sent you a survey about the status of principal preparation programs in Florida school districts. I am asking principal preparation program coordinators about the basis of the program components. As of today, I have not received a completed survey from you. I realize this is a busy time of year as the third quarter is just beginning. However, I have contacted you and others now in hopes of obtaining the insights only principal preparation program coordinators like you can provide, and which will benefit all program coordinators across the nation. As I mentioned before, all answers all confidential and will be combined with others before providing results. In case the previous questionnaire has been misplaced, I have included it again.

Your input is important because of the need to obtain accurate data about the school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida. If you feel that the survey form does not provide adequate space for comments, feel free to attach an additional page. Please take the time to fill out the enclosed survey and return it by (insert date).

This survey is voluntary and confidential. Study results will be reported only as summaries in which no individual’s answers or specifics about a school district’s individual program will be identified. When you return the completed survey, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected to your answers in any way.

Thank you very much in advance for helping with this study about school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida.

As a token of thanks, a copy of the study results will be provided to you after the completion of the study, if requested.

Sincerely,

Debbie Juusela, M.Ed.

University of Central Florida Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX H

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

CONSENT LETTER
January 28, 2004

Deborah L. Juusela  
615 Forest Lane  
DeLand, FL 32724

Dear Ms. Juusela:

With reference to your protocol entitled, "An Analysis of the Aspiring Principal Preparation Programs Provided by Florida School Districts," I am enclosing for your records the approved, executed document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office.

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur. Further, should there be a need to extend this protocol, a renewal form must be submitted for approval at least one month prior to the anniversary date of the most recent approval and is the responsibility of the investigator (UCF).

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

[Signature]

Chris Grayson  
Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Copies: Rose Taylor  
IRB File

12443 Research Parkway • Suite 207 • Orlando, FL 32826-3252 • 407-823-3778 • Fax 407-823-3299
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APPENDIX I

STANDARDS FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERS DRAFT OF PROPOSED

PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS AS OF JUNE 30, 2003
Vision – High Performing Leaders have a personal vision for their school and the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop, articulate and implement a shared vision that is supported by the larger organization and the school community.

Instructional Leadership – High Performing Leaders promote a positive learning culture, provide an effective instructional program, and apply best practices to student learning, especially in the area of reading and other foundational skills.

Managing the Learning Environment – High Performing Leaders manage the organization, operations, facilities and resources in ways that maximize the use of resources in an instructional organization and promote a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Community and Stakeholder Partnerships – High Performing Leaders collaborate with families, business, and community members, respond to diverse community interests and needs, work effectively within the larger organization and mobilize community resources.

Decision Making Strategies – High Performing Leaders plan effectively, use critical thinking and problem solving techniques, and collect and analyze data for continuous school improvement.

Diversity – High Performing Leaders understand, respond to, influence the personal, political, social, economic, legal, and cultural relationships in the classroom, the school and the local community.

Technology – High Performing Leaders plan and implement the integration of technological and electronic tools in teaching, learning, management, research, and communication responsibilities.
Learning, Accountability, and Assessment – High Performing Leaders monitor the success of all students in the learning environment, align the curriculum, instruction, and assessment processes to promote effective student performance, and use a variety of benchmarks, learning expectations, and feedback measures to ensure accountability for all participants engaged in the educational process.

Human Resources Development – High Performing Leaders recruit and select effective personnel, develop mentor and partnership programs, and design and implement comprehensive professional growth plans for all staff – paid and volunteer.

Ethical Leadership – High Performing Leaders act with integrity, fairness, and honesty in an ethical manner.
APPENDIX J

FINAL REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE
March 30, 2004
Debbie Juusela
615 Forest Lane
DeLand, FL 32724

Contact Person
Any District
Anytown, Florida, Zip

Dear Contact Person:

About two weeks ago we sent you a survey about the status of principal preparation programs in Florida school districts. This is the final request for your school district to participate in the study. I am asking principal preparation program coordinators about the basis of the program components. As of today, I have not received a completed survey from you. I realize this is a busy time of year as the third quarter is just beginning. However, I have contacted you and others now in hopes of obtaining the insights only principal preparation program coordinators like you can provide, and which will benefit all program coordinators across the nation. As I mentioned before, all answers are confidential and will be combined with others before providing results. In case the previous questionnaire has been misplaced, I have included it again.

