URBAN PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP SKILL PROFICIENCY

AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Paper Presentation

Leadership for School Improvement SIG

AERA Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.

April 13-19, 2009

Dr. Pam Winn, Tarleton State University, Educational Administration and Policy Studies
        winn@tarleton.edu
Dr. Sue Erwin, Tarleton State University, Curriculum and Instruction
        erwin@tarleton.edu
Dr. Jim Gentry, Tarleton State University, Curriculum and Instruction
        gentry@tarleton.edu
Dr. Mary Cauble, Tarleton State University, Tarleton School Leadership Alliance
        cauble@tarleton.edu

URBAN PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP SKILL PROFICIENCY

AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Abstract

Because of the importance of developing highly skilled urban school leaders, statewide assessments of 248 urban Texas public school administrators were analyzed to determine principal confidence levels in leadership skill domains identified by the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA). Important findings indicate differences exist between urban principal skill sets in relation to campus student academic achievement as measured by state accountability ratings. Leadership skills of urban principals from schools with the state's highest student academic ratings differed from principals at lower rated urban schools.

URBAN PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP SKILL PROFICIENCY

AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Introduction

Literature related to the urban principalship focuses on four challenges: low SES/high minority population, inexperienced teachers, increasing numbers of dropouts and loss of students (and related revenue) to charter schools. Thus, there is a pronounced need for effective, skilled leaders in urban schools. Urban schools produce overwhelming challenges for public school principals: student enrollment is primarily minority and low-income (Nevarez & Wood, 2007; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; Dittman, 2004; Orfield & Lee, 2004; Porter & Soper, 2003; Lippam, 1996); academic achievement is lower for minority and low-income students (Council of the Great City Schools, 2008), and dropout rates are higher (Laird, DeBell, Kienzl, & Chapman, 2007). Furthermore, diversity in urban schools is reflected in varying student languages, religions, customs, and traditions as well as social behavior patterns and attitudes (Ryan, 2003). In addition, urban public school students are taught by greater numbers of inexperienced and under-certified teachers in schools that are more likely to be classified as underperforming (Humphrey, Koppich, & Hough 2005; Cortney & Coble, 2005; Marnie, 2002). Although recent demographic data suggests a growth in the number of women and minorities hired as principals in urban schools, veteran public school administrators (those with10 or more years of experience) are predominantly White and male ("The Changing Face Of Principals", 2008; Tillman, 2003).

As if the complexity of administering diverse urban schools is not challenging enough, the school choice movement adds disproportionate pressure on urban school administrators to maintain student enrollment in failing schools (May, 2007). Two thirds of the charter school

student population come from urban public schools (Jewell, 2004) and, in the nation's largest urban districts, the number of students who opted to enroll in charter schools tripled between 2002 and 2004 (Lewis, 2004). The unintended consequence of transfers from public to charter school is reduction in funding for failing urban schools at time when budgets are already stretched (Lasley & Binbirdge, 2001).

If urban public schools are to succeed, one critical requirement is quality school leadership (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Lesotte, 1992, 1991; Reynolds, 1990; Edmonds, 1979). Twenty five years of education research confirms that school leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing student achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Furthermore, countries worldwide have recognized that as school administrator responsibilities continue to increase, a growing need for developing effective school leadership is requisite(Olson, 2008). Consequently, it is essential to identify effective leadership skills for urban principals and determine the extent to which acting principals possess these skills. Targeting specific leadership skills related to student achievement might provide university principal preparation programs and public school district staff development programs with a focus for future development of effective leaders. Ultimately, this may improve student achievement and school performance in urban schools.

Because of urgency for developing highly skilled urban school leaders, this study attempted to identify the leadership skills of practicing urban administrators and determine whether these skills were related to student achievement.

Review of Literature

Principal Effect on Student Achievement

Studies in the U.S. from the last 40 years overwhelmingly support the premise that when schools have an effective principal, students are more likely to achieve academically (Cotton, 1995; Lezotte, 1992). A review of world-wide studies (Hallinger & Heck, 1996) found similar results. Furthermore, a definitive review of thirty years of research by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) established both a practical and statistical significance in the relationship between student achievement and the quality of school leadership.

Less formally, the importance of effective leadership is also recognized within the public school community, in spite of the difficulty in identifying and assessing the composite required skills. According to Rammer's (2007) findings, superintendents acknowledge the crucial role effective principals play in the development of schools even though they have no effective means of assessing those skills in potential administrative candidates. Likewise, Hallinger, Bickman, and Davis (1996) report that parents and teachers believe principals make a difference in the achievement of students and the learning environment.

Findings from these studies suggest that even when it is difficult to discern which skills are requisite to effective leadership, there is little doubt among researchers or stakeholders that effective leadership positively affects student achievement.

Principal Assessment

Research confirms that principal effectiveness is important, yet there is no consistent or formalized method for identifying the most highly skilled principals. As noted in Rammer's (2007) study for example, superintendents' belief in the value of particular leadership characteristics does not guarantee their ability to correctly assess these skills in potential employees. Adding to the complexity of assessment, findings from a study of new principals (Daresh, 2007) suggest they do not consider critical instructional issues until they first become

comfortable with managing school, further hindering chances for academic improvement. Furthermore, new principals are likely to assess their own performance in terms of management skills rather than instructional leadership. Baxter (2008) posits this may result from university-based principal preparation programs that apply a business manager metaphor to public school administration rather than one of community leader and public servant. Anagnostopoulus and Rutlege (2007) observed that because urban schools are likely to face state and district sanctions for low performing schools, sanctions rather than best practice have become the focus of urban school administrators. Additional findings suggest that, in such an atmosphere, administrators are more likely to resort to the use of top-down managerial skills rather than collaborative instructional leadership skills. Fewer (from 15% to 5%) principals enter administration directly from the classroom (from 15% to 5%), suggesting another disconnect from the skills of instructional leadership ("The Changing Face of Principals", 2008). Present circumstances and the convergence of these factors, do little to guarantee quality leadership or stem urban school failure.

In spite overwhelming evidence of the principals' essential role in creating effective schools, measuring leadership effectiveness has yet to be adequately formalized either by urban school districts or by urban principals.

Effective Principal Self-Assessment

Among challenges urban school administrators face, self-assessment might be relegated to the end of the list as less urgent. However, personal introspection is prerequisite to understanding complexities of any leadership position. The interdependent nature of a school community makes it necessary for administrators to reflect, identify and confront their feelings and beliefs about education before they can effectively assess their job-related strengths and

weaknesses (Bennis, 1994). Tredway, Brill, and Hernandez (2007) observed this connection

between a principal's reflection on daily school experiences and resulting leadership actions.

Similarly, Krovetz (1999) posited that continual reflection is foundational for effective

leadership. Without reflection, urban principals cannot accurately assess their skills in relation to

the diversity within their campuses and the standards by which they are held accountable.

