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Preface

This second edition is a contemporary response to graduate students’ needs for a comprehensive introduction to educational administration contained within a logical, thematic structure. This edition has several important updates and additions that make the content even more relevant to those practicing and soon to be practicing in the field of educational administration. Greater emphasis is placed on such topics as data usage, ethics, innovative hiring practices, and student discipline.

As the practical world of educational administration continuously evolves and expands, the necessary concepts, so often presented in isolated bits of information, become too difficult for aspiring administrators to draw relationships between. Consequently, aspiring school leaders often feel as though they understand different aspects of educational administration separately, but they often report that they have tremendous difficulty putting all of their new knowledge together. Synthesizing information, particularly new information that has been presented in isolated units, is a great challenge.

This textbook responds to the aforementioned challenge on two levels. First, the overall content of the text is organized in a manner that makes sense for aspiring and practicing administrators alike. Rather than learning all leadership theories in a chapter about leadership and all motivational theories in a chapter about motivation, the theories in this textbook are organized around themes representative of the real and practical work life of school administrators. Secondly, the content is organized around standards, which represent the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of school administrators that are the foundation upon which many graduate programs and/or state certification requirements are organized.

By taking this conceptual framework and applying it to a structured set of standards, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, the book assists in the creation of connections for aspiring administrators. Instead of learning about administrative topics in isolation, this book presents those topics, theories, and models in the context of concise, reasonable, and widely accepted standards. The standards themselves, although they are quite significant on their own merit, are secondary to the knowledge base that this book develops around them. In fact, there are several other good sources of administrative standards worthy of examination. For example, both the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) have published standards and circulated them to their members. The wording contained in those standards represents cogent thinking about what the roles and responsibilities of educational administrators ought to be. They are, in fact, both examples of standards that are presently improving the work of school administrators all across the
country. As good as the aforementioned standards are as tools for improving the skills, behaviors, and capabilities of administrators, they may not be as comprehensively designed as the standards created and adopted by the ISLLC. Furthermore, there are no educational administrative standards that are as widely accepted as a gauge of what school administrators ought to know and be able to do as the ISLLC standards. For these reasons this book is organized around the specific wording of the ISLLC Standards. Whether or not a state or agency has officially adopted the ISLLC Standards or any other organized set of competencies is irrelevant to this book’s mission: namely, to assist in the education and development of school administrators. For ease of study, these standards create a logical framework and thus are a design feature of this book.

**Why ISLLC?**

The ISLLC was established in 1994, under the guidance of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The Standards for School Leaders were officially released two years after the organization’s initial establishment. ISLLC is a consortium currently made up of thirty-two education agencies and thirteen education administration associations that have worked cooperatively to establish an education policy framework for school leadership. The ISLLC’s vision of leadership is based on the premise that the criteria and standards for the professional practice of school leaders must be grounded in the knowledge and understanding of teaching and learning. At press, the standards are undergoing a thorough revision, so that they can best reflect the essential competencies of effective school leadership.

The essential purpose of ISLLC is to provide a means through which states can work together to develop and implement model standards, assessments, professional development, and licensing procedures for school leaders. The overarching goals of ISLLC are to raise the bar for school leaders to enter and remain in the profession, and to reshape concepts of educational leadership. Below are the six standards that serve as the basis of most leadership preparation programs and are the foundation of this textbook.

**Standards for School Leaders**

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

**Standard 2:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

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

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

Standard 6: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

ISLLC member states, at the time of this book’s publication include Alabama, American Samoa, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and Department of Defense Education Activity. Participating education organizations in ISLLC include American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), American Association of School Administrators (AASA), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), Association of Teacher Educators (ATE), Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), National Alliance of Business (NAB), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), National School Boards Association (NSBA), and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).

