Journal of Scholarship & Practice

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

BROUGHT TO YOU AS AN AASA MEMBER SERVICE

Stand Up

Research and Best Practices That Advance the Profession of Educational Administration

Spring 2006 / Volume 3, No. 1

Table of Contents

American Association of School Administrators, 801 N Quincy St., #700, Arlington, VA 22203; 703-875-0748; membership@aasa.org.

A Message From the Editor

Frederick L. Dembowski
Southeastern Louisiana University

In the first research article, Kristine A. Servais examines the critical role of evaluation in leadership, teaching, and learning in an era of educational accountability. The purpose of Servais' study, *Transformational Leadership: Development and Performance Assessment,* was to identify means to assess leadership development and performance. Although leadership development and performance can be assessed, school systems often lack consistent methods, frameworks, or efforts to evaluate leaders. This study identified three school administrators and examined assessments that were used to measure leadership development and performance. Transformational leadership and the leadership standards were provided as frameworks to define criteria for personal and professional performance assessment. Evidence of leadership development and performance was examined and collected by each of the school leaders. Among the implications of the study is the importance of leaders being provided with clear and defined criteria to improve performance that will inevitably impact student achievement.

In the second research article, Judith C. Houle and Priscilla C. Gimas discuss how reports of unethical and illegal practices among school and district leaders have been on the increase, suggesting that faculty of administrator preparation programs may want to examine the role of ethics in their programs. Houle and Gimas conducted a case study on two New England, NCATE accredited, state universities to determine how faculty and students perceive that the ethical dimensions of integrity, fairness, ethical behavior, knowledge of self and self-efficacy were taught and learned in their programs. The findings from this case study indicated strong emphases on integrity, fairness, and ethical behavior, and lesser attention to knowledge of self and self-efficacy. This article concludes with implications and recommendations for future research.

In the third article, Michael B. Brown, Larry M. Bolen, Casey L. Lassiter, and Melva M. Burke shed new light on the effectiveness of first year teachers who entered the profession from another field, or lateral entry (LE) teachers, versus the teachers who were traditionally prepared (TP) in an education program. Principals from 187 elementary, middle, and high schools in North Carolina rated both LE and TP teachers using the *Revised Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument* (RTPAI). The RTPAI consists of 28 questions in five concentrated area: management of instructional time, management of student behavior, instructional presentation, instructional monitoring, and instructional feedback. The results of the study found LE teachers' mean to be inadequate performance, whereas the TP teachers' mean ratings indicated marginal adequacy in the five areas. The authors discuss the implications of these findings and make suggestions for principals of first year teachers that have entered the profession from another field.

In the fourth research article, Christopher H. Tienken and Charles M. Achilles investigate the influence of small class sizes on middle school students' writing achievement. The authors conducted a study on 300 students enrolled in a public middle school (grades 6-8) during the 2001-2004 school years. Students remained in reduced class sizes of 12-21 pupils in math and language arts for a period of three years. Results on the district's "in-house" narrative writing picture prompt assessments and the state's Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA) each year produced positive findings.

Achievement differences were significantly higher, student participation in basic skills programs was reduced by 46%, and the year-end rate of failing students decreased to 1% of the total school population. Tienken and Achilles conclude with providing tips for administrators to reduce class size with little or no extra cost through restructuring of the existing school schedule and reassignment of staff through the elimination of costly, remedial pull-out programs.

In the last research article, Anita M. Varrati, Autumn K. Tooms, and Stephen B. Thomas address the question, "Is the new NCATE review process a help, a hindrance, or just another bureaucratic hoop for universities to jump through to achieve accreditation?" Whatever the initial perceptions, the authors contend that the new NCATE does force educational leadership preparation faculties to ask the difficult questions concerning program quality, effectiveness, and application to PreK-12 school administration. Recent criticism has prompted many educational leadership faculties to examine the efficacy of their programs. Varrati, Tooms, and Thomas espouse that NCATE may provide the critical lens to do just that.

In an article on best practices, Mack T. Hines explores the use of the ELCC Standards and Malcolm Knowles' adult learning theory to develop principal preparation students' confidence to serve as school leaders. The participants completed a four-phase program in the researcher's Role of the Principal class. Each phase was built on the ELCC Standards and Malcolm Knowles' adult learning theory. The results from the case study indicated that the students were able to use the program to develop confidence to become school leaders. Their responses to the qualitative questionnaire highlighted their uses of the ELCC Standards and Malcolm Knowles' adult learning theory to achieve this goal.

In a commentary by Bronte H. Reynolds, a colorful analogy about a doctor who tested out of going to medical school is used to compare the standards of the medical profession to the standards of educational administration. Reynolds asserts that leading is a learned behavior much like performing surgery is a learned skill; both require rigorous instruction in the classroom and guided experience in the field. Reynolds discusses California's recent decision to allow teachers who have not taken any courses in educational leadership to be granted administrative credentials merely by passing an examination. Reynolds calls for the aid of the AASA and its members to eschew such a process and continue to work toward dignifying the role of the school administrator.

Finally in a review of the book *How about it, Writer?* by H. Charles Romesburg, Ann K. Nauman states that although the author claims that the book can be used by authors of essays and speeches, the book is well-served for use in a creative writing class. Nauman discusses features of the book that could be improved upon such as navigation and use of citations.

Enjoy!

Published by the
American Association of School Administrators
801 North Quincy St., Suite 700
Arlington, VA 22203

Available at www.aasa.org/publications

Transformational Leadership: Development and Performance Assessment

Kristine A. Servais, EdD
Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership
Department of Education
North Central College
Naperville, IL

Introduction

Leadership is about transformation. It is the opportunity to transform people, places, and possibilities. The purpose of the study reported here, *Transformational Leadership: Development and Performance Assessment*, was to identify means to assess leadership development and performance. Although leadership development and performance can be assessed, school systems often lack consistent methods, frameworks, or efforts to evaluate leaders. This study identified three school administrators and examined assessments that were used to measure leadership development and performance.

In an era of educational accountability, leadership evaluation is critical for individual leadership development as well as its impact on teaching and learning. Recent studies provide compelling evidence of the impact of leadership on student achievement (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Leaders are in a position to assess organizational performance, student achievement, as well as their own performance. "The fundamental purpose of leadership evaluation is the improvement of teaching and learning through building the knowledge and skills of current and prospective educational leaders" (Reeves, 2004a, p. 16). However, the results of studies in leadership assessment reveal that leadership evaluation is random and ambiguous (Reeves, 2004a). School leaders frequently indicate that evaluation of job performance is rare and typically, if it does occur, takes place once a year with little or no formative measurement. While schools have greatly increased assessment and accountability for students (Marzano, 2003), the work of Reeves (2004b) indicates large gaps in the evaluation of leadership performance. Relative to this gap in leadership evaluation is that without a means to measure and assess effective leadership, leadership development is likely to be random, aimless, and idiosyncratic.

Purpose of the Study

This study examined the development and performance assessment of three school leaders. A case study approach was used with three different types of school leaders: a superintendent, an elementary school principal, and a middle school leadership intern candidate. The superintendent, for the past five years, served in a large rural school district with approximately 4,500 students. The second year elementary principal was an administrator of a K-5 school of 450 students. The third participant in the study was a middle school intern in a suburban district with a student enrollment of 950 students. This leader was a teacher provided with a one year internship by his district to practice and experience school administration while completing his leadership certification.

Each participant of the study was asked to identify evidence of leadership development and job performance assessment over the course of a year. The researcher provided opportunities to dialogue, reflect, and interact with each leader in their school environment during this period of time. The use of portraiture, a genre associated with Lawrence-Lightfoot (1983), was selected since it allows for the researcher to interact and dialogue with each of the participants. Portraiture utilizes the metaphor of the researcher as an artist who attempts to collaboratively paint a portrait of each of the subjects.

Transformational leadership was chosen as the framework of this study as a form of collaborative leadership based on six primary dimensions: creating a shared vision, modeling best practices, setting high expectations for performance, utilizing shared decision-making, providing individual support, and developing an intellectually stimulating environment (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). "Transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus has a transforming effect on both." (Burns, 1978, p.20) Each of the three educational leaders identified themselves as transformational leaders when provided with the framework of six dimensions and a common definition: The goal of transformational leadership is to build relationships with a mutual focus on the commitments and capacities of the organizational members (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999).

The researcher and each participant jointly designed a plan to examine leadership development and performance assessment. Leadership development and performance has been compared metaphorically to fitness (Servais & Sanders, 2006). Much like a fitness program, leaders look for methods to identify strengths and weaknesses, and consequently, ways to improve and measure performance. Each participant was encouraged to identify ways leadership could be measured and assessed. A leadership fitness profile using performance assessments selected by each leader was developed as a result of the study.

Data Collection.

Sources of data for this study were researcher site observations, field notes, interviews, and leadership performance assessments. The participants were observed and interviewed in their educational settings. Each participant identified formal and informal artifacts to create a performance profile according to their position and experience. The researcher maintained field notes of observations and conversations throughout this process. The researcher also fulfilled the role of a collegial coach as each leader shared reflections and understandings of their own leadership development.

Evidence of leadership development and performance was identified and collected by each of the school leaders. Evidence identified by the superintendent included a formal evaluation from the Board of Education, informal feedback from the administrative team and community groups, and a professional portfolio of artifacts and reflections. Prevalent in the leadership evidence identified for this superintendent was informal and interactive feedback. Feedback included personal letters, local newspaper articles, and daily conversations with parents, town officials, and community members. Weekly administrative team meetings were designed to be collaborative and fostered positive interaction between the superintendent and his administrative team. A significant source of self assessment became the development of a professional portfolio. This portfolio was created as a result of conversations between this leader and the researcher using the transformational leadership framework.

The elementary principal provided a diverse range of leadership artifacts reflective of a building level administrator. Evidence of this leader's performance included professional goals, a school and professional portfolio, extensive self-reflections, and informal feedback from staff and parents. Although a formal job performance evaluation of the principal was not conducted, a conference with the superintendent to review building goals was held at the conclusion of the year.

The elementary school leader related well to the framework of transformational leadership and established professional goals for the year using this framework. A professional leadership portfolio had been developed upon completion of an administrative leadership program and was also a source of continued evidence of leadership development. A daily reflective journal was maintained as a form of self-assessment. This journal included accomplishments, challenges, and lessons learned. Informal feedback included anecdotal events and feedback from staff and parents. This feedback, however, was typically problem-oriented, random, and reflected the perceptions of the individual teacher or parent involved. This leader had a strong desire to demonstrate high level performance and sought out as many ways as possible to determine evidence of leadership growth and achievement. An informal mentoring experience developed as a result of the researcher's role as a coach and allowed for another opportunity in reflective feedback.

The middle school principal intern identified a range of leadership evidence and assessments. These included a portfolio initiated in his educational administration program, a formal district evaluation, informal feedback from staff and parents, a mentoring peer group, and the utilization of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC, 1996) leadership standards. A professional portfolio based on the ISLLC leadership standards was developed at the conclusion of a graduate program for educational administration and provided a comprehensive framework to assess leadership. The standards served as a transition to identifying evidence of leadership development and performance in the first year of a leadership position.

The intern demonstrated a high desire for interaction in the school environment and, as a result, experienced a great deal of informal feedback from teachers. Like the elementary principal, this feedback was primarily problem-based and limited to the viewpoint of each teacher. This school leader received strong support and informal mentoring from the middle school principal. The intern also participated in an informal mentoring group of graduates from the same leadership program. This group met four times during the year and provided support and feedback for one another. A formal job performance evaluation of the intern was not conducted at the conclusion of the year.

Each of the three leaders developed a leadership profile as a result of identifying evidence of leadership development and job performance during the study. The desire to utilize a framework such as transformational leadership and the ISLLC standards resonated with all three leaders. The intern and elementary principal, recent graduates of standards-based administrative programs utilized the leadership standards as a means to identify artifacts of job performance for a professional portfolio. Opportunities to reflect and dialogue with the researcher served as a platform for self-assessment.