In spite of overwhelming evidence that principals have an essential role creating effective

schools, measuring their leadership effectiveness has not been adequately formalized either by

urban school districts or by urban administrators. The following study attempted to identify the

relationship between the leadership skills of urban principals and campus student achievement as

measured by current state accountability ratings. Demonstrating the mutuality of specific

leadership skills and measureable academic achievement would also provide a basis for

reflection and school reform.

<center>Procedure</center>

Every five years in Texas, principals are required to participate in a state-approved

professional development performance assessment. Records from one such assessment, Principal

Assessment of Student Success (PASS), provided the data for this study (see Appendix A). One

component of the PASS assessment requires school administrators to rate themselves on 14

leadership knowledge and skill domains (see Appendix B) identified by Thompson (1993) and

adopted by the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA). PASS principal

self-ratings from 2006 to 2008 determined which NPBEA skills predominated among Texas

urban administrators in terms of student achievement as measured by the state of Texas public

school accountability ratings Academically Acceptable (AA), Recognized (R) or Exemplary (E)

(see Appendix C).

PASS NPBEA skills were divided into four domains and ranked by principals within

each domain: functional domain (seven skills), programming domain (six skills), interpersonal

domain (four skills), and contextual domain (one skill). The 14 NPBEA skills were not ranked

overall (1-14). Data for one skill (*Implementation)* within the functional domain were incomplete

due to a malfunction in the database and were omitted. Furthermore, because only one skill was

listed in the contextual domain (*Legal and Regulatory Applications*), it could not be ranked and,

therefore, was also omitted.

In addition, PASS data provided assessments from teams (two assessors per principal) as

to the predominant NPBEA skills exhibited by each urban principal. PASS assessors were

recruited among veteran campus and central office administrators, as well as from university

educational leadership departments within the state of Texas. Sampled principals provided

evidence of their job performance in a variety of ways (campus improvement plan, state

accountability data, Adequate Yearly Progress phone interview, teacher performance data, and

student performance data). Based on this evidence, assessors cooperatively identified each

principal's NPBEA leadership strengths. The top three skills identified by assessors for all

principals sampled were tallied and categorized in terms of student achievement as measured by

campus accountability ratings (AA, R, or E).

Finally, to identify the relationship between the leadership skills of urban principals and

campus student achievement, NPBEA skills identified by sampled principals were compared to

NPBEA skills identified by assessors within student achievement categories as measured by

campus accountability ratings (AA, R, or E). Because NPBEA skills *Implementation, and Legal*

and Regulatory Applications were omitted from the data set of principal rankings, they could not

be compared to ratings by assessors. It was decided to remove ratings of those three skills from the assessor data set as well.

Participants

PASS data accessed from principal evaluations conducted throughout the state of Texas from 2006 through 2008 yielded records of 248 urban school principals, representing 51.6 % (128) elementary, 20.2% (50) middle, and 28.2% (70) high school campuses.

Table 1

Frequency Counts and Percentages of Texas Accountability Ratings by Urban School Type (N=248)

	Academically Acceptable (AA)		Recognized (R)		Exemplary (E)		Total	
	Count %	Of Total %	Count %	Of Total %	Count %	Of Total %	Total Count	Table %
Urban Elementary Campuses	68 (39.3%)	27.4	48 (76.2%)	19.4	12 (100%)	4.8	128	51.6
Urban Middle School Campuses	39 (22.5%)	15.7	11 (17.5%)	4.4	0 (0%)	0	50	20.2
Urban High School Campuses	66 (38.2%)	26.6	4 (6.3%)	1.6	0 (0%)	0	70	28.2
Total	173 (100%)	69.8	63 (100%)	25.4	12 (100%)	4.8	248	100

The 248 campuses of sampled principals were identified by Texas state accountability ratings (AA, R, E; see Table 1). Elementary schools received more Academically Acceptable (AA) ratings compared to middle school and high school and campuses with 39.3% (68), 22.5% (39),

and 38.2% (66), respectively. Elementary campuses also lead in Recognized (R) ratings 76.2%

(48) compared to middle and high schools 11% (17.5) and 6.3% (4), respectively. In addition,

only elementary schools were rated Exemplary (E) as compared to high schools and middle

schools by 100% (12), 0%, and 0%, respectively. Unequal representation of schools at each

instructional level (elementary, middle and high school) within each state accountability level

(AA, R, E) may have affected interpretation of study findings. However, the dispersion of these

data reflects the pattern of accountability ratings in Texas. Overall, urban campuses rated

Academically Acceptable (AA) were associated with 173(69.8%) of sampled principals, the

largest group, while urban campuses rated Recognized (R) and Exemplary (E) were associated

with 63(25.4%) and 12(4.8%) sampled principals, respectively.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to calculate principal and assessor rankings. Chi-square

cross tabulation tables determined dependence/independence by school accountability ratings

and principals' NPBEA skill ranking frequency counts per NPBEA domain. Significant

differences and effect sizes were reported.

<div align="center">Results</div>

<div align="center">*Principal Self-Rankings of NPBEA Functional Domain Skills*</div>

The NPBEA functional domain skills included: *Leadership, Information Collection,*

Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Oversight, Implementation, and *Delegation*. As

noted, the skill of *Implementation* was omitted due to missing data. Principals ranked themselves

on functional domain skills using a seven point scale. Rankings for one of the 248 urban school

principals was not complete for the remaining six skills and was omitted; only data from the

remaining 247 principal skill rankings were computed. The ranking omitted represented an AA

rated campus. Rankings were categorized as skills in which principals were Less Confident

(ranks 5- 7), Confident (rank 4), or Most Confident (ranks 1- 3). Categorized rankings were then sorted by campus state accountability ratings: Academically Acceptable (AA), Recognized (R), and Exemplary (E) as seen in Table 2.

Table 2

Frequency Counts and Percentages: Texas Accountability Ratings by Principal Ranked NPBEA Functional Domain Skills (N= 248; n= 247)

NPBEA Functional Domain Skills	Academically Acceptable(AA)				Recognized(R)				Exemplary(E)			
	Less Confident	Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL	Less Confident	Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL	Less Confident	Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL
Leadership	24 (14.0%)	14 (8.1%)	134 (77.9%)	172 (100%)	5 (7.9%)	5 (7.9%)	53 (84%)	63 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (16.7%)	10 (83.3%)	12 (100%)
Information Collection	68 (39.5%)	28 (16.3%)	76 (44.2%)	172 (100%)	22 (34.9%)	12 (19.0%)	29 (46.0%)	63 (100%)	5 (41.7%)	3 (25%)	4 (33.3%)	12 (100%)
Problem Analysis	48 (27.4%)	37 (21.5%)	87 (50.6%)	172 (100%)	9 (14.3%)	14 (22.2%)	40 (63.5%)	63 (100%)	3 (25%)	1 (8.3%)	8 (66.7%)	12 (100%)
Judgment	34 (19.8%)	33 (19.25%)	105 (61%)	172 (100%)	20 (31.7%)	15 (23.8%)	28 (44.4%)	63 (100%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)	6 (50.0%)	12 (100%)
Organizatio n Oversight	103 (59.9%)	21 (12.2%)	48 (27.9%)	172 (100%)	43 (68.3%)	4 (68.3%)	16 (25.%)	63 (100%)	7 (58.3%)	3 (25%)	2 (16.7%)	12 (100%)
Delegation	114 (66.35)	17 (9.9%)	41 (23.8%)	172 (100%)	46 (73.0%)	1 (91.6%)	16 (25.%)	63 (100%)	6 (50.0%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)	12 (100%)
Total Count Averages	65	25	82		24	9	30		3	3	5	

Note. Less Confident = (ranks 5-7), Confident = (rank 4), Most Confident= (ranks 1-3); =divided by.