Your input is important because of the need to obtain accurate data about the school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida. If you feel that the survey form does not provide adequate space for comments, feel free to attach an additional page. Please take the time to fill out the enclosed survey and return it by (insert date).

This survey is voluntary and confidential. Study results will be reported only as summaries in which no individual’s answers or specifics about a school district’s individual program will be identified. When you return the completed survey, your name will be deleted from the mailing list and never connected to your answers in any way.

Thank you very much in advance for helping with this study about school district aspiring principal preparation programs in the state of Florida.

As a token of thanks, a copy of the study results will be provided to you after the completion of the study, if requested.

Sincerely,

Debbie Juusela, M.Ed.
University of Central Florida Doctoral Candidate
APPENDIX K

SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH ASPIRING PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAM

INFORMATION ON WEBSITE
Alachua
Broward
Escambia
Hillsborough
Leon
Marion
Miami-Dade
Okaloosa
Osceola
Palm Beach
Pinellas
Saint John’s
Santa Rosa
Seminole
Volusia
APPENDIX L

VARIABLE DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY

ITEM RESPONSES FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE PILOT GROUP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Survey Answer DNK</th>
<th>Survey Answer Yes</th>
<th>Survey Answer No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56.21</td>
<td>40.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DNK = do not know
APPENDIX M

VARIABLE DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE
SURVEY ITEM RESPONSES FOR THE EDUCATIONAL LEADERS PILOT GROUP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Survey Answer DNK</th>
<th>Survey Answer Yes</th>
<th>Survey Answer No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>31.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DNK = do not know
The responses are listed verbatim and organized by school district size.

Very Large Districts = 100,000+ students; Large Districts = 40,000+ to 100,000; Medium Districts = 20,000+ to 40,000; Medium/Small Districts = 7,000+ to 20,000; Small Districts = Under 7,000.

Q38. If your school district does not provide a principal preparation program, but your assistant principals participate in a consortium or another districts’ program, please tell me why your district does not provide their own program?

Medium/Small Districts
We have our own – see attached HRMD booklet.
We have our own program based upon the needs of our district.

Small Districts
We do not have a formal program. We are the smallest school district in the state with one elementary school and one middle/high school. We only have one assistant principal; therefore, we can tailor a program to his individual needs.
We do not offer a HRMD preparation program for aspiring principals anymore. We have no pool of assistant principals.
We are a small district with a very small pool of assistant principals. It is not cost effective to provide a HRMD program. Too expensive. In-house training only.

Q39. What are the areas that need improvement of your principal preparation program?

Very Large Districts
We plan to add this next year – Data Analysis. We can analyze data, but then what? We need to include not only what the data means, but next steps.
We need to add a post assessment.

Large Districts
Update to new standards that state is developing.
More professional development opportunities.
We are currently working with the old Florida Principal Competencies. The new competencies need to be included, particularly technology.
More time for AP’s [Assistant Principals] to attend workshops and visit other schools within the district and other schools in other Florida school districts.

Medium Sized District
We have gone through a number of iterations regarding leadership development in our district. We have evolved to a Leadership Academy that we are comfortable with.

Currently AP’s [Assistant Principals] are selected by principals. They are not placed with high performing ones as part of their Preparing New Principals Program. They also select who is on their support team. Those selected aren’t always the best role models.

Better mentoring & career shadowing.

We are revising our program for 04 - 05 implementation:
- Transition team for first 90 days – all new principals
- Orientation & formal mentoring/coaching
- Utilization of retired mentors

Individualized Leader Learning plan with complementary portfolio using competencies, ISLLC [Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium] standards & Sterling criteria

We continuously survey and ask for feedback on the types of training, study groups, etc. that we provide.

Re-align with new “Leadership Standards” from DOE [Department of Education]. True “intern” experiences.

Experience of those eligible to work on certification. We have many who are retirement age and many who are very young, but lack the middle ground.

The method to determine which candidates are suitable for becoming a school leader needs to me more objective and relevant to today’s school cultures and complexities.

Real, applicable learning rather than theory. Stringent entrance & exit requirements.