Outcomes of the Study

Three outcomes were identified as a result of this study. Although size limitations exist with a case study approach, the subjects represented three diverse leadership roles, experiences, and demographics. The most evident outcome from the study of leadership development and performance was the lack of formal job assessments. Only one of the three administrators, the superintendent, was formally evaluated. Unfortunately, while the superintendent received high scores numerically for each performance area, individual school board members provided personal criticism that was inconsistent with this evaluation.

A second finding of this study was the lack of performance criteria identified for each leader. The middle school intern and second year school leader found themselves challenged by daily roles and responsibilities that were not formally identified or assessed as performance expectations. While the superintendent was provided with a formal job description, most of the daily job expectations were unpredictable and undefined. The summative job evaluation did not take into account the many challenges for this superintendent of a rapidly growing district, restricted funding, redistricting boundary lines, and many other emerging issues.

A third outcome of the study was the strong personal desire by leaders to identify and measure his or her leadership development and performance. Although the school leaders often had no criteria or evidence to measure leadership performance, each attempted to employ a range of informal methods. Methods such as journaling, reviewing staff feedback, conversing with parents and teachers, and developing artifacts were used. The two building level administrators considered the ISLLC leadership standards as criteria for performance assessment as a result of recent experiences in educational leadership graduate programs.

In summary, the study of three transformational leaders reflected a lack of formal performance criteria or assessments to measure leadership. Evident among these leaders was a personal desire to identify, develop, and assess leadership performance. The leadership standards and transformational leadership framework were a means to define criteria for personal and professional performance assessment.

Implications

A major implication of this study on transformational leadership development and performance assessment is the need to provide leaders with clear performance criteria and assessment. The development and assessment of leadership performance is an essential process that will require greater consideration and commitment from a variety of constituencies. These include educational leadership programs, state education boards, district school boards, and professional leadership organizations. Presently, the ISLLC leadership standards provide a consistent and comprehensive means for leadership development in many educational leadership programs. The leadership standards are a framework that could be used to transition leadership candidates from the educational administrative classroom to the field as educational leaders. Such a framework would provide leaders with performance criteria, common language, and leadership assessment.

A second implication is the need for a standardized instrument in which performance can be formatively and summatively assessed. The leadership standards could be compared to a fitness measure in which the standards represent general areas of fitness. The indicators provide specific goals and activities from which these leadership areas can be demonstrated and measured for individual and organizational leadership performance. An instrument using consistent performance criteria in a continuous cycle of assessment could provide meaningful data for the development of individual, team, and school leadership.

A third implication is the benefit of mentoring and reflection in leadership development and assessment. When participants dialogue with a colleague and reflect on their own performance, leadership development can be enhanced. Mentoring and collegial coaching should be further explored for school administrators as a means to enhance reflective practice for leaders.

Finally, the ultimate reason to improve the development and assessment of leadership is the impact leaders have on student achievement. Leaders must be provided with clear and defined criteria to improve performance in a role that will inevitably impact the primary purpose of schools, student achievement.

Author Biography

Dr. Kristine A. Servais is an assistant professor of educational leadership at North Central College in Naperville, Illinois. She was previously the director of field placements for elementary education pre-service teachers at Northern Illinois University and principal of Bay View Middle School, recognized as a National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence. In addition to teaching and preparing school leaders for the role of principals, Dr. Servais has designed and implemented a North Central Leadership Academy for Educators that has provided leadership workshops for more than 200 teachers and leaders over the past two years. Through a grant provided by the Associated Colleges of Illinois, Dr. Servais will be training principals in high-needs schools, including the Chicago school district, in 2006-07. Dr. Servais has been active as a state and national presenter for the National Middle School Association, American Association of School Administrators, International Principal's Center, and National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Presentations and research include transformational and collaborative leadership. Her most recent publication is a co-authored leadership book entitled *The Courage to Lead: Choosing the Road Less Traveled*.

References

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Interstate School Leaders' Licensure Consortium. (1996). Standards for school leaders. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (1983). *The good high school: Portraits of character and culture*. New York: Basic Books.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

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

Reeves, D. (2004a). *Assessing Educational Leaders: Evaluating performance for improved individual and organizational results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Reeves, D. (2004b). Evaluating administrators. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 52-59.

Servais, K., & Sanders, K. (2006). *The Courage to Lead: Choosing the Road Less Traveled.* In press, Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

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

Building Capacity for Ethical Leadership in Graduate Educational Leadership Preparation Programs

Judith C. Houle, EdD
Assistant Professor
University of Hartford
Department of Educational Leadership
West Hartford, CT

Priscilla C. Gimas, EdD
Principal
Hellenic American Academy
Lowell, MA

Introduction

The September 2004 issue of *The School Administrator* brought attention to ethics as crucial to the work of educational leaders. Pardini (2004) noted the following incidents regarding unethical/illegal actions on the part of superintendents from across the country:

- a superintendent accused of embezzling more than $1,000,000 from his district;
- a superintendent convicted for theft of a school district vehicle;
- a superintendent convicted for embellishing his salary by over $40,000 annually;
- a superintendent arrested for indecency; and
- a superintendent facing the loss of certification for using district computers to disseminate pornography.

Pardini also listed other incidents of unethical/illegal actions involving school leaders that surfaced in 2004. These incidents and many others involving superintendents, principals, and school board members are indicative of a larger societal problem. Unethical practices by governmental officials, business leaders, and church leaders have permeated the media in recent years.

Ethics Defined

Attention to ethics by educational professional organizations and state governments has increased over the past few years in response to this growing problem. Numerous organizations—American Association of School Administrators (AASA, 1993), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 1976), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 2001), and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) through membership on the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA, 2002)—have articulated a variety of ethical behaviors expected of educational leaders. Many states have also published codes of ethics for educational leaders. The ethical expectations for educational leaders include the common themes of respecting the rights of others, maintaining confidentiality and impartiality, interacting honestly, displaying sensitivity to ethnic/cultural diversity, employing ethical considerations when working with constituents, and making decisions based on legal and objective principles (NPBEA, 2002).

The study specifically examined five ethical dimensions for educational leaders through a set of topics defined by the NPBEA (2002) and Kouzes and Posner (2002):

- integrity
    - respecting the rights of others
    - maintaining confidentiality
    - interacting honestly
- fairness
    - maintaining impartiality
    - displaying sensitivity to diversity
    - employing ethical considerations
- ethical behavior
    - making decisions in compliance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations
    - making objective decisions
- knowledge of self
    - developing personal values and beliefs
    - recognizing strengths and weaknesses
- self-efficacy
    - accepting consequences for upholding principles
    - accepting consequences for actions

A premise underlying this study was that ethical standards alone are insufficient for effective leadership and therefore, knowledge of self is imperative in the development of leadership. The knowledge of self provides an individual with the intrinsic motive to act ethically and to uphold ethical standards. To achieve this, an individual must be able to reflect on one's personal convictions, strengths, and weaknesses (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). This knowledge of self is the vehicle for leaders to be able to accept the consequences of his or her decisions and actions, defined by Kouzes and Posner (2002) as self-efficacy.

Ethics in Educational Leader Preparation Programs

This attention to ethics for educational leaders has prompted researchers to look at how graduate programs prepare leaders for the ethical dilemmas they may face in practice. Beck and Murphy (1994) conducted a study to determine how University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) affiliates addressed ethics in their programs. Surveys were sent to the chairs of the 50 member programs in 1992. Forty-two program chairs completed the surveys. Beck and Murphy (1994) also reviewed syllabi from 17 of these programs. Their study indicated an increase in concentration on these issues from the an earlier study conducted by Farquhar (as cited in Beck & Murphy). However, only 9.5% of the institutions reported providing a great deal of learning opportunities designed to build aspiring leaders' capacity for ethical practice.

Upon review of the study results, there seemed to be a lack of consistency regarding the definition of ethics at each of the institutions. Pardini (2004) interviewed Beck regarding the definition of ethics and its implication in practice. Beck noted "a distinction between principle- or problem-focused ethics and narrative ethics" (p. 12). Principle/problem-focused ethics are embedded in ethical behaviors espoused by professional organizations and state codes designed to give guidance to leaders making difficult judgments. However, Beck defined narrative ethics as "…one's orientation toward life" (p. 12). In this context, educational leaders must make decisions based on knowledge of self and self-efficacy (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

The ability to rely on one's knowledge of self as a means to develop self-efficacy requires educational leaders to spend time engaged in self-reflection. Beck and Murphy (1994) noted reflection on personal beliefs and resulting actions as a trend in leadership preparation programs. Teaching strategies indicated by analyses of course syllabi included writing assignments designed to assist students' self-reflection and use of case studies designed to engage students in ethical dilemmas based on a particular policy or practice. The case studies were intended to build students' problem-solving skills and knowledge of ethical theories. Kraus (1996) noted the importance of the role of reflection in educational leadership preparation programs. Kraus found that reflection, through journaling, dialogue, portfolios, and the development of educational platforms, was critical to the development of aspiring leaders' problem-solving skills. A 2003 study of faculty and students in two NCATE-accredited New England universities sought to understand the kinds of learning opportunities the respondents perceived helped them build the capacity for ethical practice as defined by the NPBEA (2002), and the role of reflection in developing knowledge of self and self-efficacy, as defined by Kouzes and Posner (2002), as the basis for ethical practice.

Design of the Study

A study was conducted of these two educational leadership programs, using surveys and interviews of both faculty and students designed by the researchers. Only full-time educational leadership faculty was invited to participate in the study. Students were selected after having completed a core set of courses required of all those matriculated in the program so they could speak to a common set of experiences.

Both faculty and students were administered a survey designed to address the five ethical dimensions of integrity, fairness, ethical behavior, knowledge of self, and self-efficacy. The surveys had both closed- and open-ended questions. The closed-ended items were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Open-ended questions were subjected to a content analysis. The faculty was interviewed individually, using a semi-structured interview protocol. Students were interviewed using a semi-structured focus group protocol. The interviews were taped and transcribed, then analyzed using both open and axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The use of a qualitative study employing surveys and interviews versus a broad-based survey allowed the researchers to better understand which of the ethical dimensions were learned during the course of the program and how. The use of specific ethical behaviors as a starting point for the conversation allowed the researchers to probe more deeply into the learning process and provided a lens for data analysis when examining the programs' strengths and challenges.

Results of the Study

A formal ethics course did not exist at the graduate level at either of the institutions. Faculty reported using case studies as the primary instructional strategy to integrate ethics into their courses. The use of journaling and discussions of assigned readings were also reported as methodology faculty used to incorporate ethics into their respective courses; however, there was no unified definition of ethics. At both universities, professors recognized the need to pay more attention to knowledge of self and self-efficacy.

The faculty and students perceived that the ethical dimensions of integrity, fairness, and ethical behaviors, along with policy and legal implications, were the major strengths of both programs. Specific considerations of these dimensions included making decisions in compliance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations, upholding confidentiality, and respecting the rights of others. Students and faculty reported learning and teaching of these dimensions occurred through the use of case studies and readings. One student shared that "the consistency of the instructors' behavior enabled the groups to build trust. I think when you see that over and over from the professor, that's what makes the difference." Other students referred to the "modeling of integrity by faculty" as a way they learned the importance of that ethical dimension. Students were appreciative to learn the laws in their school law classes that told them "what they could and couldn't do." One of the professors stated "I always make it clear to my students that following the law and acting ethically aren't necessarily the same thing."

Making objective decisions, maintaining impartiality, practicing ethical considerations, and displaying sensitivity to diversity followed, to a lesser extent, as focus areas. These ethical dimensions are what Beck (as cited in Pardini, 2004) referred to as principled-problem ethics and are driven by outside forces such as legislation and litigation and do not necessarily require self-reflection.