Skill ranking levels (Less Confident, Confident, Most Confident) across campus accountability ratings manifested similar frequency count patterns per NPBEA skills. With the exception of the *Information Collection* skill, each remaining NPBEA functional domain skill was ranked Most Confident per Texas accountability rating (AA, R, E). *Information Collection* was rated Most Confident at AA (6/44.2%) and R (29/46.0%) rated campuses, while it was rated Less Confident at E rated campuses (5/41.73%). *Organizational Oversight* and *Delegation* skills were ranked Less Confident among all three accountability rating categories: AA = 103/59.9%, R = 43/68.3%, and E = 7/58.3%; AA = 114/66.35%, R = 46/73.0%, and E = 6/55.0%, respectively.

Frequency count averages for skills ranked Less Confident were lower than frequency counts averages for skills ranked Most Confident per campus accountability rating category. This tendency for sampled principals was to assess their skills as Most Confident, rather than Less Confident, regardless of their campus accountability rating. Finally, chi-square comparisons between campus accountability ratings and NPBEA functional domain skill ranking frequency counts proved non-significant.

Principal Self-Rankings of NPBEA Programming Domain Skills

The NPBEA programming domain included rankings of six skills: *Instructional Management, Curriculum Design, Student Guidance and Development, Staff Development, Measurement and Evaluation,* and *Resource Allocation*. Principals ranked themselves on the programming domain skills using a six point scale. Principal rankings were categorized as Less Confident (ranks 5 - 6), Confident (ranks 3 - 4), or Most Confident (ranks 1 - 2), across the six domain skills. Rankings for four of the 248 urban school principals were not complete for all six

skills and their rankings were omitted; only data from the remaining 244 principal skill rankings were computed. The four principal rankings omitted all represented AA rated campuses. The remaining principals represented 169/69.3% campuses with AA ratings, the largest group, while sampled principals at R and E rated campuses comprised 63/26.8% and 12/4.9%, respectively (See Table 3).

Table 3

Frequency Counts and Percentages: Texas Accountability Ratings by Principal Ranked NPBEA Programming Domain Skills (N= 248; n= 244)

NPBEA Programming Domain Skills	Academically Acceptable				Recognized				Exemplary			
	Less Confident	Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL	Less Confident	Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL	Less Confident	Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL
Instructional Management	25 (14.8%)	48 (28.4%)	96 (56.8%)	169 (100%)	15 (23.8%)	22 (34.9%)	26 (41/3%)	63 (100%)	3 (25%)	2 (16.7%)	7 (58.3%)	12 (100%)
Curriculum Design	63 (37.3%)	58 (34.3%)	48 (28.4%)	169 (100%)	28 (44.4%)	18 (28.6%)	17 (27.0%)	63 (100%)	6 (50.0%)	3 (25%)	3 (25%)	12 (100%)
Guidance Development	46 (27.2%)	53 (31.4%)	70 (41.4%)	169 (100%)	15 (23.8%)	17 (27.0%0	31 (49.2%)	63 (100%)	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.7%)	5 (41.7%)	12 (100%)
Staff Development	53 (31.4%)	71 (42.0%)	45 (26.6%)	169 (100%)	16 (25.4%)	31 (49.2%)	16 (25.4%)	63 (100%)	1 (8.3%)	4 (33.3%)	7 (58.3%)	12 (100%)
Measure. & Evaluation	61 (36.1%)	67 (39.6%)	41 (24.3%)	169 (100%)	20 (31.7%)	25 (39.7%)	18 (28.6%)	63 (100%)	4 (33.3%)	7 (58.3%)	1 (8.3%)	12 (100%)

Resource Allocation	86 (50.9%)	38 (22.5%)	45 (26.6%)	169 (100%)	32 (50.8%)	13 (20.6%)	18 (28.6%)	63 (100%)	8 (66.7%)	3 (25%)	1 (8.3%)	12 (100%)
Total Count Averages	56	56	58		23	21	21		4	4	4	

Note. Less Confident = (ranks 5-6), Confident = (ranks 3- 4), Most Confident= (ranks 1-2); =divided by.

Two of the six NPBEA skills in the programming domain, *Instructional Management* and *Student Guidance and Development*, were ranked Most Confident per campus accountability rating. Furthermore, *Curriculum and Design* and *Resource Allocation* skill rankings featured higher Less Confident rankings across all campus accountability ratings. The *Measurement and Evaluation* skill ranking also followed a similar pattern per campus accountability rating; however, in this case Confident rankings produced the highest counts. Although *Staff Development* was ranked highest at the Most Confident level per E campus accountability rating (7/58.3%), AA and R principal's ranked *Staff Development* as Confident (71/42.0% and 31/49.2%, respectively).

Total count averages by ranking level per NPBEA skill were not unique and differed slightly within each accountability rating. Chi-square comparisons between campus accountability ratings and NPBEA programming domain skill ranking frequency counts proved non-significant or violated expectancy count assumptions.

Principal Self-Rankings of NPBEA Interpersonal Domain Skills

The NPBEA interpersonal domain included four skills: *Sensitivity, Oral and Nonverbal Expression, Written Expression,* and *Motivation of Others*. Principals ranked themselves on interpersonal domain skills using a four point scale. Principal rankings were categorized as Less Confident (ranks 3-4) or Most Confident (ranks 1- 2) across the four domain skills. Rankings for four of the 248 urban school principals were not complete for all four skills and their rankings

were omitted; only data from the remaining 244 principal skill rankings were computed. The

four principal rankings omitted, all represented AA rated schools. The remaining principals

represented 169/69.3% campuses with AA ratings, the largest group, while sampled principals at

R and E rated campuses comprised 63/26.8% and 12/4.9%, respectively (See Table 4).

Table 4

Frequency Counts and Percentages: Texas Accountability Ratings by Principal Ranked NPBEA

Interpersonal Domain Skills (N= 248; n= 244)

NPBEA Interpersonal Domain Skills	Academically Acceptable (AA)			Recognized(R)			Exemplary (E)		
	Least Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL	Least Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL	Least Confident	Most Confident	TOTAL
Motivating Others	73 (43.2%)	96 (56.8%)	169 (100%)	26 (41.3%)	37 (58.7%)	63 (100%)	6 (50.0%)	6 (50.0%)	12 (100%)
Sensitivity	57 (33.7%)	112 (45.9%)	169 (100%)	27 (42.9%)	36 (57.1%)	63 (100%)	3 (25.0%)	9 (75.0%)	12 (100%)
Oral & Nonverbal Expression	91 (53.8%)	78 (46.2%)	169 (100%)	41 (65.1%)	22 (34.9%)	63 (100%)	6 (50.0%)	6 (50.0%)	12 (100%)
Written Expression	115 (68.0%)	54 (32.0%)	169 (100%)	32 (50.8%)	31 (49.2%)	63 (100%)	9 (75.0%)	3 (25.0%)	12 (100%)
Total Count Averages	84	85		31.5	31.5		6	6	

Note. Less Confident = (ranks 3-4), Most Confident = (ranks 1- 2); /=divided by.