Medium/Small Districts

It would be beneficial to be able to establish a mentoring system.

More time for training and “on-the-job” experiences.

More funding for continued training/ in-service.

The program needs to be updated. We will probably do so after the Florida Competencies are formally adopted.

Frequency of training offered.

We need to know more about the ISLLC [Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium] standards.

Currently, mentor principals are under a tremendous amount of pressure to perform (accountability). They are sometimes reluctant to let an aspiring principal handle high stakes responsibilities.

The mentor principal may not always be a high performing administrator. More time for direct coaching is needed.

Small Districts
The district has been waiting three years for direction from the DOE regarding revised standards for “Principal” certification. At that point in time we will revise our plan/procedures to meet requirements.

Stronger emphasis on effective instructional practices and leadership for instructional improvement; including literacy instruction.

Need to provide an internship program whereby this is the participant’s only assignment. Budget constraints will not allow.

Internships for instructional personnel in administrative pool are not provided due to budget constraints.

I think our program perhaps needs a little strengthening in the area of personnel evaluations.

More screening for the applicants that are high performers, lots of time is wasted on candidates who never will be educational leaders.

Q40. What are the strengths of your principal preparation program?

Very Large Districts

We have a very comprehensive preparing new principals program that takes 2-3 years to complete. It includes extensive training, documentation of principal competencies, job shadowing, sharing sessions, and a mandatory 8-week internship.

Auditing of the 19 state competencies and feedback within the first 6 months.

Job-embedded with professional development throughout the 2-year program. The program is endorsed by our principals, which also helps!

Large Districts

In-service program. Documentation of work as an AP [Assistant Principal].

Tiered approach, leadership participation, 2-year in-depth program, and professional development team.

One on one mentoring.

The Internship – with both a Supervising Principal (mentor) and a Clinical Supervisor. The CS meets with the Intern monthly and with the Supervising Principal at least twice a year, more often if needed.

Medium Sized Districts

Practical applications supplement philosophical exercises. The program was designed and is operated by three former principals - all who were awarded the Commissioners Award for Outstanding Leadership.

Facilitative Leadership and Professional Enhancement Program are two new professional development components that have been added. Participants find these very beneficial.

Documentation of the principal competencies.
The flexibility of the process whereby an intern can choose to fast track or spend two years in the process. The offering of the Principal Enhancement Program (PEP).

Strong role models; On-going professional development; job-embedded learning experiences such as book study groups; critical friend teams; classroom walk-through training; & district monthly presentations.

Collegial community; exposure to key district staff; building knowledge of system capacity to support school-based initiatives.

The assessment center.

Retired mentors as well as supervising principal mentors. Regular opportunities for participants to interact among themselves and with school and district administrators. A final portfolio conference with the Superintendent before completion is finalized.

Small group mentoring & coaching. Strength development & coaching.

Mentoring.

Medium/Small Districts

Our district is small enough to be able to maintain personal contact with all participants.

Training programs. Principal support. District support.

Mentor program. Internship program.

On the job – real life experience.

Each participant’s plan is tailored to his or her needs.

The smallness of the district allows for more one-on-one.

Support team.

Training.

Having the assistant principals document all one hundred fifty-seven of the items listed in the Function/Task Analysis requires that they become involved in all aspects of running a school.

Small Districts

Addition of an internship for persons aspiring to Administrative positions specifically school level positions – but who are still instructional. For quite a long period there was little to no movement in the AP rank of our small district. This has changed during the last two years.

Provides tools for self-assessment and requires hands-on application level learning activities; opportunities for choice in training for individual needs.

Training components provided by the Panhandle Management Development Network are excellent.
Mentor relationship that is provided.

I feel that our program adequately prepares AP’s [Assistant Principals] to assume the challenges of the principalship.

Mentoring by great role models is definitely the key.

Mentoring by a support team of three educational leaders. Shadowing high performing principals in another district for two weeks. Must serve as the intern principal for 25 days at the site that they are AP. While the principal is assigned to a different site.

Q41. Is there anything else you would like to say about your principal preparation program?

Very Large Districts

All documentation of plans must focus on being an instructional leader. I’ve included some info that will be up on our website. All PNPP [Preparing New Principals Program] candidates receive a CD with information and forms at the orientation.