In the area of sensitivity to diversity, two different perspectives emerged from the students at each of the universities. One university attracts students from all over the world, which was noted by the students as a driving force in their understanding of the need for cultural and ethnic understanding. The other university is situated in an area where cultural and ethnic diversity are new demographic growth areas. One student noted, "We need to be a little bit more aware of … the differences in culture and understanding …"

The student data also indicated how they felt they were learning to be more objective, ethical, and impartial in their decision-making skills. At one of the universities, students felt they learned best through their school law course and the use of case studies and reflections in other courses. At the other university, students reported learning about objectivity and ethical behavior through their research methods courses. One student noted, "We are all subjective; we try to be objective, but that is not truly possible. Learning our biases, looking for our subjective tendencies is useful."

Minimal attention was given to knowledge of self and self-efficacy. Knowledge of self and self-efficacy are examples of Beck's (as cited in Pardini, 2004) narrative ethics, which are not codified in law but require self-reflection, an understanding of each individual's personal values, and an ability to stand up for those beliefs publicly despite the consequences. One student explained how the best reflections regarding knowledge of self were had while driving home after class, while some felt that the case studies and development of a personal platform were helpful in this regard. Other students viewed this dimension in the context of their academic work, rather than through a more personal, introspective lens. Faculty expressed that they did not believe they did a good job with knowledge of self or self-efficacy. One professor stated that she never thought of discussing strengths and weaknesses as a part of ethics but would seriously think about it.

Students and faculty both felt that self-efficacy was not taught in their coursework. One student noted, "I don't think they address how we ourselves are going to develop any particular courage or confidence and accept consequences." A faculty member stated, "I'm not sure we do a good job with this." One particular professor referred to using case studies involving parents, teachers, students, and administrators as a means of addressing ethical dilemmas during an interview. However, this professor was dismayed when students' responses indicated they would succumb to pressure from outside sources rather than stand up for their personal values and beliefs.

The students reported that their coursework related to ethics centered primarily on case studies as a methodology. Students in one institution spoke about writing personal statements in the context of their internships as a means for exploring their personal values. They noted that opportunities for personal capacity building of ethical leadership practices were not often provided outside of the case studies, other than crafting personal belief statements. However, the personal reflection necessary to fully appreciate the dimensions of knowledge of self and self-efficacy upon which all other ethical dimensions are built, was seen as an area of need in both programs by both faculty and students.

Implications

The study showed that principle-centered ethics that enable ethical interpretations in a black and white fashion are addressed at both universities. What appeared to be lacking were the narrative ethics or the gray area of ethics, where not everything is codified. Individuals can be taught to uphold the law and follow rules and regulations without the necessity of having to reflect on personal values and beliefs. Knowledge of self requires an individual to clearly define his or her personal values and beliefs. This requires personal self-reflection which can be gained through journaling, developing personal statements, and analyzing case studies. However, the data in this study suggest that external case studies alone are not sufficient for the development of knowledge of self and self-efficacy. Both faculty and students noted that more opportunities for personal reflection should be provided so students can build the capacity necessary for ethical practice.

By increasing their knowledge of self and self-efficacy, students gain a better sense of self and develop skills in ethical areas that allow them to develop and follow their personal values. This understanding will afford them the skills to combat the rising trend of unethical behaviors among educational leaders.

Today's educational leaders are tugged and pulled in a whole host of ways by politicians, legislators, unions, peers, and society's expectations, each with their own agenda. This tug of war challenges these educational leaders and requires them to hold steadfast to their values and beliefs. In the current climate of ethical misdeeds, it is imperative that we understand and examine these issues. When a leader is confident in his or her knowledge of self, then he or she will have the courage to face adversity and uphold his or her values and beliefs. While attention must be paid to the knowledge and skills necessary to lead schools in the 21st Century, preparation of leaders as whole persons equipped to uphold ethical practice in high-stress positions is critical.

Author Biographies

Dr. Judith C. Houle is an assistant professor in the Department of Education in the College of Education, Nursing, and Health Professions at the University of Hartford. Her research interests include building capacity for school districts, and building leadership in the context of education reform and policy issues, as well as educational leadership preparation and in-service learning. She has recently published two articles: “Action Research in Administrative Internships,” in the Summer 2005 issue of *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, and “Professional Development for Urban Principals in Underperforming Schools,” in the February 2006 issue of *Education and Urban Society*.

Dr. Priscilla C. Gimas is principal of Hellenic American Academy in Lowell, MA, an elementary school with the distinction of being the oldest Greek American day school in the United States. She has over 20 years of experience in the field of education from elementary to college level. Her research interests include ethical leadership practice in education and the role of faith-based schools in meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students. She presented a paper, “Knowing the Self that Leads,” at the New England Educational Research Organization's annual conference in April 2005.

References

American Association of School Administrators (1993). *Professional standards for the superintendency*. Arlington, VA: Author.

Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1994). *Ethics in educational leadership programs: An expanding role.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kraus, C.M. (1996, April). *Administrative Training: What Really Prepares Administrators for the Job?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1976). *Statement of ethics for school administrators*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (2001). *Statement of ethics for school administrators*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2002). *Standards for advanced programs in educational leadership for principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors.* Washington, DC: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Pardini, P. (2004). Ethics in the superintendency. *The School Administrator.* September, 2004. Retrieved February 25, 2005, from http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=1155&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Competencies of Traditionally Prepared and Lateral Entry Teachers: Implications for School Administrators

Michael B. Brown, PhD
Professor of Psychology
Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC

Casey L. Lassiter, MA, CAS
School Psychologist
Currituck County Public Schools
Currituck, NC

Larry M. Bolen, EdD
Professor of Psychology
Thomas Harriot College of Arts & Sciences
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC

Melva M. Burke, EdD
Coordinator of Alternative Licensure
College of Education
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC

Many states established a lateral entry policy that allows individuals with a degree in an area other than education to be employed as teachers while concurrently completing specified academic coursework loosely based on traditional teacher education preparation program coursework. Upon successful completion of the coursework, lateral entry teachers are eligible for standard teaching licensure (Hawk, 1999). The initial intent of the alternative certification policy was to entice qualified professionals outside of education (i.e. mathematicians, scientists) to become teachers. As the teacher shortage increased, however, more individuals, who were not highly qualified or skilled in the area in which they were to teach, have been hired as teachers. Research consistently shows a positive connection between teachers' preparation and higher student achievement, especially in mathematics, science, and reading (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Goldhaber, & Brewer, 2000). Increased emphasis on student performance and outcomes assessment has highlighted school administrators' concerns about the quality of teaching. This has led to questions about the teaching effectiveness of individuals who did not complete a traditional teacher education program.

The purpose of this study is to examine principals' perceptions of the teaching ability of first-year traditionally prepared and lateral entry teachers. There is little research that directly assesses what teachers learn in their pedagogical preparation and the relationship of their level of pedagogical knowledge to how they actually teach or to what students learn (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). Previous studies have found few differences with regard to principals' and administrators' perceptions of the classroom performance of these traditionally prepared and alternatively prepared classroom teachers (Bradshaw & Hawk, 1996; Hawk, 1999). One major shortcoming of these studies, however, is the use of global measures of teacher behavior or effectiveness that have been shown to be highly unreliable (Ferguson & Womack, 1993; Guyton & Farokhi, 1987). In order to obtain a more reliable indicator of teacher performance this study utilized a revised version of the *Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument* (RTPAI; White, Stuck, Wyne, & Coop, 1984) to assess principals' perceptions of teacher performance. The RTPAI allows raters to examine specific competencies rather than simply global or overall teacher characteristics which lead to a more reliable measure of teaching competency.

Method

The participants included public elementary, middle, and high school principals in the state of North Carolina. Principals were sent a survey and asked to rate their perception of teachers' performance using a 4-point rating scale for 28 observable teaching practices on the RTPAI. Scores on the 28 teaching factors assess performance on five major teaching competency areas: Management of instructional time, management of student behavior, instructional presentation, instructional monitoring, and instructional feedback (Hawk & Schmidt, 1989).

The schools were sampled within the three regional areas of the state. Because of the small number of schools in the mountain and coastal plains regions all schools in these regions were mailed surveys. This resulted in the surveying of 84 elementary, 56 middle, and 54 high schools in the coastal plain region and 43 elementary, 25 middle, and 30 high schools in the mountain region. In the piedmont region, 25% of the elementary, middle, and high schools that employed alternative prepared teachers were selected resulting in 97 elementary, 69 middle, and 51 high schools that were sent surveys.

Five hundred and six principals across the state were mailed the survey, with a follow-up survey mailed to non-responders after four weeks. Two hundred and eight principals responded to the survey, resulting in an overall response rate of 41%. Of the responses, 21 were unusable due to the principal's lack of experience with alternative licensed teachers, leaving a total sample of 187 principals. Thus, the final sample included 66 elementary school, 59 middle school, and 54 high school principals that completed the survey. Eight principals were employed at various other types of schools such as alternative schools and those that housed students in grades pre-kindergarten to twelfth. Eighty-one of the principals were from the coastal plain region, 75 were from the piedmont region, and 31 were from the mountain region.

Results

The mean ratings for the five competencies were consistently higher for the traditionally prepared (TP) teachers compared to the lateral entry (LE) teachers (see Table 1).

Table 1

Means and standard deviations for teacher's ratings on the RTPAI (N=187)

Type and competency	*M**	*SD*	*Alpha*
LE			
Time	2.46	.77	.93
Behavior	2.26	.74	.95
Presentation	2.51	.55	.92
Monitor	2.64	.61	.94
Feedback	2.59	.65	.80
TP			
Time	3.01	.79	.69
Behavior	2.90	.77	.91
Presentation	3.01	.55	.91
Monitor	3.09	.65	.89
Feedback	3.05	.84	.90

Each item is rated on a 1 to 4 point scale and items are averaged for each competency area: 1 = unsatisfactory; 2 = inadequate; 3 = adequate; 4 = consistently high.

Note: LE = Alternatively prepared teachers; TP = Traditionally prepared teachers. Time = management of instructional time; Behavior = management of student behavior; Presentation = management of instructional presentation; Monitor = management of instructional monitoring; Feedback = management of instructional feedback. Alpha = Cronbach's Alpha – reliability for each the five RTPAI scales.

The mean ratings for LE teachers indicated inadequate performance, whereas the TP teachers' mean ratings indicated marginal adequacy in the five areas. A multivariate analysis of variance found significant differences in ratings between the TP and the LE teachers, ($F_{(5,368)} = 19.32$, $p < .001$; eta=.21). Follow-up ANOVAS reveal significant differences, with the first-year TP teachers rated higher than the first-year LE teachers in all areas.

In the area of Management of Instructional Time, 30.5% of the first-year LE teachers and 8.6% of the TP teachers were rated at 2 or lower, corresponding to inadequate or unsatisfactory performance on tasks such as getting the class started quickly or having materials and supplies ready. Almost 37% of the LE teachers and 83.4% of the TP teachers were rated at adequate to consistently high performance on each of these items. The competency area Management of Student Behavior includes four items such as stopping inappropriate behavior promptly and establishing class rules that govern student behavior. Forty percent of the first-year LE teachers were rated as having inadequate or unsatisfactory performance and 24% were rated as having adequate to consistently high performance on all four items. Nine percent of the TP teachers were rated as performing in the inadequate to unsatisfactory range and 73.7% were rated as performing adequate to consistently high on these items.

The 12 items in the competency area Management of Instructional Presentation include adapting instruction for diverse learners and conducting lessons at an appropriate pace. Principals rated 19.3% of the first-year LE teachers and 7% of the TP teachers as having inadequate or unsatisfactory performance on all 12 characteristics. Twenty-four percent of the LE teachers and 74% of the TP teachers were rated as adequate to consistently high on all items. On the Management of Instructional Monitoring factor (i.e. making work standards clear and using student responses to adjust teaching), 16% of the first-year LE teachers and 5.9% of the TP teachers were rated as performing in the inadequate or unsatisfactory range on all items. Thirty-nine percent of the LE teachers and 80.3% of the TP teachers were rated as performing in the adequate to consistently high range.

Management of Instructional Feedback includes providing prompt feedback on written work and appropriately confirming students' correct responses. Slightly more than 18% of the first-year LE teachers and 6.4% of TP teachers were rated as performing in the inadequate or unsatisfactory range on all items. Forty percent of the LE teachers and 80.1% of the TP teachers were rated as performing in the adequate to consistently high range on all items.