NPBEA interpersonal domain skills differed slightly among principal rankings per accountability

level. Principals, regardless of school accountability rating, rated themselves Most Confident in

the skills of *Motivating Others* and *Sensitivity.* Furthermore, regardless of school accountability

rating, principals ranked themselves Less Confident in skill *Written Expression*. On the other hand, while *Oral and Nonverbal Expression* was ranked Less Confident by AA (91/53.8%) and R (41/65.1%) campus principals, E rated campus leaders split evenly between Most Confident (6/50.0%) and Less Confident (6/50.0%) rankings.

Total count averages by ranking level per NPBEA interpersonal domain skill did not differ by accountability level. AA, R and E categories manifested the same average count totals per ranking level. Chi-square comparisons between campus accountability ratings and NPBEA interpersonal domain skill frequency counts proved non-significant for all domain skills.

PASS Assessor Ratings of Principal NPBEA Skills

Teams of two PASS assessors cooperatively rated the NPBEA skills of each principal based upon data from multiple sources. A total of 707 ratings were produced by 244 assessor teams (three skills per principal). However, because data for four of the 18 NPBEA skills were unavailable for comparison in the principal ranked data (*Implementation* and *Legal and Regulatory Applications)* those skills were removed from the assessor data set as well (35 from 707 ratings), leaving a total of 672 ratings (see Table 5). In addition, the skills of *Motivating Others and Delegation* were not rated by assessors as part of the PASS evaluation.

TABLE 5

Frequency Counts: Texas Accountability Ratings by Assessor Ratings of Principal NPBEA Skills (N= 244 teams)

NPBEA Domains	Skills	Academically Acceptable (AA)	Recognized (R)	Exemplary(E)	TOTAL RATINGS	Total By Domain
Functional	Leadership	86	28	3	117	322/672 (47.9%)
	Information Collection	51	13	4	68	

	Problem Analysis	15	8	2	25	
	Judgment	29	14	2	45	
	Organizational Oversight	50	16	1	67	
Programming	Instructional Management	32	11	1	44	197/672 (29.3%)
	Curriculum Design	17	10	1	28	
	Student Guidance & Development	49	17	4	70	
	Staff Development	11	3	0	14	
	Measurement & Evaluation	19	6	2	27	
	Resource Allocation	11	3	0	14	
Interpersonal	Sensitivity	67	26	7	97	153/672 (22.8%)
	Oral & Non-verbal Expression	29	12	4	45	
	Written Expression	8	2	1	11	

Note. /=divided by.

Leadership produced the largest frequency count from assessors (117) while the lowest

frequency count was found for *Resource Allocation* (11), a difference of 106 counts (See Table

5). Skills in NPBEA's functional, programming, and interpersonal domains differed in frequency

with 322/47.9%, 197/29.3%, and 153/22.8%, respectively. Functional domain skills netted

greater totals than skills in the programming and interpersonal domains by 18.6% and 25.1%,

respectively.   Overall, within the functional domain, *Leadership(117)* received the largest count

while the highest counts in the programming and interpersonal domain were found for *Student*

Guidance and Development (70) and *Sensitivity* (97).

The five NPBEA skills with highest frequencies by campus accountability level were: AA = *Leadership* (86), *Sensitivity* (67), *Information Collection* (51), *Organizational Oversight* (50), and *Instructional Management* (49); R = *Leadership* (28), *Sensitivity* (26), *Student Guidance and Development* (17), *Organizational Oversight* (16), and *Judgment* (14); and E = *Sensitivity* (7), *Student Guidance and Development* (7), *Oral Communication* (4*), Information Collection* (4), and *Leadership* (3)*. Although different in rank, all groups shared the skills of: *Leadership, Sensitivity*, and *Student Guidance and Development. Organizational Oversight* was common to the AA and R groups while *Information Collection* was common to the AA and E groups. Only two skills were unique to one group; *Judgment* was only noted among principals in the R group and *Oral Communication* was only noted among principals from E rated campuses (see Table 5 and 6).

Comparison of Principal Self- Rankings and Assessor Ratings of NPBEA Skills

by Texas Accountability Ratings

In order to identify the relationship between the leadership skills of urban principals and campus student achievement, NPBEA skills identified by sampled principals were compared to NPBEA skills identified by assessors within student achievement categories as measured by campus accountability ratings (AA, R, or E). Table 6 depicts comparisons of the top NPBEA skills found from principal self-rankings and assessor ratings by campus accountability level.

It should be noted that principals ranked skills within three NPBEA domain groups, whereas assessors rated skills within all 14 skills. This accounts for seeming discrepancies reported in the frequency and percentages of E level principal ratings (see Table 6). Furthermore, as previously mentioned, two NPBEA skills were omitted because data were

missing (*Implementation)* or could not be ranked by principals *(Legal and Regulatory*

Applications).

TABLE 6

Most Frequent NPBEA Skills: Principal and Assessors Ratings by Texas Accountability Ratings

	Academically Acceptable (AA)		Recognized (R)		Exemplary (E)	
Most Confident NPBEA SKILLS From Principal Self-Rankings	Leadership	134 (77.9%)	Leadership	53 (84.0%)	Leadership	10 (83.3%)
	Sensitivity	112 (45.9%)	Problem Analysis	40 (3.5%)	Sensitivity	9 (75.0%)
	Judgment	105 (61%)	Motivating Others	37 (58.7%)	Problem Analysis	8 (66.7%)
	Instructional Management	96 (56.8%)	Student Guidance & Development	31 (49.2%)	Instructional Management	7 (58.3%)
	Problem Analysis	87 (50.6%)	Information Collection	29 (46.0%)	Staff Development	7 (58.3%)
Most Proficient NPBEA SKILLS From Assessor Ratings	Leadership	86	Leadership	28	Sensitivity	7
	Sensitivity	67	Sensitivity	26	Student Guidance & Development	4
	Information Collection	51	Student Guidance & Development	17	Oral communication	4
	Organizational Oversight	50	Organizational Oversight	16	Information Collection	4
	Student Guidance & Development	49	Judgment	14	Leadership	3

Note. # = frequency counts.

Out of the five highest ranked or rated skills, principals from AA rated campus identified only

two NPBEA skills that were also noted by assessors as strength areas: *Leadership* and

Sensitivity. Three skills identified from principal self-rankings but not noted by assessors as most

proficient were *Judgment*, *Instructional Management,* and *Problem Analysis.* Instead, assessor

ratings identified *Information Collection, Organizational Oversight, and Student Guidance and*

Development as AA campus principal strengths.