Information is on our website.

Large Districts

It is excellent and has produced outstanding AP’s [Assistant Principals] and Principals.

District still uses assessment center (for principal competencies) that lends objective approach to selection.

Our program has three phases. Phases 1 & 2 are for all interested employees who have Ed Leadership & have passed the FELE [Florida Educational Leadership Exam]. Not all have the qualities needed to go on to the Internship. We have a strong partnership with the University of West Florida Ed Leadership Dept.

Medium Sized Districts

Our program combines an “on-line” component (ASAP – Annenberg), which aligns with our district-wide strategic plan.

Still molding – changing as new ideas and leadership emerge. We do Gallup Strength Training in our district. These themes [competencies] are all present. Our checklist for documentation is based upon these [Florida Principal Competencies and ISLLC [Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards].

All of these [Florida Principal Competencies] are touched on with various class sessions and portfolio documentation.

It’s a mirror image of Hillsborough’s. The needs of this district are different so we’re modifying the program. The brochure is being redesigned currently to include ISLLC [Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium] standards.

Our district is currently revising & enhancing our principal preparation program under Bank of America Center for Leadership. The PPP [Principal Preparation Program] document is currently being revised and the new revisions
will include the ISLLC [Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium] standards. A portfolio for documentation is in development.

The process has a group of on-the-job experiences, which must be documented. This assures that the participants gain the insight and practice with the functions of a school administrator.

Medium/Small Districts

We have maintained the old program mandated under the Florida Council on Education Management – old F.S. 231.087 & 231.0861. We have modified as required by new legislation.


The program is directed toward the assistant principal completing the requirements for School Principal Certification.

Small Districts

I think the “old” PN/DN networks & HRMD plans and the support given to Principal’s (Leadership Training) at the state level through funding & personnel was very valuable. As a small rural district the networks formed and cooperative support shared by districts enabled us to have HRMD plans & Principal Assessment Centers.

I have just recently taken over this phase of the training. The manual is also in floppy format.

Our HRMD program targets candidates with MS degrees who are seeking Administrative (AP & Prin) positions, not those who are AP’s seeking principal positions.

Even though we have a HRMD program, presently there are no assistant principals in the pool.

Our district plan has been developed in cooperation with the PMDN plan that has been developed with many North Florida Districts.

You need to have some educational background of working in a school setting before you consider educational leadership.
APPENDIX O

ITEM IMPROVEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONTENT EXPERTS
Directions for Piloting the Survey

You are being asked to give your comments and suggestions on a survey that will be sent to the coordinators of the principal preparation programs in each of the Florida school districts. Studies show that a formal, systematic review is best. I am interested in item improvement to the selected response (yes/no/do not know) and constructed-response (short answer) items. The quality of the field test data is dependent on a) the similarity of the field test to the actual respondents and b) the seriousness with which the field test students respond to the field test items (Popham, 2000, p. 328).

Please complete the survey and return it to the administrator.

With the new survey handed out to you, please answer the following questions:

Item Improvement Questionnaire For Content Experts

Is the item congruent with its assessment domain?

Are there violations of standard item-writing guidelines?

Is the content of the item accurate?

Is the item ethnically, socio-economically, or otherwise biased (Popham, 2000, p. 316)?
Directions for Piloting the Survey

You are being asked to give your comments and suggestions on a survey that will be sent to the coordinators of the principal preparation programs in each of the Florida school districts. Studies show that a formal, systematic review is best. I am interested in item improvement to the selected response (yes/no/do not know) and constructed-response (short answer) items. The quality of the field test data is dependent on a) the similarity of the field test students to the actual students and b) the seriousness with which the field test students respond to the field test items (Popham, 2000, p. 328).

Please complete the survey and return it to the administrator.

With the new survey handed out to you, please answer the following questions:

Item Improvement Questionnaire For Students

If any of the items seemed confusing, which ones were they?

Did you think any items had more than one correct answer? If so, which ones?

Did you think any items had no correct answers? If so, which ones?

Were there words in any items that confused you? If so, which ones?

Were the directions for the survey, or for particular subsections of the survey, unclear? If so, which ones (Popham, 2000, p. 318)?
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