Discussion and Implications

Principals perceive that traditionally prepared (TP) teachers are more competent than teachers seeking alternative teacher licensure, although they are not viewed as meeting the competencies on the RTPAI on a consistently high basis. The lower ratings of lateral entry (LE) teachers in all five teacher competency areas likely reflect the LE teachers' lack of prior teaching experience. LE teachers are not required to have taught before beginning teaching while the TP teachers traditionally have one or more semesters of teaching experience during the clinical practice portion of their training program. Previous research has found that secondary teachers with no pedagogical preparation were limited in their ability to engage high school students in the subject matter even when they knew their subject well (Grossman, 1989).

The competency area of management of instructional time and management of student behavior involve skills that must be learned through practical experience and cannot be learned solely in a university classroom. The teacher is expected to have an established set of rules and procedures that govern student participation and movement during various types of activities. The teacher should also be able to monitor the behavior of all students during whole-class, small group, and seat work activities and be able to stop inappropriate behavior. Instructional presentation and instructional feedback competencies are highly detailed and involve applied pedagogical knowledge and skills that are learned through education courses and applied experience. The first-year LE teachers have not received training in these areas through either education courses or the experiences that come with student teaching. Lack of pedagogical knowledge and practical experience could account for the differences in the principal's ratings of TP and LE teachers in these competency areas.

First year teachers in this study, whether LE or TP, are consistently perceived by school principals as having marginally adequate to inadequate mastery of major teaching competencies. The first year of teaching is especially difficult (Kennedy, 1998) and new teachers must learn to reorganize their knowledge of subject matter (Adams & Krockover, 1997; Gess-Newsome & Lederman, 1993). In one longitudinal study, the impact of teacher preparation was shown to emerge in the second year of the new teacher's experience, not the first year (Kennedy, 1998). Thus, all teachers need support and skill-development during the first year in the areas of management of instructional time, management of student behavior, instructional presentation, instructional monitoring, and instructional feedback.

Instructional supervision is a critical domain of principals' leadership responsibilities (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). A key aspect of principal leadership includes ensuring that increased on-site supervision, mentoring, and feedback are provided during the critical first year of teaching for all educators (Johnson, 2001). First-year teachers often want more principal mentoring than principals think (Brock & Grady, 1998). The results of this study remind principals that special attention must be directed to the LE teacher in the classroom. Mullin (2005) recommends that educational leadership programs emphasize instructional supervision. Our results suggest that school leadership programs should ensure that principals learn strategies to provide the necessary support to LE teachers.

It would be advantageous for educational administrators to be familiar with university programs developed to enhance LE teachers' performance. These are formal programs that provide training in pedagogy prior to beginning teaching (Office of Alternative Licensure, 2002). Project ACT, a program that began at East Carolina University (ECU) in 1992, requires participants to complete a five-week summer session in which relevant pedagogical information is provided. This is followed by monthly seminars throughout the academic year during which participants are employed as LE teachers. A similar program model is NC TEACH, developed in 1999 at ECU, which includes five weeks of pre-service training in essential teaching skills as well as seminars and mentor supervision throughout the academic year. Superintendents, principals and educational leadership faculty are encouraged to be aware of these programs and support their implementation where possible. Principals might also encourage LE teachers in their schools to become affiliated with one of these proactive preparation programs during their lateral entry period.

Author Biographies

Dr. Michael Brown is professor of psychology and director of the school psychology program at East Carolina University in Greenville, North Carolina. He teaches courses on professional issues, provides school consultations, and supervises public school interns and has published a number of articles that deal with job satisfaction and roles and functions of school psychologists. He serves as a member of the East Carolina University's Council on Teacher Education and the Provost's Council for Collaboration for Teacher Education. Dr. Brown was a 2004-2005 American Council on Education fellow.

Dr. Larry Bolen is professor and acting chair of the Department of Psychology at East Carolina University. He serves on the editorial board of *Psychology in the Schools* and as an editorial reviewer for *Psychological Reports, Perceptual and Motor Skills,* and *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry.* His experience includes 33 years of service as a school psychologist and school psychology trainer. Dr. Bolen has published many articles in professional journals on research topics that emphasize cognitive assessment, learning strategies, and children with chronic illness.

Ms. Casey Lassiter is a school psychologist in the Currituck County, NC schools. She is a graduate of North Carolina State University and holds MA and CAS degrees in school psychology from East Carolina University. She specializes in teacher consultation and developing cognitive strategies to enhance student learning. Ms. Lassiter is the primary school psychologist for the Dr. W.T. Griggs Elementary School and the J. P. Knapp School.

Dr. Melva Burke is the coordinator of alternative licensure at East Carolina University where she also teaches in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. She advises persons who are working toward teacher certification on a variety of alternative routes, and works with public school systems who hire persons on a provisional license. Dr. Burke participated in the development of, and currently teaches in, two specific alternative licensure programs at East Carolina University.

References

Adams, P. E. & Krockover, G. H. (1997). Beginning science teacher cognition and its origins in the preservice science teacher program. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34*, 633-653.

Bradshaw, L., & Hawk, P. (1996). *Issue analysis: Teacher certification*. Greenville, NC: ENCCARE.

Brock, B. L., & Grady, M. L. (1998). Beginning teacher induction programs: The role of the principal. *Clearing House, 71*, 179-183.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders*. Washington, DC: Author

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*, 1.

Ferguson, P., & Womack, S. T. (1993). The impact of subject matter and education coursework on teaching performance. *Journal of Teacher Education, 44*, 155-63.

Gess-Newsom, J., & Lederman, N. G. (1993). Preservice biology teachers' knowledge structures as a function of professional teacher education: A year long assessment. *Science Education, 77,* 25-45.

Goldhaber, D. D., & Brewer, D. J. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22,* 129-145.

Grossman, P. L. (1989). Learning to teach without teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 91*, 191-207.

Guyton, E., & Farokhi, E. (1987). Relationships among academic performance, basic skills, subject matter knowledge, and teacher skills of teacher education graduates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 38*, 37-42.

Hawk, P. (1999). *Report on lateral entry teachers in North Carolina*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

Hawk, P., & Schmidt, M. (1989). Teacher preparation: A comparison of traditional and alternative programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40,* 53-58.

Johnson, H. (2001). Administrators and mentors: Keys in the success of beginning teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 28,* 44-49.

Kennedy, M. (1998). *Learning to teach writing: Does teacher education make a difference*? New York: Teachers College Press.

Mullin, C. A. (2005). What knowledge matters most to on-the-job school administrators in Florida? *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice, 2* (1), 11-15.

Office of Alternative Licensure. (2002). NC TEACH. Greenville, NC: East Carolina University College of Education.

White, K., Stuck, G., Wyne, M., & Coop, W. (1984). *Carolina teaching performance assessment system*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations*. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Technical Working Paper Document R-01-3.

Making Class Size Work in the Middle Grades

C. H. Tienken, EdD
Assistant Superintendent
Monroe Township School District
Middlesex County, NJ
and
Professor
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ

C. M. Achilles, EdD
Professor
College of Education and Human Services
Seton Hall University
South Orange, NJ
and
Professor
College of Education
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI

Introduction

Education leaders are faced simultaneously with calls for improved outcomes and to achieve those outcomes with limited resources. One way to overcome those twin challenges is through resource reallocation of time, personnel, and funding.

Most research on the positive effects of class-size reduction (CSR) has occurred in the elementary level (Word, Johnston, Bain, Fulton, Zaharias, Lintz, Achilles, Folger, & Breda, 1990; Molnar, Smith, Zahorik, Palmer, Halbach, & Ehrle, 1999). Is CSR an important variable in improving education in the middle grades? Can small classes be achieved in the middle grades at reasonable costs? This article provides an overview of a three-year initiative (2001-2004) to lower class sizes in a middle school through structural changes. Based on initial pre and post-test data, the process and student outcomes have been positive. All improvements occurred at no added cost.

Context

The Emma C. Attales (ECA) Middle School is in Absecon, New Jersey. New Jersey's approximately 600 school districts are classified into District Factor Groups ranging from A to J, where "A" districts are located in the state's poorest communities and "J" districts are the wealthiest. Absecon is categorized as a CD district based on socio-economic status (SES), property wealth and other factors developed by the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE). Absecon is one of the 20th lowest per-pupil spending districts for preK-8 in New Jersey.

The district is undergoing demographic changes including a growing English as a second language (ESL) population, mainly from India, and increasing numbers of students eligible for free or reduced lunch. During the 2003-2004 school year, 24% of the 422 students in the ECA school qualified for free or reduced lunch, up from 17% in 2000. The school population increased from 387 in 2000, peaking to 440 students during 2002-2003 and ending the 2003-2004 school year with 422 students. Normally, increases in students eligible for free or reduced lunch and students requiring English language instruction would lead to an increase in special programs and personnel to support the needs of the changing population.

Organization of Schooling

The middle school was organized in a traditional grades 6-8 configuration with 27 regular and seven special education teachers. Two physical education teachers, an art teacher, and one special education teacher also taught part-time at the elementary school. Sharing of staff with the elementary school kept costs low, but constrained each school's schedule.

Teachers were not teamed or part of a "house" structure; there were too few staff to create teams with common planning times or to keep teachers at a single grade level, so some teachers taught (and still teach) several core subjects on multiple grade levels. For example, one teacher covered two 6^{th-} and one 7^{th-} grade math courses and a 7^{th-} grade science course. Class periods were 43 minutes and all core academic subjects were single periods except for language arts (LA) classes, which were two periods each day. Fifth-grade classrooms were included in the school but functioned as two-teacher teams. One teacher taught language arts and social studies and the other taught mathematics and science for the team of 125 students.

During the 2000-2001 school year students had a 10-minute homeroom period four times a week and a 30-minute "advisory" once a week. There were separate classes for Basic Skills Instruction (BSI) in LA and in math. The BSI students were tracked for both subjects and approximately 12-16 students were in each section at each grade level. Typically, most students placed in the school's BSI did not exit that program by the time of graduation, including students placed in BSI during their elementary school years. This is consistent with the research on traditional Title I and other remediation programs, showing that few students exit traditional BSI programs once placed in them (Borman & D'Agostino, 1996).

The school had homogeneous "high ability" classes for math and LA on each grade level, with 20-29 students in each high section at each grade level. A "gifted and talented" LA program was available with 5-8 students per grade level.

The remaining 55-75 students were placed into two or three "regular sections" of LA and math. Science and social studies were intentionally not homogenously grouped, but scheduling constraints resulted in some de facto grouping. Special education students receiving in-class support were included in regular (non-BSI, non-high ability) sections. Table 1 illustrates the basic homogeneous structure of specific courses as they were implemented in 2000-2001.

Table 1

*Average Class Sizes for Grades 6-8 During the 1999-2000 School Year, Before the Organization Changes**

	Class Types							
Grade/Class	High Ability		Regular		Basic Skills		Gifted and Talented LA** Only	
	Size	(n)	Size	(n)	Size	(n)	Size	(n)
6^{th} LA	22-24	1	22-25	2	12-16	1	5-8	1
6^{th} Math	24-28	1	24-26	2	12-16	1		
7^{th} LA	22-24	1	22-25	2	12-16	1	5-8	1
7^{th} Math	24-28	1	23-26	2	12-16	1		
8^{th} LA	20-22	1	20-22	2	12-16	1	5-8	1
8^{th} Math	24-26	1	20-22	2	12-16	1		

*Note: 387 student total during the 1999-2000 school year. 5^{th} grade classes not shown
**LA = Language Arts

The Problem

The average yearly student failure rate was between 3%-6 % and approximately 12-25 students attended summer school each year. Although not high by some standards, the teachers were concerned. (Data on student retention prior to 2002 were not available). Teachers voiced concerns about growing class sizes as impediments to differentiating instruction and individualizing the learning experience. Many teachers expressed concerns about the students' lack of homework completion, low performance on classroom tests, apathetic student participation, too much paperwork, parental apathy, off-task behavior in class, increasing cognitive and behavioral needs of the regular education population, and the dwindling resources to deal with these issues. Teachers expressed concerns about "borderline" students whom they believed could succeed with individualized assistance. Analyses, as explained in the next section, revealed that most concerns were symptoms of large class size and were not each a "special case" (Deming, 1993). Education funding was constrained simultaneously with increasing emphases on “standards,” “high-stakes” testing, and threats of sanctions for poor test performance.