At campuses with R accountability ratings, assessors and principals also produced similar

ratings for two out of five NPBEA skills: *Leadership* and *Student Guidance and Development*.

However, while principals identified *Problem Analysis, Motivating Others,* and *Information Collection* as strengths, assessors noted *Sensitivity, Organizational Oversight* and *Judgment.*

In the category of E rated campuses, assessors named *Leadership* and *Sensitivity* as strengths, in agreement with principal rankings. However, although principals ranked themselves highest on these skills, assessors rated *Leadership* less strongly. For assessors, E campus principals were strongest in *Student Guidance and Development, Oral Communication* and *Information Collection.* Other skills noted by principals, but not by assessors, were *Problem Analysis, Instructional Management,* and *Staff Development.*

In all campus categories, principal rankings and assessors were consistent in their ratings only 2 out of 5 times. Only four unique skills were noted among these groups: *Motivating Others* and *Judgment*, identified in R campus leaders and *Staff Development* and *Oral Communication* found among E campus principals. This suggests urban school principals from R and E rated schools exhibit different skills than urban principals from AA campuses.

<center>Conclusions</center>

Even though effective leadership positively impacts student achievement, it has proved difficult to discern the requisite skills of effective leaders (Leithewood, et al., 2004; Cotton, 1995; Lezotte, 1992; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Marzano et al., 2006). In this study, the PASS assessment was used to measure leadership skills as defined by the NPBEA. Each NPBEA domain (*Functional, Programming*, and *Interpersonal)* reflects a particular skill set. Before the findings of this study can be adequately discussed, a deeper understanding of the nature of the NPBEA domain skill sets is necessary.

 The functional domain comprises skills needed to manage daily, routine campus business (*Leadership, Information Collection, Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational*

Oversight, and *Delegation)*. Thus, the term functional indicates a base level of skills needed to manage a school: an organizational structure exists to provide order (e.g. to run the buses on time, schedule classes, supervise instruction, or maintain order). Evidence of effectiveness is typically measured and quantified (e.g. attendance records, disciplinary referrals, walk-through documentation).

The skill set of the programming domain (*Instructional Management, Curriculum Design, Student Guidance and Development, Staff Development, Measurement and Evaluation,* and *Resource Allocation)* provides systemic campus leadership which requires greater perspective than do daily routines. Skills in this domain are more complex and difficult to quantify. Building upon skills in the functional domain, programming skills enable principals to develop frameworks, design anticipated outcomes, implement ongoing supervision, set goals and draw inferences.

Within the interpersonal domain are more subjectively measured skills (*Motivating Others, Sensitivity, Oral and Nonverbal Communication,* and *Written Expression)*. To effectively employ the skills from both functional and programming domains, these interpersonal skills are subject to individual perception. For example, while principals may perceive themselves to be sensitive, teachers may not feel the same way. Furthermore, these perceptions vary according to time or experiences.

This description of NPBEA domain skill sets provides a context from which to compare the principal self-assessments and the assessor rankings of principal NPBEA skills in relation to campus student achievement as measure by state accountability ratings.

Functional Domain Skill Comparisons

Urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves as Most Confident in the NPBEA functional domain skills of *Leadership, Problem Analysis*, and *Judgment,* indicating their perceived ability to manage daily campus tasks requiring direction (*Leadership*), identifying problems and possible solutions (*Problem Analysis*), and drawing logical conclusions and making quality decisions (*Judgment*). However, urban principals ranked themselves differently across accountability levels on *Information Collection* (majority rankings: AA and R, Most Confident; E, Less Confident). Urban principals from lower rated campuses may focus on information collections to monitor pass rates on benchmark testing as noted by the Council of Greater City Schools (2008). Furthermore, information regarding academic performance of sub-populations that include primarily minority and low-income students (Nevarez & Wood, 2007; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; Dittman, 2004; Orfield & Lee, 2004; Porter & Soper, 2003; Lippam, 1996); and greater student diversity (Ryan, 2003) may require greater attention of leaders at lower rated campuses. Notably, E campus principals appear not to focus as intently on *Information Collection* skills, perhaps a result of less pressure to improve academic performance. This may allow E campus leaders time to develop more complex leadership skills.

Regardless of campus accountability rating, urban principals also consistently ranked themselves to be Less Confident in the NPBEA functional domain skills of *Organizational Oversight* and *Delegation*. This may reflect the difficulty urban leaders face in providing leadership and management for large, diverse groups of parents, teachers and students. *Organizational Oversight,* by NPBEA definition, requires principals to facilitate groups (i.e. planning and scheduling own and other's work, appropriately allocating resources and prioritizing goals to meet deadlines). As noted by Ryan (2003), student diversity issues found on

urban campuses intensifies these duties. Furthermore, because urban schools include large numbers of inexperienced and under-certified teachers (Humphrey, Koppich, & Hough, 2005; Courtney & Coble, 2005; Marine, 2002), *Organizational Oversight* and *Delegation* may be exponentially more complex. Faculty instability related to inexperienced, under-certified teachers and attrition may inhibit urban leaders from responsibly delegating duties to meet campus goals and deadlines.

Programming Domain Skill Comparisons

As previously noted, NPBEA skills in the programming domain are more difficult to quantify and require use of functional domain skills to facilitate frameworks, design anticipated outcomes, implement ongoing supervision, set goals and draw inferences, and allocate resources to reach predetermined goals. Urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves Most Confident in *Instructional Management* and *Student Guidance and Developmen*t. Furthermore, urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, ranked themselves Confident in the skill of *Measurement and Evaluation*. Accountability, according to the state of Texas and No Child Left Behind (NCLB), requires principals to insure quality, aligned instruction in every classroom, a time intensive process. Focus on state and national accountability measures requires urban principals to competently provide leadership in *Instructional Management*, *Student Guidance and Developmen*t, *Measurement and Evaluation*. Furthermore, student achievement test scores that are quantified and publicly reported, may inhibit urban leaders from prioritizing other goals.

Again, urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves to be Less Confident in the skills of *Curriculum Design* and *Resource Allocation*. The complexity of large, diverse student populations, teacher attrition and, inexperienced or

poorly trained teachers provide less continuity in long term curriculum planning. As a result, some curriculum design requires extensive faculty training and preparation time. For this reason, it is not uncommon for urban districts to distribute curriculum documents, scope and sequence timelines, and scripted programs to campuses for expediency, thus, establishing a one-size-fits-all curriculum that lacks authentic instruction for diverse student populations. Additionally, low rankings in *Resource Allocation* could be attributed partially to limited campus funding. It is clear that as more students leave urban schools to attend charter schools or drop out of school, urban principals find they have even less funding available (May, 2007; Jewell, 2004; Lewis, 2004; Lasley & Binbirdge, 2001). Furthermore, in large urban districts, decisions regarding *Resource Allocation* of human resources, time, and materials are made at the district office level, with little or no input from the campus principal.

   Staff Development was the only skill in the programming domain upon which principals differed. Urban principals at E campuses ranked themselves as Most Confident in the skill of Staff Development while, urban principals on AA and R campuses ranked themselves to be only Confident. As Leithwood, et al. (2004) noted, school leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing student achievement and several studies have shown that urban schools employ greater numbers of inexperienced and under-certified teachers (Humphery, et al., 2005; Corntey and Coble, 2005; Marnie, 2002). If E campus principals do provide more effective staff development it would follow that student achievement would be positively affected. This would also imply a systemic approach of collaborative leadership rather than top-down management. Interestingly, E campus principals did not associate skills in *Staff Development* with greater success in *Curriculum Design* and *Resource Allocation*.

<div align="center">

Interpersonal Domain Skill Comparisons

</div>

NPBEA skills in the interpersonal domain, found urban principals, regardless of campus accountability rating, consistently ranked themselves Most Confident in *Motivation of Others* and *Sensitivity.* Complexity at large, urban campuses associated with student diversity (Nevarez & Wood, 2007; Talbert-Johnson, 2006; Dittman, 2004; Orfield & Lee, 2004; Porter & Soper, 2003; Ryan, 2003; Lippam, 1996) and challenges in supervising inexperienced/under-certified teachers (Humphrey, et al., 2005; Cortney & Coble, 2005; Marnie, 2002) require principals to motivate staff through supportive feedback, coaching, and guidance. Sensitivity to individual needs may further enhance the motivation process. Principals in the study appeared to understand the importance of motivation and sensitivity needed within urban settings. Because urban settings have diverse populations, principals, regardless of accountability ratings, appeared to value the ability to motivate, while being sensitive to cultural, religious, and sexual orientation differences.

Whereas principal rankings were Most Confident for *Motivation of Others* and *Sensitivity* regardless of accountability rating, urban principals were consistently Less Confident in *Written Expression*. Large urban districts, regulated by complex bureaucracies, typically require conformity to innumerable legal policies and procedures. Furthermore, district level scrutiny and daunting legal implications afforded written statements may cause principals to perceive their written expression skills less confidently.

Oral and Non-verbal Expression was the only skill in the programming domain upon which principals differed. Urban principals at E campuses ranked themselves as Most Confident in the skill of *Oral and Non-verbal Expression,* while urban principals on AA and R campuses ranked themselves Less Confident. *Oral and Non-verbal Expression* assists principals to provide clear direction for staff and students to assure goals will be met. Effective communication has

been identified as a key component for leadership; the glue that bonds leadership responsibilities together (Scribner, Cockrell, Cockrell, & Valentine, 1999; Elmore, 2000; Fullan, 2001; & Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). This finding implies that in urban schools, campus student achievement is connected to the principal's effectiveness in communicating orally and non-verbally.

<div align="center">Comparison of Principal Self-rankings and Assessor Ratings</div>

A comparison of urban principal self-rankings and PASS assessor ratings produced the study's most important findings: E campus principals possess a different skill set than principals from AA or R campuses.

Principal Skills at Academically Acceptable Campuses

The top ranked skills identified by AA campus principals from highest to lowest were: *Leadership, Sensitivity, Judgment, Instructional Management,* and *Problem Analysis*. Although selected skills represented all three domains, three of the five reflected functional domain attributes. In comparison, the top rated skills identified by assessors from highest to lowest were: *Leadership, Sensitivity, Information Collection, Organizational Oversight*, and *Student Guidance and Development*. While the majority represented functional domain skills, *Student Guidance and Development* reflected the programming domain, and *Sensitivity* represented the interpersonal domain.

 Overall, assessor ratings of AA campus principals centered on skills related to management (functional domain) rather than collaborative systemic leadership (programming domain) focused on broader perspectives that utilize frameworks and processes to reach anticipated outcomes and goals. These findings support Anagnostopoulus and Rutlege's (2007) contention that principals from schools facing state and district sanctions for low student

achievement tend to focus on the sanctions rather than best practice. In addition, when faced

with performance pressure, administrators are more likely to resort top-down managerial skills

rather than collaborative instructional leadership skills ("The Changing Face Of Principals",

2008).

Comparison of Principal Skills at Academically Acceptable and Recognized Campuses

Top ranked skills identified by R campus principals from highest to lowest were:

Leadership, Problem Analysis, Motivating Others, Student Guidance and Development, and

Information Collection. This skill set mirrored AA campus principals' selection of *Leadership*

and *Problem Analysis; however,* AA and R campus principals ranked the three remaining skills

differently. Three of the five skills selected by R campus were from the functional domain

(*Leadership, Problem Analysis*, and *Information Collection*); however, while principals from AA

campuses selected the programming domain skill of *Instructional Management*, R campus

principals selected *Student Guidance and Development*. The AA campus principals chose

supervision strategies to ensure instructional methods created positive learning experiences

(*Instructional Management*) whereas principals from R campuses enlisted support from groups

to promote student achievement. This suggests principals from lower performing campuses focus

on management verses collaborative leadership as previously noted ("The Changing Face of

Principals", 2008).

In addition, while AA principals selected *Sensitivity* from the interpersonal domain, R

principals selected *Motivating Others,* perhaps indicating that AA campus principals responded

to individuals (*Sensitivity*), whereas R campus principals attempted to create conditions

promoting goals attainment, by providing staff feedback, guidance, and coaching (*Motivating*

Others). Once again, this evidence suggests R campus principals provide more collaborative leadership than do AA campus principals.

Top assessor ratings for R campus principals from highest to lowest were: *Leadership, Sensitivity, Student Guidance and Development, Organizational Oversight,* and *Judgment*. Assessor rated skills differed from RR campus principal rankings. Although three of the top five assessor rated skills (*Leadership, Organization Oversight*, and *Judgment*) were functional domain skills, assessors rated *Leadership* and *Sensitivity* as the top two skills for both AA and R principals. Assessors rated *Student Guidance and Development* third highest for R campus principals, in comparison to *Information Collection* as third highest for AA campus principals. This implies a shift from decision making based on gathering and classifying information (AA principals), to decision making based on cooperation of diverse groups to address student needs (R principals). Although assessors rated *Organizational Oversight* fourth highest for both AA and R campus principals, ratings of the fifth skill differed; R campus principals (*Judgment*), AA campus principals *(Student Guidance and Development)*. Assessors found R campus principals more likely to prioritize significant issues, reach logical conclusions, and make quality decisions (*Judgment*) than did their AA campus counterparts.