Searching for Answers

During 2000-2001 school year, building and district personnel sought scientific-based research (SBR) ways to mitigate challenges posed by increased enrollment, demographic changes, and reduced per-pupil funds. After reviewing research on how to improve student achievement, the ECA educators agreed upon organization changes based on the longitudinal SBR on class size and related theory. The teachers and district leaders believed that structural changes to improve the education experience for those most in need would also benefit all students. W.E. Deming (1993, 2000) had proposed that administratively-mutable structural changes account for 85%-94% of an organization’s effectiveness. The class size research meets Deming’s theoretical position. Achilles (2003) put it another way: “The contexts in which teachers must teach (structure and organization) influence greatly what teachers can do to teach and teach well” (p. 11). Teachers need the opportunity to teach effectively if they are to be successful and students need the opportunity to learn.

Research demonstrating positive impacts of CSR is very strong, but has mostly been conducted at the elementary level (Achilles, 1999). Some research, although limited has suggested that small classes are important in later years of schooling (Deutsch, 2003). A long-term, two-stage (Key Stage 1 [KS1] and Key Stage 2 [KS2]) study in England has followed over 40,000 students in “reception” (similar to PreK in the USA) through years, or grades, 4-6 (KS2 study). The KS2 study whose aim “was to extend the examination of the effects of class size to later school years” found that “results for KS2 were similar to those for reception and KS1. Class size effects…are not singular but multiple. As the size of the class increases, size and/or number of groups increase, and the management of groups, both in terms of size and number, becomes ever more crucial” (Blatchford, Bassett, Brown, Martin, & Russell, 2004, p.2).

Known organization arrangements that get positive outcomes such as apprenticeships, internships, and seminars are typically small groups, as are advanced placement classes. Some who argue against small classes confuse class size and pupil-teacher ratio (PTR); other people simply use the terms as synonyms (e.g. Hanushek, 1996, 1998; Hanushek, Rivkin, & Taylor, 1996). Class size, an addition problem, is determined by adding the students who are actually in a class. The PTR is determined by dividing the total students at a site by the total number of adults serving the students (Achilles, 1999). Class size is an organizational/structural arrangement for the delivery of instruction while PTR is a formula to guide distribution of resources to achieve equity (Achilles, 2003). Class size and PTR are about n=10 different in actual schooling practice: In a building with a 16:1 PTR, the average teacher will have approximately 26 students in a class (Achilles & Sharp, 1998).

The Student Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR) experiment, along with Project Challenge, STAR Follow-up, the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) project and other class-size initiatives consistently demonstrated positive short and long-term effects for students from small classes (Word, et al., 1990; Molnar, et al., 1999). STAR was a longitudinal, randomized class size experiment conducted in Tennessee during the early and mid 1980’s (approximately 12,000 students and 1,300 teachers in grades K-3 participated). The STAR Follow-up was a study that looked at those students in the original STAR study (1985-1989) after they graduated high school or turned 18 (10 to 13 years later). The follow-up study reaffirmed the researchers' speculations about lasting effects on students who were placed in small classes during their first few years in school. Project Challenge in Tennessee built upon the work of STAR. The aim was to put the conclusions of STAR into practice in the schools. Project SAGE was a class size project conducted in K-3 schools in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The project has been ongoing since 1996. No negative effects to students were identified for students in small classes through these programs (e.g. Word, et al., 1990; Molnar, et al., 1999). Importantly, class-size effects are cumulative. The longer students have small classes the greater the impact and the benefits, even when students move into larger classes in higher grades (Finn, Gerber, Achilles & Boyd-Zaharias, 2001; Krueger & Whitmore, 2000).

Theory to Practice

The devil is in the details. Some grades 6-8 staff questioned whether class-size reduction should be used because most empirical evidence was from grades K-3. Following Ouchi's (2004) recommendation that "structure must change before culture can change" (p.18), the staff placed emphasis on structural change that was administratively mutable (based on the STAR findings). The structural changes behind the small-group focus (Adapted from Achilles, 2003, p. 9) included:

1. Maintain small classes (n=13-18) for at least 3, preferably 4 years.
2. Avoid PTR events like pullout programs. Keep students together in the classroom.
3. Phase out expensive remedial practices as small class benefits increase.
4. Analyze and adjust personnel assignments to create small classes without hiring additional staff.
5. Frequently evaluate and communicate results.

The initiative began with a long-term mindset and a three-year plan. The master schedule was the lever to launch structural changes. The staff entered the process early. Schedule planning for the following year began during the school year instead of during the summer when staff input was not possible. Staff received rough-draft versions of the master schedule each month, complete with student assignments. The staff, superintendent, director of special services, and principal made incremental changes in the master schedule each year to influence teaching assignments. Change preceded simultaneously both top-down and bottom-up. (Ouchi, 2004). The faculty set subject-specific priorities focused on achieving lower class size and targeted LA and math classes to begin lowering class sizes in grades 6-8.

The master schedule evolved with the addition of an "exploratory period" of approximately 28 minutes to start each day in which all BSI classes and exploratory subjects (e.g. additional art classes, small group homework help, and technology lab) were held. Next pullout BSI programs (including the homogenous grouping of BSI students) were ended and small classes for LA and math in all three years in grades 6-8 were maintained. Finally, reassigned staff was reassigned to add more sections of all core subjects.

Output

This study is not experimental and by following cohorts of students, the early indicators are simply trend data. Nevertheless, while acknowledging weaknesses, the preliminary outcomes and the change processes employed have encouraged the school and district educators to consider the class-size effort a work in progress. Outputs of great interest such as student scores on state tests are least reliable. This is a function of the state's Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA), with its high standard error of measurement and changing proficiency levels. A few "hard-data" outcomes are becoming available and subject to evaluations. Some early results of the three-year initiative are:

- Reduced overall school BSI population between the 2000 to 2003 school years by 46%, reduced the 8th grade math BSI population (6th graders at the start of this initiative) by 60% and the 8th grade LA population by 87%.
- Reduced the overall year-end failure rate to five students, 1% of the total population, by the end of the 2003 school year, while absorbing an increase of 40-60 students in the total population and 7% increase in students eligible for free or reduced lunch.
- Reduced the year-over-year marking period failure rate by an average of 29% per marking period.
- Created lower class sizes in the regular LA and math classes. Reassigned BSI teachers to instruct regular classes of math, LA, and science.
- Lowered class sizes in selected science and social studies classes (based on specific student needs).
- Decreased behavior referrals from small classes.
- Significantly increased writing scores on the district's in-house post-test picture-prompt speculative essays for those in regular education (including students receiving BSI services) who experienced small LA classes for three years (n=38).

The small-class cohort scored 3.42/6 in 2002 and 4.17/6 in 2004. Differences in scores between 2001-2002 and 2003-2004 were statistically significant ($p \leq .000$) and educationally significant with .80 effect size (See Table 2). The picture-prompt essays were scored using a system similar to that used for the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). Two raters blind-scored each paper, with emphasis on the paper's content and organization, followed by grammar, sentence construction, and mechanics as per the NAEP guidelines. A third rater was used to settle disputes. The school administrator randomly sampled papers from each grade level for auditing purposes. All teachers were trained and refresher sessions are conducted each year to check rater agreements.

Table 2

Independent Samples two-tailed T-test Results for 2001-2002/2003-2004 Regular Small Class Cohort Writing Scores on the District's Speculative Writing Prompt

Year	n	Mean	SD	df	t-score	p	Effect Size
2001-2002	38	3.42	.94	74	-3.680	.000	.80
2003-2004	38	4.17	.82				

Note: 2001-2002 data describe class cohort as it was in 6th grade. 2003-2004 data describe class cohort as it was in 8th grade. Scores are based on a 6-point rubric developed by the New Jersey Department of Education.

The 2003-2004 cohort of 38 students scored significantly higher ($p \leq .001$) on the GEPA speculative writing portion than did the 2001-2002 8th grade class. The 2001-2002 class did not experience consistently small class size and scores for this group were less than for the 2003-2004 class. Table 3 illustrates the differences in scores.

Table 3

Comparison of GEPA Speculative Picture Prompt Essay Scores for Students in 8th Grade 2001-2002 to 8th Grade Small Class Cohort 2003-2004

2001-2002			2003-2004			df	t-score	p	Effect Size
n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD				
43	3.50	.51	38	3.88	.45	79	-3.521	.001	.75

Note: All students in New Jersey public schools take the Grade Eight Proficiency Assessment (GEPA) during March of their 8th grade year. The language arts portion of the test has a writing component. Picture prompt speculative essays are one part of the writing section.

The 2003-2004 8th grade cohort of 38 students scored significantly higher ($p \leq .022$) on the in-house speculative essay post-test compared to the 2001-2002 8th grade class that did not experience small-class conditions. Table 4 provides the data.

Table 4

Comparison of Scores for Students in 8th Grade 2001-2002 to 8th Grade Small Class Cohort 2003-2004 on the In-District Speculative Writing Prompt

2001-2002			2003-2004			df	t-score	p	Effect Size
n	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD				
53	3.59	1.36	38	4.17	.82	90	-2.326	.022	.43

Note: Students in the 2001-2002 8th grade class were not exposed to small classes. Students in the 2003-2004 8th grade were exposed to small classes for up to three years.

The neediest academic students were distributed throughout the smallest classes at each grade level to maximize impact on the BSI, inclusion, and other struggling students. Class-sizes for 2003-2004 are presented in Table 5. During the 2003-2004 school year 35/52 classes, 67%, in grades 6-8 had 20 or fewer students. There were 20 or fewer students in 21/23, 91%, of the language arts and mathematics classes.

Table 5

Actual Class Sizes for the 2003-2004 School Year for Regular Section Core Subjects

Grade	Regular LA	Regular Math	Social Studies	Science
6th	16,16,17,20	18,18,19,20	16,18,19,23,25	17,20,20,22,22
7th	18,19,19,20	17,19,20,21	19,19,19,21,26	17,19,22,23,23
8th	12,12,18,18	19,20,21	12,16,22,23,23	24,24,25,25

Note: Remaining students constituted the 5th grade class.

All changes and improvements came at no added cost or staff while negative context factors increased from 2000-2004. No additional professional development for teachers was provided or needed. The differences in scores between groups could be due to random error but the consistency of early results suggests that this is not likely as the results are consistent with best practice and relevant theory (e.g. individual attention, engagement, time-on-task).

The demographics of the 2003-2004 class were different in ways that traditionally depress academic achievement; higher percentages of students on free or reduced lunch and of minority students than the class of 2001.

Summary

The SBR on the benefits of small class size is clear. The class-size research base includes over 100 years of study, analysis, re-analyses, and practical experience. The application of the research base at the middle school demonstrates that small class size can drive improvements and need not be expensive if implemented according to research (end pullout programs, re-assign staff members, change the structure). Benefits were cognitive (achievement) and non-cognitive (behavior) and cumulative as demonstrated by the large percentage of 6th grade students who exited the BSI program by 8th grade, and by the higher outcomes for the cohort (n = 38) who had small classes for three full years, when compared to other groupings of students. Class size reduction can have a positive impact in the middle grades.

Author Biographies

Dr. Christopher H. Tienken is currently the assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction in the Monroe Township School District, Middlesex County, NJ. He is also a part-time professor at the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University. He was a former middle school principal. Research interests include professional development, curriculum studies, and education policy. Recent publications include an article co-authored by Dr. Charles Achilles entitled, "The Effects of Professional Development: A View from Plato's Cave," that appeared in 2005 in the *National Forum of Education Administration and Supervision Journal* and a chapter in the book *Current Issues in School Leadership* entitled, "Staff development and school outcomes," also co-authored by Dr. Achilles.