While skill rankings and ratings varied in order for AA and R rated principals, principals and assessors chose only nine of the 14 NPBEA skills within their top five. Of the nine, the following seven skills were identified for both AA and R campus principals:

1. Five functional domain skills *Leadership, Information Collections, Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Oversight*

2. One programming domain skill: *Student Guidance and Development*

3. One interpersonal domain skill: *Sensitivity*

Only two skills were unique to one principal group: *Instructional Management* (AA principals) and *Motivating Others* (R principals), both skills identified through principal rankings. *Instructional Management* indicates the use of supervisor skills to ensure instruction methodology, and *Motivating of Others* indicates collaborative coaching and guidance to promote a desire to achieve campus goals. Finally, although the majority of top skills identified for both AA and R campus principals fell within the functional domain, R campus principals' skills were slightly more likely to promote collaborative leadership. R campus principals appear to focus leadership in areas that directly impact testing results. *Motivation of Others, Student Guidance* and *Development*, and *Information Collection* may be skills valued by R principals seeking to maintain or improve accountability test scores; they may emphasize campus-wide strategies to motivate students to learn and be persistent during bench mark and summative testing, guided by data regarding student test performance. Unfortunately, it is not clear from these findings the degree to which AA and R rated schools may have differed in terms of student diversity. Nevertheless, these findings suggest increased student achievement may occur on campuses where urban campus leaders have developed more expertise in programming domain skills.

Principal Skills at Exemplary Campuses

Top skills from self-rankings by E campus leaders from highest to lowest were: *Leadership, Sensitivity, Problem Analysis, Instructional Management,* and *Staff Development*. These skills were identified by principals of AA and R campuses with the exception of *Staff Development,* which was top-ranked exclusively by E campus leaders.

The most frequently noted assessor ratings for E campus principals from highest to lowest were: *Sensitivity, Student Guidance and Development, Oral Communication, Information*

Collection, and *Leadership.* Of these, only one skill was found exclusively among E campus principals: *Oral Communication.* A comparison of skills identified through principal self-rankings and assessor ratings found six common skills among E campus principals and their AA and R campus counterparts:

1. Three functional domain skills: *Leadership, Information Collection, Problem Analysis;*

2. Two programming domain skills: *Instructional Management, Student Guidance and Development;*

3. One interpersonal domain skill: *Sensitivity*

Most importantly, two skills exclusive to urban principals at E rated campuses were: *Staff Development* and *Oral Communication.* As noted previously, if E campus principals do provide more effective staff development than to AA and R campus leaders and if E campus leaders supervise faculty through more effective communication (e.g. providing clear instruction, guidance, training, performance feedback, etc.), it follows that student achievement would improve. Again, this implies that E campus principals demonstrate a more systemic, collaborative leadership approach rather than one focused on top-down management.

<div align="center">Recommendations</div>

Because of the importance of quality school leadership to improved student academic performance (Leithwood et al., 2004), professional development opportunities designed specifically for urban principals are needed. Based on the findings of this study, urban principals with lower campus achievement focus on managerial skills in the functional domain. Conversely, it appears urban principals who demonstrate greater programming domain skills systemically

address campus instructional needs utilizing collaborative leadership. These findings are consistent with recent studies regarding the impact of campus leadership on student achievement (Daresh, 2007; Baxter, 2008; & Rutlege, 2007), establishing the necessity of accurate principal assessment in any school reform plan.

Based on study findings, principal preparation programs might place principals in field learning experiences that emphasize:

Functional domain skills: *Leadership, Information Collection, Problem*

Analysis;

Programming domain skills: *Instructional Management, Student Guidance and*

Development; Staff Development

Interpersonal domain skill: *Sensitivity, Oral communication*

Principal preparation programs could include more authentic writing experiences for principal candidates to bolster confidence in this form of communication.

Future studies might examine the influence of principal attributes (i.e. gender, pre-administrative educational experience, leadership experience) related to differences in campus student achievement levels. Furthermore, differentiation of principals' skills by campus level of instruction (i.e. elementary or secondary) might reveal effective leadership skills unique to student instructional level. Finally, the skills of *Staff Development* and *Oral Communication,* exclusively found among urban principals at campuses with the highest student achievement should be examined in greater depth to determine the degree to which they account for student achievement and the degree to which they vary among campus leaders.

References

Anagnostopoulos, D., & Rutledge, S. (2007, May). Making sense of school sanctioning policies in urban high schools. *Teachers College Record, 109*(5), 1261-1302.

Baxter, V. (2008). A communitarian framework for planning educational leadership preparation programs. *Educational Planning, 17*(1), 18-26.

Bennis, W. (1994). *On becoming a leader*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

Council of the Great City Schools. (2008, April). Beating the odds: An analysis of student performance and achievement gaps on state assessments. Results from the 2006-2007 School Year. Washington, DC: Council of the Great City Schools.

Cotton, K. (1995). *Principals and student achievement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cortney, R., & Coble, C. (2005, March). Targeting Teacher Recruitment and Retention Policies for At-Risk Schools. Policy Issues. Number 20. *Learning Point Associates / North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL).* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED489524)

Daresh, J. (2007, Fall). Mentoring for beginning principals: Revisiting the past or preparing for the future? *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 20*(4), 28-34.

Dittman, M. (2004, September). Fifty years later: Desegregating urban schools. *Monitor on Psychology*, *35*(8), 62.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*, 15-24.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. New York: Albert Shanker Institute.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis, K. (1996). School context, principal leadership, and student

     reading achievement. *Elementary School Journal, 96*(5), 527-549).

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A

     review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5

     - 44.

Humphrey, D., Koppich, J. and Hough, H. (2005, March). Sharing the wealth: National board

     certified teachers and the students who need them most. *Educational Policy Analysis*

     Archives, 1*3*(18), 1-50.

Husser, W. (2007) *Projections of Education statistics to 2016.* (NCES 2008-060). U.S.

     Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

     Retrieved June 15, 2008 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Jewell, A. (2007, September). Ten years and still failing: An analysis of Ohio. *Focus Education*,

     Retrieved June 16 from http://www.sheffield.k12.oh.us/Focus%20Education

     %20Special%20Report%209-12-07.pdf

Krovetz, M. (1999). *Fostering resilience: Expecting students to use their minds and hearts as*

     well. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Laird, J., DeBell, M., Kienzl, G., and Chapman, C. (2007). *Dropout Rates in the United States:*

     2005 (NCES 2007-059). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National

     Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved June 15, 2008

     fromhttp://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Lasley, T. & Bainbirdge, W. (2001, May). Unintended consequences. *Education Week*, *20*(33),

     38, 42.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004) *How leadership influences*

student learning. A commissioned report. New York: Wallace Foundation.

Leithwood, K. & Riehl, C. (2003). *What do we already know about successful school leadership*? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Lesotte, L. (1991) *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.

Lessote, L. (1992). "Principal" insights from effective schools. *Education Digest, 58*(3), 14-17.

Lewis, A. (2004, march). Failing NCLB. *The Education Digest, 69*(7), 65-67.

Marzano, R., Waters, T, & McNulty, B. (2005) *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Alexandria VE and Aurora, CO: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Marnie, S. (2002). *School finance: Per-pupil spending differences between selected inner city and suburban schools varied by metropolitan area*. Report to the Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.

May, J. (2007, Fall). The market-driven age of education: Challenges of urban school leadership. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 20*(4), 28-34.

Nevarez, C., & Wood, J. (2007, December). Developing urban school leaders: Building on solutions 15 years after the Las Angeles riots. *Educational Studies, 42*(3), 266-280.

Olson, L. (2008, April). Lack of school leadership seen as a global problem. *Education Week*, 27(33), 8.