Dr. Charles M. Achilles is a professor of education administration at Seton Hall University (part-time) and Eastern Michigan University (part-time). Dr. Achilles was one of the principal investigators of Project STAR and several other class-size studies. He is a frequent contributor to the professional literature on education administration and on class-size issues.

References

Achilles, C.M. (1999). *Let's put kids first finally: Getting class size right.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Achilles, C.M. (2003, August). *One proven practice for improving schools that policy and practitioners avoid.* Paper presented at the NCPEA Annual Conference, Sedona, Arizona.

Achilles, C.M. & Sharp, M. (1998). Solve your puzzles using class size and pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) differences. *Catalyst for change, 28*(1), 5-10.

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P, Brown, P, Martin, C., & Russell, A. (2004, December). *The effects of class size on attainment and classroom process in English primary schools (years 4-6) 2000-2003.* Institute of Education, University of London. Research Brief RBX 13-04.

Borman, G.D. & D'Agostino, J.V. (1996). Title I and student achievement: A meta-analysis of federal evaluation results. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(4), 309-326.

Deming, W.E. (1993). *The new economics for industry, government, education.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. (Second edition, 2000).

Deutsch, F.M. (2003). How small classes benefit high school students. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(635), 35-44.

Finn, J. D., Gerber, S. B., Achilles, C. M., & Boyd-Zaharias, J. (2001). The enduring effects of small classes. *Teachers College Record , 103*(2), 145-183.

Hanushek, E. (1996). A more complete picture of school resource policies. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(3), 397-409.

Hanushek, E. (1998). *The evidence on class size*. Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester. W. Allen Wallis Institute. (Occasional Papers 98-1).

Hanushek, E., Rivkin, S. & Taylor, L. (1996). Aggregation and the estimated effect of school resources. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 78*(4), 611-627.

Krueger, A. B. & Whitmore, D. M. (2000, March). The effect of attending a small class in the early grades on college-test taking and middle school test results: Evidence from Project STAR. Princeton University, Industrial Relations Section. NBER Working and Conference Paper.

Molnar, A., Smith, .P., Zahorik, J. Palmer, A., Halbach, A., & Ehrle, K. (1999). Evaluating the SAGE program: A pilot program in targeted pupil-teacher reduction in Wisconsin. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21*(2), 165-178.

Ouchi, W. G. (2004). Tilting the balance. *The School Administrator*, 61(7), 18-22.

Word, E., Johnston, J., Bain, H., Fulton, B., Zaharias, J., Lintz., N., Achilles, C.M., Folger, J., & Breda, C. (1990). *Student/Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR): Tennessee's K-3 class size study*. Final report and final report summary. Nashville, TN: Tennessee State Department of Education.

Is NCATE the Answer to Current Criticism of Educational Leadership Preparation Programs?

Anita M. Varrati, EdD
Assistant Professor of Educational Administration
Department of Teaching Leadership and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University
Kent, OH

Autumn K. Tooms, EdD
Assistant Professor of Educational Administration
Department of Teaching Leadership and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University
Kent, OH

Stephen B. Thomas, EdD
Professor of Educational Administration
Department of Teaching Leadership and Curriculum Studies
Kent State University
Kent, OH

Lately, preparation programs for PreK-12 school leaders have been at the center of controversy. Infamous among university circles is the 2005 *Educating School Leaders* report, which calls for an overhaul of university-based principal and superintendent preparation programs. The report cites several problem areas of such programs. Among the criticisms, PreK-12 leadership programs lack (Levine, 2005):

- an explicit, relevant, and practical curriculum;
- high admission and graduation requirements;
- program faculty that are current on the day-to-day experiences of today's school administrators; and
- meaningful and extensive field-based experiences.

The focus of the report is that school leadership programs are in critical need of redesign. However, program improvement is not a new concept to the educational administration faculty of Kent State University. As a member of the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA), our leadership preparation program improvements have reflected standards for institutions granting doctorates. Especially critical is the ability of program faculty to prepare school leaders consistent with current research and practice.

Another step in this direction was the involvement of Kent State University in a pilot of the new National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) program review. This process reflects a tighter partnering between NCATE and state departments of education in order to increase the rigor of institutional reviews. This process is also consistent with another UCEA standard for program faculty, which recommends program integration and alignment of quality standards for educational leadership. The centerpiece of the NCATE Educational

Administration Program (EDAD) review process was to identify assessments that meet standards designated by professional educational association standards. The professional standards that NCATE identified were the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards.

A critical piece of this process is whether EDAD programs evaluate whether they are meeting the ELCC standards. This is done by collecting data. It has been increasingly recognized that data and results can be a powerful force for generating an intrinsic desire to improve (Schmoker, 1999). This is a concept that is incorporated into PreK-12 leadership courses. The new NCATE process also recognizes the applicability of using data to improve educator preparation programs. NCATE requires that EDAD programs submit data from over a three-year period that demonstrate if candidates can:

- master job knowledge and skills;
- meet state licensure requirements;
- plan professional education responsibilities;
- implement their plan with students and colleagues; and
- promote student learning in their school and district.

By working through the revised NCATE format, pilot schools should be able to provide feedback concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the new process. However, the most important aspect of this exercise for our faculty resided with the in-depth examination of our EDAD program on various levels in an effort to meet the ELCC standards.

NCATE Process

Although the new NCATE/ELCC process remains time consuming and data intensive, it does require less preparation than in the past. In addition to accreditation, the procedure of assessment development, application, evaluation, and review should prove efficacious in faculty efforts to self-evaluate. Data resulting from this accreditation process may prove helpful in supporting a program's academic integrity, in justifying the need for continued resources or expansion, and in identifying means of program improvement. In generating the needed information and data, the new NCATE process requires the submission of a five-part program report.

In Section I, Contextual Information, program faculty has the opportunity to describe their respective licensure and degree requirements and specify student expectations. Programs must attach course syllabi, tables reflecting student program admittance and completion numbers, and general faculty information.

Section II, Assessments and Related Data, requires identification of seven or eight assessments for each license or degree addressing ELCC standards. Table 1 charts possible assessments for a licensure program for principals.

Table 1

Sample Assessments for Building Administrator Licensure

Assessment Type	Example
Data from licensure tests or professional examinations.	Praxis
Content knowledge in educational leadership.	Comprehensive Course Exams.
Application of content knowledge in educational leadership.	Program Portfolio: Students contribute one artifact of their choice from each required course that reflects a comprehensive understanding of the principal's role.
Demonstration of effectively developed supervisory plans for classroom-based instruction, and other identified professional responsibilities in educational leadership.	Faculty Intervention and Supervision Process: Conduct pre/post conferences and classroom observation to better understand and apply these facets of instructional supervision.
Demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions applied effectively in internship or clinical practice.	Internship Supervisor Assessment: A framework for reflective discussion between administrative intern, field supervisor, and university supervisor. Designed as a means for participants to reflect on each ELCC standard as related to the intern's experience.
Demonstration of abilities in organizational management and community relations.	Strategic Plan for Curriculum Development: Develop an action plan to carry out responsibilities associated with the administration of the building curriculum.
Demonstration of ability to support student learning and development.	Employer Satisfaction Survey: Employee supervisors evaluate the performance of individuals who have completed university licensure programs. Submitted to the employee's supervisor one year following initial employment as an administrator.
Optional assessment that addresses ELCC standards.	Action Research - Administrative Calendar: Collection of artifacts that form a year-long calendar for the candidate's reference when serving as a principal in the field.

(Developed by Varrati, Tooms & Thomas, 2005; based on NCATE requirements)

Each assessment must specify format, administration time, student instructions, and an evaluation rubric. Assessment results must be reflected in a three-year data base. Table 2 illustrates a sample assessment that meets NCATE requirements for Section II.

Table 2

Sample Assessment for Building Principal Licensure

Section II: Praxis

Addresses ELCC standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5, 6.

Type/Form of Assessment: Standardized Test. The Praxis is a standardized test developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Candidates take test 0410 for Educational Administration.

When is the Assessment Administered: Candidates take the Praxis near the end of meeting Principal licensure requirements but before employment.

Attachments

Assessment, Including Instructions to Candidates: The ETS provides detailed instructions for completing the registration materials, preparing for the test, requesting scores, and the like.

Scoring Guides/Criteria Used to Score Responses on the Assessment:
The ETS does not distribute copies of its tests but has identified areas of concentration and established 610 as a "passing mark." The test covers content regarding educational needs, curriculum design, instructional improvement, development of staff, program evaluation, school management, and individual and group leadership skills.

Data Table: Most Recent Three Years, Organized According to Scoring Guides/Criteria (Percentage of Candidates Achieving Within Each Category)

Praxis 2001-2004

	2001-2002	**2002-2003**	**2003-2004**
# Candidates Passing Examination/# Candidates Taking Examination	**17/17**	**26/26**	**7/7**
Average Score	**725.71**	**728.52**	**714.44**
National Average/Passing Score	**690/610**	**690/610**	**690/610**

(Developed by Varrati, Tooms & Thomas, 2005; based on NCATE requirements)

Section III, Standards and Assessment Chart, represents how each ELCC standard could be addressed by assessments. Some standards may be met through several assessments, while others may be aligned with a single measure.

In Section IV, Evidence of Assessment Results to Improve, programs must describe the assessment, its use in the program, and match the assessment to ELCC standards. Section IV also asks for a summarization of data findings with an explanation of how the data provide evidence for meeting the standards. Table 3 provides the Section IV overview of the assessment sampled in Table 2.

Table 3

Evidence of Assessment Results to Improve

Section IV: Praxis

Description of the assessment and its use in the program

Candidates must pass test 0410, Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision (score of at least 610) of the Praxis examination--a 120 multiple choice standardized test that covers content regarding educational needs; curriculum design and instructional improvement; development of staff and program evaluation; school management; and individual and group leadership skills.

Alignment of the assessment with the specific SPA standards addressed by the assessment, as identified in Section III

The Praxis examination addresses standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5, 6.

Brief summary of the data findings attached in Section II

The Praxis examination has extensive sections/subsections that examine school culture, effective instruction, best practices, professional development, organizational structure and management, school resources, and community involvement. Candidates must have a good understanding of the "larger educational context" and must apply their knowledge in a range of settings.

Data regarding passing rate, mean, and national average for the past three years are provided below.

Praxis 2001-2004

	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
# Candidates Passing Exam/ # Candidates Taking Exam	17/17	26/26	7/7
Average Score	725.71	728.52	714.44
National Average/ Passing Score	690/610	690/610	690/610

Candidates completing our program have passed the exam over the past three years. Note also that over the three-year period the average scores of candidates exiting our program are 24 to 35 points higher than the average national score.

Interpretation of how that data provide evidence for meeting standards

The test, which reflects the most current research, professional judgment, and educational experience, requires the synthesis and application of knowledge and higher cognitive skills. The instrument has also been validated as an effective measure of the content areas identified above, many of which overlap with ELCC standards.

(Developed by Varrati, Tooms, & Thomas, 2005; based on NCATE requirements)

Section V, Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate Program Performance, analyzes results and determines whether assessments improve student performance and program quality (e.g., the need for a year-long internship). Responses should focus on content knowledge, professional knowledge, skills, dispositions, and effects on student learning. It is this section which gives faculty the opportunity to analyze the data and make needed improvements.

Conclusion

Accreditation reviews are generally viewed as among the more onerous tasks required of program faculty. Additionally, the ELCC standards are not completely revered by those who train leaders in educational institutions nor do all preparation institutions follow them. Discussions among some scholars continue as to the relevance of the ELCC standards. In light of the recent criticism concerning preparation programs for educational leaders, embracing ELCC accreditation may be another way to demonstrate program efficacy and relevancy to the profession.

If undertaken seriously and comprehensively, this straight forward, simplified approach has the potential to assist programs in identifying appropriate curriculum requirements, determining when each is to be undertaken, and ascertaining how each is to be assessed, with resulting data used to provide the impetus for effective program change. This process requires work but may provide the opportunity to take educational leadership programs to another level, address program weaknesses, and build on program strengths. While it is still a work in progress for our program, we recognize the benefits to be gained for educational leadership programs, faculty, and most importantly, students.

Author Biographies

Dr. Anita M. Varrati is assistant professor of preK-12 educational administration at Kent State University. She marks over 26 years as an educator with 18 years of administrative experience including middle school principal, K-12 district language development coordinator, and assistant executive director of an educational service agency. She received her doctorate in Educational Administration and Policy Studies at the University of Pittsburgh. Her most recent publication, "The ESA: Is it a Link between Top-Down and Bottom-up Reform," appears in the fall 2005 issue of *Perspectives.*

Dr. Autumn Tooms is assistant professor of preK-12 educational administration at Kent State University. She has administrative experience at the high school, middle school, and elementary school levels. She received her doctorate in Educational Administration and Supervision from Arizona State University. Dr. Tooms has written books focused on school leadership and several articles for various national practitioner-focused journals including *Kappan, Educational Leadership, American School Board Journal, The School Administrator,* and *Principal Leadership*.

Dr. Stephen B. Thomas is professor and coordinator of educational administration at Kent State University. He received his doctorate from the University of Florida. Previously he was at Madison College, Texas Tech University, and St. Johns University. His primary national association is the Education Law Association, for which he has served as president and interim executive director. His most recent books are *Public School Law*; *Legal Rights of Teachers and Students*; and *Students, Colleges, and Disability Law.*

References

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders.* The Education Schools Project. Retrieved August 10, 2005, from http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Final313.pdf#search='educating%20school%20leaders.

Schmoker, M. (1999). *Results: the key to continuous improvement,* 2nd Edition. Arlington, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

A Day at the SPA (Successful Practices of Andragogy): How to Use the ELCC Standards and Adult Learning Theory to Sustain a "Self-As-Principal" Voice in Principal Preparation Students

Mack T. Hines III, EdD
Assistant Professor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX

Introduction

Each year, students satisfy theoretical and field-based requirements to graduate from principal preparation programs. However, many of them still feel unprepared to lead schools. Translation: principal preparation programs must continuously develop strategies that enhance their students' abilities to serve as school principals.

The researcher relates this goal to his "Self-As-Principal" theory. The researcher theorizes that students enter principal preparation programs with emerging "Self-As-Principal" voices. A "Self-As-Principal" voice is the confidence to serve as a school principal. This voice is made of an inner "Self-As-Student" voice and "Self-As-Teacher" voice. The "Self-As-Student" voice allows students to receive and recall information on school leadership. The "Self-As-Teacher" voice allows students to analyze and interpret this information for higher level meaning. School principals are required to direct schools in accordance to the interests and needs of students and teachers. Thus, the "Self-As-Student" voice and "Self-As-Teacher" voice will collectively establish the "Self-As-Principal" voice in principal preparation students.

Many principal preparation programs use lectures and note-taking to achieve this goal. However, this cognitive structure won't sustain a "Self-As-Principal" voice in the students. Principal preparation programs can help students find and keep this voice by engaging them in authentic school leadership experiences. This study sought to determine if the Educational Leadership Council Standards (ELCC; Wilmore, 2002) and Malcolm Knowles' (1970) adult learning theory could create these experiences.

Theoretical Framework

E is For ELCC

The ELCC standards are guidelines for developing principal preparation students' leadership skills (Wilmore, 2002). This seven-standard framework indicates that principals are school leaders who can:

- create a shared school vision;
- promote a positive school culture;
- manage resources and materials;
- communicate with parents and community leaders;
- display character and ethics; and

- respond to legal and political issues that affect schools.

The seventh standard requires aspiring school leaders to practice implementing the first six standards into schools.

Knowles Knows Best

Malcolm Knowles is the pioneer of the adult learning theory (Candy, 1991). In *Modern Practice of Adult Education*, Knowles (1970) defined andragogy as the science of teaching adults. He further indicated that adults have a strong psychological desire to be viewed as self-directed learners. As a result, they strive to quickly move from dependent to independent learning experiences. Knowles further outlined other andragogical characteristics of adult learners indicating that adults have a strong desire to:

- understand the relevance of learning information;
- learn information that tap into their past experiences;
- assume active roles in negotiating the learning process; and
- engage in learning experiences that prepare them for life and work situations.

Consequently, instructors should create classrooms that consist of:

- mutual planning;
- open-ended discussions;
- formative and summative evaluations; and
- sequential learning objectives and activities.

He theorized that these parameters create meaningful and relevant learning experiences for adult students. An advocate of Knowles' theory, the researcher has incorporated andragogical teaching strategies into educational leadership courses. This study investigated the use of the adult learning theory and ELCC standards to sustain a "Self-As-Principal" voice in principal preparation students.

Case Study

The researcher created a case study that determined if the ELCC Standards and adult learning theory could develop "Self-As-Principal" voices in principal preparation students. What follows is a description of and results from this case study.

"Self-As-Principal" Phase One: Self-as-Conference Builder

The researcher started the class by introducing the students to the ELCC Standards. The researcher demonstrated how these standards would help them understand the principalship. The researcher also specified that the standards would build their confidence to be principals.

To put structure to strategy, the researcher replaced the traditional classroom lecture model with a staff development center. Dufour and Berkey (1995) indicated that staff development activities are designed to develop the professional growth of faculty and staff members. Principals nurture this process by engaging the faculty and staff in training that relates to their professional interests and needs. Consequently, the staff development activities become learning experiences that change the faculty and staff members' behavior towards school related concepts and issues.

Drawing upon this theory, the researcher informed the students that they would hold reflective conferences instead of classroom lectures. The researcher then assembled the students into five groups of three co-principals. Afterwards, the researcher told the co-principal groups that they would serve as staff developers for one of the chapters of the book. During the staff development presentations, the co-principal groups agreed to simultaneously view the audience as fellow principals, faculty, and staff members.

As principals, the students would define their intentions for using the staff development to lead a school. As faculty and staff members, the students would describe their intentions for using the staff development to lead classrooms. In addition to self-evaluations, they also agreed to evaluate each other's performances. Each co-principal group contributed to the development of an ELCC-centered rubric for evaluation procedures. Afterwards, each co-principal group picked a chapter to present to their fellow principals, faculty, and staff members.

"Self-As-Principal" Phase Two: Self-as-Staff Developer

The first co-principal group conducted a staff development presentation entitled "The Principal as Student Services Leader." They discussed how the principal should stay abreast of the issues that affect student development and achievement. The second co-principal group presented on the topic "The Principal as Decision-Maker." They explained why principals must be able to make good decisions. The third co-principal group conducted a staff development presentation entitled "The Principal as Communicator." These group members challenged their faculty members to overcome personal biases to effectively receive information from other people. The fourth co-principal group elaborated on the responsibilities of "The Principal as Human Resource Manager." During this presentation, the group members explained how principals should select and choose personnel for their schools. The fifth co-principal group conducted a presentation entitled "The Principal as Change Agent." These presenters provide their faculty and staff members with strategies for facilitating change. They also discussed how to deal with resistance to change.

Each co-principal group involved their fellow principals and faculty and staff members in their presentations. They particularly provided them with hands-on activities that reinforced the concepts. The co-principal groups also engaged their fellow principals and faculty and staff members in open-ended discussions about the relevance of the concepts to current school leadership issues.

After each chapter presentation, the co-principal groups reiterated the main points of their presentations. As fellow principals and faculty and staff members, the students provided their co-principal groups with feedback regarding their performances. In particular, they identified at least three ideas gathered from the presentations. As principals, the students discussed how they would use the staff developments to serve teachers and students.

As faculty members, the same students indicated how they planned to use the staff developments to serve students. They then completed the evaluation rubrics. The researcher synthesized the dialogue by engaging the groups in discussions about the relationship between the presentations and the ELCC Standards. The researcher then conducted conference calls with school principals who used the ELCC standards that address the topics of the presentations.

"Self-As-Principal" Phase Three: Self-As-Reflective Practitioner

The researcher provided the co-principal groups with their fellow principals and faculty and staff members' quantitative and qualitative feedback on their performances. The researcher then administered an oral and written exam to the co-principal groups. Both exams consisted of information that was gathered from the presentations. During the oral exam, the researcher provided the co-principal groups with other co-principals' names and concepts from their presentations. The researcher then asked the co-principals to explain the relationship between the concepts and their overall relevancy to the ELCC Standards. The written exam required the co-principals to explain how these concepts related to their philosophy of educational leadership. The researcher evaluated both exams in accordance to their implications towards the ELCC Standards and school leadership.

"Self-As-Principal" Phase Four: Self-As-Community Leader

During this phase, the co-principals interviewed school stakeholders to determine their perceptions of assistant principals. In addition to practicing administrators, they asked teachers, counselors, parents, and students to define the characteristics and duties of an effective assistant principal. The co-principals aligned the results with the ELCC Standards. They also translated the results into an assistant principal job description. Overall, the co-principals used them to gain a better understanding of how they will be viewed in their initial roles of school leadership.

The results from the study indicated that the school and community leaders used ELCC Standard Three to describe the characteristics of an effective assistant principal. They implicated that the assistant principal should primarily be a strong disciplinarian who creates a safe learning environment. But the co-principals strongly disagreed with the results from their study. This disagreement was due to the staff developments and reflective discussions. These activities showed them that the initial position of school leadership could transcend routine managerial duties. As a result, the co-principals invited their interviewees to class to discuss the findings with them. They informed the interviewees of their visions for the role of the assistant principal. The co-principal groups then discussed how to prevent misperceptions from created distorted views of school leadership.

Results

At the end of the semester, the researcher administered a four-item questionnaire to the co-principals. The questionnaire consisted of ten leadership traits that were embedded in the ELCC Standards. They were Change Master, Communicator, Researcher, Envisioner, Culture Builder, Encourager, Educator, Harmonizer, and Facilitator. The questions required the co-principals to identify the leadership traits used during each phase of the class. The answers were used to determine if the course developed "Self-As-Principal" voices in the students.

The first question asked the co-principals to identify the leadership characteristics used to participate in the "Self-As-Conference Builder" phase. During the phase, the co-principals stated that they were "Culture Builders." The reason is that they contributed to creating the rubric that evaluated their performances. One co-principal remarked: "I felt that that it was a clever idea to let us create the rubric. That way, we all played a major role in building the culture and climate for the presentations and the entire class!"

The "Self-As-Staff Developer" phase question two was divided into three parts. The first part asked the co-principals to identify the leadership traits that helped them to conduct the staff development presentations. A majority of the co-principals stated that they used the "Communicator" and "Envisioner" trait to conduct their presentations. A representative response read:

> "I was able to envision the staff development through the use of the rubric. The rubric allowed me to communicate accurate information to my fellow principals and faculty and staff members."

A large number of co-principals stated that they used the "Researcher" trait to deliver staff development presentations to their faculty members. For example, consider this response:

> "I felt that I was a researcher, because I and my co-principals used the Internet to gather many different areas of information for our presentation."

The second part of the question asked the co-principal to identify the leadership traits that allowed them to evaluate their peers' comprehension of the staff development presentations. The co-principals stated that they used the "Encourager" and "Culture Builder" traits during this part of the presentation. Sample responses included but were not limited to:

> "The rubric encouraged me to think of being a culture builder in order to communicate my information."

> "When we monitored the faculty and other principals, we encouraged them to be a part of new ideas and new ways of seeing particular circumstances from other points of view."

The third part asked the co-principals to identify the leadership traits used to evaluate their peers' presentations. The co-principals identified "Encourager" and "Culture builder" as the most significant traits. One of the most important statements was:

> "The peer assessment was meant to evaluate, and we used it to provide each other with encouraging feedback. In this process, I think that we built a culture of professionals who worked to create thought-provoking presentations. Also, we built a culture that nurtured a scholarly environment."

The researcher used the feedback from the pencil-and-paper examination to generalize about the "Self-As-Reflective Practitioner" phase.