Orfield, G., & Chungmei, L. (2004). Brown at 50: King's dream or Plessy's nightmare? Cambridge, MA: Civil rights Project.

Porter, K. & Soper, S. (2003, Spring). Closing the achievement gap: Urban schools.
Comprehensive School Reform Connection. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for
Comprehensive School Reform.

Rammer, R. (2007, November, December). Call to action for superintendents: Change the way
you hire principals. *Journal of Educational Research*, 101(2), 67-76.

Reynolds, D. (1990). An introduction to managing school effectiveness. *School Organisation.*
10(2-3), 163-165.

Ryan, J. (2003). *Leading diverse schools*. Dordrect, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Scribner, J., Cockrell, K. Cockrell, D. & Valentine, J. (1999). Creating professional learning
communities in schools through organizational learning: An evaluation of the school
improvement process. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(1), 130-160.

Talbert-Johnson, C. (2006, November). Preparing highly qualified teacher candidates for urban
schools: The importance of dispositions. *Education and Urban Society*, *39,* 147-161.

Tillman,L. (2003, Fall). From rhetoric to reality? Educational administration and the lack of
racial and ethnic diversity within the profession. *University Council for Educational*
Review. 14(3), 1-4.

Tredway, L., Brill, F., & Hernandez, J. (2007, Summer). Taking off the cape: The stories of
novice urban leadership. *Theory Into Practice, 46*(3), 212-221.

The changing face of principals. (2008, January). *NEA Today*, Retrieved June 25, 2008, from
MasterFILE Premier database.

Thomson, S. (Ed.). (1993). *Principals for our changing schools: The knowledge and skills base.*
Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Education Administration.

Appendix A

Principal Assessment of Student Success (PASS),

Principal Assessment for Student Success (PASS) is a principal assessment that has been

approved by the State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) for principal assessment within

the state of Texas. According to Texas Education Code (TEC) 21.054, all principals must

complete an assessment in order to maintain certification. The overarching goals of PASS

include:

1.   To determine the level of knowledge and skills for the principalship that each

    principal assessed demonstrates.

2. To provide quality assessment activities relevant to the role of the principalship.

3. To provide purposeful and constructive feedback related to each principal's

    demonstration of knowledge and skills.

4. To provide opportunities for each principal assessed to be reflective about his/her

    level of knowledge and skills, as well as to his/her plan for professional growth.

PASS is based on three sets of criteria: skills, standards, and knowledge.   The skills

included in the assessment comprise 14 of the 21 skills identified for the principalship by the

National Board of Policy Educational Administration (see Appendix B). The standards are the

seven State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) Standards which are required by the state to

be included in the assessment. The knowledge is a compilation of the Ten Components of

Effective Schools, the framework components of Instructional Leadership Development (ILD),

and the instructional processes from the Student Success Initiative (SSI).

Each criterion is measured multiple times in PASS through a variety of authentic

activities within the assessment. PASS contains a self-assessment process, a campus component,

a teacher component, and a student component. All activities are based on authentic data provided by the principal being assessed and are directly connected to his/her campus.

The assessment process occurs over a 30-day period. All online activities are completed within 16 days and are then submitted for assessor review. The assessors are given 11 days to review the online responses and conduct a phone interview with the principal. Each principal's data and entry is reviewed by two assessors. One assessor is considered the primary assessor and, in addition to scoring the rubrics for each activity, provides written feedback on each activity. The assessment also includes one, face-to-face feedback day in which principals expand on their previous responses with a state-of-the -campus report and a plan of action for a teacher in need of assistance. Each primary assessor provides up to one hour of verbal feedback to each principal being assessed.

Appendix B

National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA): Knowledge and Skill Domains

Functional Domains

1. Leadership: Providing purpose and direction, formulating goals with staff and setting priorities based on community and district priorities and student and staff needs.

2. Information Collection: Classifying and organization information for use in decision making and mentoring.

3. Problem Analysis: Identifying problems, identifying possible causes, seeking additional needed information, framing possible solutions.

4. Judgment: Giving priority to significant issues then reaching logical conclusions and making quality decisions.

5. Organizational Oversight: Planning and scheduling own and other's work so that resources are used appropriately and monitoring priorities so that goals and deadlines are met.

6. Implementation: Facilitating the coordination and collaboration of campus activities by establishing checkpoints and providing support.

7. Delegation: Assigning projects, tasks, and responsibilities together with authority to accomplish them.

Programming Domains

8. Instructional Management: Ensuring appropriate instructional methods are used to create positive learning experiences.

9. Curriculum Design: With staff, planning and implementing a framework for instruction and aligning curriculum with anticipated outcomes.

10. Student Guidance and Development: Enlisting the support and cooperation of diverse professionals, citizens, community agencies, parents and students to promote the growth and development of all students.

11. Staff Development: Supervising individuals and groups and providing feedback on performance and initiating self-development.

12. Measurement and Evaluation: Examining the extent to which outcomes meet or exceed previously defined goals, or priorities and drawing inferences for program revisions.

13. Resource Allocation: Allocating, monitoring and evaluating fiscal, human, material and time resources to reach campus goals and objectives.

Interpersonal Domains

14. Motivating Others: Creating conditions that promote the staff's desire to achieve campus goals and providing feedback, coaching and guidance to staff.

15. Sensitivity: Perceiving and responding to the needs and concerns of others.

16. Oral and Nonverbal Expression: Making oral presentations that are clear and easy to understand.

17. Written Expression: Expressing ideas and appropriately in writing for different audiences.

Contextual Domains

18. Legal and Regulatory Applications: Working within local rules, procedures, and directives and recognizing standards of care involving civil and criminal liability for negligence. (Thomson, 1993).

(Note: only 18 of the original 21 NPBEA knowledge and skill domains are assessed in PASS)

Appendix C

Texas Education Agency: School Accountability Rating

	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base indicators			
TAKS (2006-07) • All students *and each student group meeting minimum size:* • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantage.	Meets each standard: • Reading/ELA ... 65% • Writing.............. 65% • Social Studies.. 65% • Mathematics .... 45% • Science .... 40% OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 75% standard for each subject OR meets 70% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard for each subject
*SDAA II (2007)*All students (if meets minimum size criteria)	Meets 50% standard *(Met ARD Expectations)* OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 70% standard *(Met ARD Expectations)* OR meets 65% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard *(Met ARD Expectations)*
Completion Rate I (class of 2006) • All students *and each student group meeting minimum size:* • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantage.	Meets 75.0% standard OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 85.0% standard OR meets 80.0% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 95.0% standard
Annual Dropout Rate (2005-06) • All students *and each student group meeting minimum size:* • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv.	Meets 1.0% standard	Meets 0.7% standard	Meets 0.2% standard
Additional Provisions			
Exceptions	Applied if district/campus would be Academically Unacceptable due to not meeting Academically Acceptable criteria.	Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of Recognized.	Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of Exemplary.
School Leaver Provision for 2007	A campus or district annual dropout rate, completion rate and/or underreported student measures cannot be the cause of lowered rating		

(Texas Education Agency, 2007, p. 42).