The third question asked the co-principals to identify the leadership traits that allowed them to complete the "Self-As-Community Leader" phase. An overwhelming majority of the co-principals related that "Harmonizer," "Educator," and "Communicator" helped them to hold mini-conferences with the community leaders. One co-principal wrote:

> "We had to communicate accurate information to these people."

Another co-principal confessed:

> "I felt obligated to educate the interviewees on the potential of the assistant principal."

Another co-principal added:

> "As a harmonizer, I wanted to get my points across in a peaceful manner. Because I was successful, I see how I can use this trait to build a faculty and staff, too."

The fourth question asked the co-principals to explain how the traits and activities enhanced their preparation to serve as school leaders. The co-principals responded that through these experiences, they were able to demonstrate leadership skills. As a result, they were more confident to assume the assistant principal or principal duties of a school. Sample responses included:

> "By helping to design each phase, I can say that the ELCC Standards have been ingrained, internalized, and now to the real world to utilize!"

> "I usually take notes on leadership. This class helped me to feel the traits of leadership. I'm now more ready than ever before to finish my degree and become a school leader."

Other students gave more in-depth testimonies. As an example, consider this response:

> "Wow! Through active participation and engaging activities, students can actually experience the principalship before they actually get to the internship. Each phase showed me how to manage and prepare a school staff. I think the most important thing I learned from these activities is how to professionally argue for what you believe in. As a principal, I will need that!"

Discussion

It appears that the emerging theme of this study was self-directed learning. The underlying concepts were the ELCC Standards and Knowles' (1970) adult learning theory. The reason is that each phase and activity reflected the ELCC standards and elicited adult learning behaviors. They collectively required the students to make independent, self-conceptual moves towards understanding the role of the principal. During this process, the students participated in three transformations. They were a transformation of self, transformation of people, and transformation of culture. During the transformation of self phase, the students' "Self-As-Student" and "Self-As-Teacher" voices caused them to examine their personal and professional views and feelings about the role of the principals. During the transformation of people, the students began to examine how the inherent views of their presentations affected other people. During the transformation of culture, the students realized that their and other students' different and similar belief systems created the class' overall value system for the role of the principal. As a result, this culture collectively enhanced the students' self-directed pursuits to becoming school leaders.

Summary/Conclusion

Principal preparation programs are designed to create and prepare effective school leaders. These programs pursue many pathways to achieve this goal. This study highlighted the significance of framing this pursuit around the ELCC Standards and Knowles' (1970) adult learning theory.

In essence, the students entered the researcher's class as adult learners with two goals. They wanted to develop a better understanding of educational leadership. They also wanted to enhance their preparation to become school principals. The researcher facilitated these goals by engaging the students in ELCC-driven, self-directive learning activities. Each activity developed the students' "Self-As-Student" and "Self-As-Teacher" interpretations of the role of the principal. Consequently, the students developed the emerging "Self-As-Principal" voices needed to serve as school leaders. They also became lifelong, self-directed advocates of voicing their opinions on educational leadership.

Author Biography

Dr. Mack T. Hines III is an assistant professor of educational leadership at Sam Houston State University. His research interests are middle-level education and the role of the principal. He is currently conducting a national research study on the andragogical learning preferences of principal preparation programs and students. Dr. Hines is also a NCATE program trainer and reviewer.

References

Candy, P. (1991) *Self-direction for Lifelong Learning. A comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DuFour, R., & Berkey, T. (1995). The principal as staff developer. *Journal of Staff Development*, 16, 4. Knowles, M. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: from pedagogy to andragogy.* NY: Cambridge Books.

Wilmore, E. (2002). *Applying the ELCC standards.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

School Administration – A Complex Profession Requiring Rigorous Standards

Bronte H. Reynolds, EdD
Associate Professor of Education
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
California State University
Northridge, CA

Steve Marsh felt reasonably comfortable as the attendant guided the gurney through the double doors of the operating room. The sedative, given him by the nurse a half hour earlier, had taken effect, and whatever anxiety he had about having his gall bladder removed prior to coming to the hospital was assuaged by that little pill he had been given moments ago, and by his assurance that thousands of gall bladders had been removed by qualified professionals in this hospital over the years without incident.

Steve was gently transitioned from the gurney to the operating table by the attendant and a couple of nurses, who seemed to smile behind their masks. "Welcome Mr. Marsh. The surgeon will be with you in just a minute. I am Dr. Jones, your anesthesiologist. We're going to give you a little something to make you sleep, and when you wake up, everything will be over." Dr. Jones' reassuring tones were accompanied by a prick of the skin at the top of Steve's hand as a needle was inserted and secured with adhesive tape.

The nurse turned a valve on the drip stand and medication began flowing through Steve's veins. Dr. Smith, the surgeon, emerged quietly and moved to Steve's side.
"Hi, Mr. Marsh. How are you feeling?"

"Pretty good," Steve responded. Seeking what he thought was unnecessary reassurance, Steve asked, "And how many of these have you done, Doc? I suppose they put you through the ringer in med school. You could probably do these operations in your sleep." Steve felt a warm sensation begin to wash over his body as the anesthesia began taking effect. His words started to slur.

"Not to worry, Steve." The surgeon's words were beginning to fade. He engaged Steve and the attendants in general patter while he searched for the point to make the first incision across Steve's abdominal area. The surgeon glanced at one of the nurses and gestured with the scalpel. "About here, would you say?" "Wrong side," responded a voice from behind the mask of one of the nurses. She guided the surgeon's hand to the proper spot.

Dr. Smith turned his attention back to Steve who, by this time was beginning to get a bit fuzzy. "Not to worry, at all, Steve," he repeated. I've done one of these already, and it turned out reasonably well. Oh, and about med school? I got lucky. Just before I signed up and paid all that tuition, the state passed a law saying that I could "test out" and get my medical degree and license if I passed. And, wouldn't you know it, there were two questions on the test about gall bladders and I got them both right."

Steve wasn't sure if the response he heard was real or anesthesia-induced fantasy as he drifted into unconsciousness.

There is a point to this analogy. What, heretofore, has been the only path to a California Administrative Credential, specifically the successful completion of an accredited, post-graduate college or university program, is now just one of several alternatives for acquiring the credential. One such alternative is the ability of a prospective candidate with limited teaching experience to take an examination prepared by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), which targets understanding of the role of education administration standards set by the International School Licensure and Administration Consortium (ISLAC). The test, which is devoid of any reference to school finance, school law, or special education, has had its first rounds of administration, with a significantly successful pass rate. There are several other states for whom the ETS has prepared similar tests; however, these states use the examination as a culminating activity to accredited university coursework. California is the only state using the test as a vehicle for licensure in lieu of coursework.

We may not learn if Steve Marsh made it through surgery. What we do know, however, is that the thought of "testing out" in medicine is repugnant to our common sense and would compromise society's confidence in doctors. The American Medical Association simply would not let this happen. This professional organization would rightfully argue that being a doctor is complex, a matter of life and death to patients. Fundamental to a doctor's success is a rigorous program of instruction over several years in order to lay the scholarly foundation upon which is built medical competence and public trust. The medical student must prove him or herself worthy of residency and, eventually, licensure by virtue of his or her academic performance. Society would have it no other way.

So what about becoming a school administrator? Over the decades, we, in education, have waged a noble struggle in an attempt to achieve the respect and dignity worthy of our profession. Our social value, our worthiness, and the critical nature of our success, it can be argued, are every bit as significant as that of practicing medicine. Research consistently demonstrates the positive impact of a well-educated, well-trained principal on his or her school. The circle of influence of an educational leader is profound when considering the lives of those touched by a school principal or a district superintendent throughout a career. And, while death may not be a fateful outcome for the students they serve, thoughtful and rigorous preparation of an educational leader is, in fact, a matter of life.

Those in the field of educational administration continue with this struggle for recognition, not for self-serving reasons but for a greater social good. Our collective communities must understand our value. We turn to our professional organizations for support and guidance in this endeavor. We look to our organizations' leaders to reinforce our image and add credibility to the complicated nature of our profession. We rely on their wisdom and their leadership to affect the paradigm change for those skeptics in politics, in business, and in our neighborhoods. Skeptics who believe school principals, district superintendents, and others in positions of educational leadership are non-essential employees in a failing bureaucracy, whose primary role is to serve as a lightening rod for disgruntled citizens. Just when the heroes and heroines in positions of administrative leadership have made painfully slow progress toward professional recognition, they find that in one fleeting moment, their status has been compromised. Any progress toward public trust has received a major set-back by de-professionalizing educational administration with the new law and California Commission on Teaching Credentialing regulations that provide for administrative credential achievement by testing out.

Motivation to pursue administrative credential alternatives arises from the dearth of qualified applicants for administrative positions generated statewide over the past decade. There are other ways to attract candidates to the field other than by de-professionalizing the profession with tests in lieu of coursework, especially when considering the growing complexity of the profession.

How logical and proactive it would be for professional administrative organizations to direct their expertise, political savvy, and revenue squarely at enhancing the significance of the role of the school administrator and improve economic benefits. In addition, the profession would be well-served if these organizations made the effort to collaborate with institutions of higher learning to develop programs and scholarly work that recognize the complexity of the role and dignify positions of educational leadership in our schools. The challenge is enormous. With a society so conditioned to instant gratification, intense global competition, material benefit, I recommend that the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and its state affiliates must eschew the quick fix afforded by testing in lieu of quality administrative preparation programs. Actions must be taken in order to secure an administrative credential and avoid being swept up in the wake of a trend that compromises the status of its members.

The profession needs help. The power of AASA is an important cornerstone for that support. Our students, from the well-served in the high wealth districts to the under-served in the inner-city schools, would be the beneficiaries of AASA's continued work toward an effective support system of continuous learning, planning, and promotion of economic benefit for its members. This, unlike taking a test, is the professional way.

By the way, Steve Marsh is doing well after removal of his … appendix.

Author Biography

Dr. Bronte H. Reynolds is associate professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at California State University, Northridge, a position he has held for the past four years. Previously he had 38 years of professional involvement in California's public schools as a teacher, school principal, and district superintendent. He earned his BA and MA degrees from San Francisco State University and his EdD degree from the University of Southern California. Dr. Reynolds' most recent article, "Searching for the Best to do Their Best," was published in the best practices journal of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators, and he has presented the concept of teacher selection at conventions in Atlanta and San Diego.

How about it, Writer?

Ann K. Nauman, PhD
Professor of Educational Leadership and Technology
Southeastern Louisiana University
Hammond, LA

How about it, Writer? is a work which would serve quite nicely as a textbook for a creative writing class. The author has gleaned opening sentences from, according to his preface, over 12,000 essays in various publications and over many years. His premise is that words he has highlighted in these excerpts could be used in solving word and sentence construction problems encountered by a writer of essays and speeches.

The book is rather difficult to use for several reasons. First, the format of the book – a 8 ½ x 11, tightly bound paperback – makes it unwieldy for the user. It would be far more usable if it were spiral bound. Second, there is so much didactic information that it takes too much time to wade through it all just to find out how to use the book, although this introductory matter might be very useful to the creative writing instructor who adopts the work as a class text.

Unfortunately, one of the things that the writers of essays need is almost totally absent in the work: proper documentation and instruction on how to properly document sources. The author has only documented chapters 10 and 11, and it is difficult to determine just what quotations came from which essays. The book would be much more usable if it were offering fully documented quotations which writers and speakers could use in their entirety; a sort of collection of quotations categorized by subject rather than by sentence construction.

Reference

Romesburg, H. Charles. (2005). *How about it, Writer?* Morrisville, NC: Lulu Press. 190 pp. $22.95 ($16.95 from the publisher), softcover

Author Guidelines

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

Author Guidelines

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

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

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

The type of submission must be indicated on the cover sheet in order to be considered. Articles are to be submitted to the editor by e-mail as an electronic attachment in Microsoft Word 2003.

Book Review Guidelines

Book review guidelines should adhere to the Author Guidelines as found above and on the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* website at *www.aasa.org/publications*.

The format of the book review is to include the following:

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

Book reviews may be submitted by e-mail as an electronic attachment to Fred Dembowski, Editor, *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, at fdembowski@selu.edu.

Additional Information

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

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

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