Because of the ISLLC Standards’ adoption and acceptance in so many arenas, they are a logical tool for organizing and presenting an introduction to educational administration. Even in environments where they are not formally adopted, their principles are consistent with contemporary educational administration research, and they are worded in such a way that even novice school leaders can understand their meaning and see their relevance. They are, it is worth mentioning again, secondary to the practical and conceptual information contained within this book’s pages. When that information is presented within
the framework of the ISLLC Standards, then the result is a meaningful, practical organization of essential teachings for educational administrators.

It is wise to consider that the ISLLC Standards, taken in their entirety, represent a comprehensive summary of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of effective, caring school administrators. Although they are separated into six distinct entities, it is difficult to consider them in isolation without at least acknowledging the interrelationships that exist among them. Many theories and concepts presented in this textbook are placed within the context of one standard while, of course, being relevant to other standards at the same time. As such, readers should consider that the first organizational layer of this textbook deals with the practical world of school administrators. The ISLLC Standards represent the second organizational layer. Some concepts, even though relevant to several different ISLLC Standards, are placed in chapters that draw better relationships between them and the practical work life of school administrators.

**Organizational Features of This Book**

Aside from the obvious advantage of organizing theories and concepts around the widely adopted and acknowledged ISLLC Standards, there are several other features that distinguish this textbook and add to its strength as a comprehensive work from which to study educational administration.

First, each section of the book introduces and briefly explains a particular ISLLC Standard. Each introduction is accompanied by a brief description of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances indicated by each standard. Additionally, the introduction of each standard provides a brief description of the chapters that will follow as a means to assist the reader in beginning to draw connections between and among topics. This is helpful to students regardless of whether or not the intent is for them to focus their learning around the ISLLC Standards.

Second, each chapter in this second edition begins with a brief section entitled Think About It. This section, not present in the earlier addition, provides a practical scenario for which knowledge contained in the chapter will be important. By having this scenario in mind while reading the chapter, readers will be better able to see the relevance of the concepts and theories introduced. A brief section, called Have You Thought About It, ends each chapter by relating chapter content to the Think About It section.

Third, each chapter in this second edition contains a brief section entitled, Point–Counterpoint. This new section facilitates an understanding of the concepts from two diverse viewpoints, enabling the reader to more deeply examine his or her own beliefs regarding the material presented in the chapter and its application to work in our schools.

Fourth, each chapter contains application questions which can be used as classroom discussion points or independent reflection pieces for readers. These application questions cause readers to reflect on some of the important concepts and theories outlined in the chapter.
Finally, each chapter includes a field activity, which provides a vehicle for readers to engage with practitioners in the field so as to apply some of the knowledge gained from the chapter. Because many graduate programs in educational administration include field-based requirements, the field activity can be used as part of a portfolio or as a stand-alone experience that enables the reader to interact with practitioners.
Standard One

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

As Chapters 1 and 2 illustrate, school leaders must assume responsibility for leading all stakeholders to the understanding of a common set of beliefs about why they engage in the daily activities of their school leadership experience. The leadership demands placed on administrators require the articulation of this mission to students, staff, parents, and community members. In demonstrating an understanding of and adherence to the language in Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 1, educational administrators recognize the importance of preparing a well-educated student body for success. This brings up the crucial role of the educational administrator as instructional leader.

Administrators also recognize through Standard 1 that such accomplishments do not happen without the collective efforts of the larger school community. Furthermore, administrators are cognizant that they, the educational leaders of their schools, must be stewards of this vision of student learning. In doing so, administrators are facilitators of everybody else’s work.

Such language requires that administrators be visionaries. The language demands that administrators be effective communicators with all constituent groups. The language of ISLLC Standard 1 also requires educational administrators to understand leadership theory and to pay particular attention to the structures around which they engage in leadership behaviors.

Before going further, readers ought to examine the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of ISLLC Standard 1. Revisiting this list while reading Chapters 1 and 2 will provide opportunities for deeper understanding of the standard. This same list of knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators is revisited at the conclusion of Chapter 2.
Standard 1

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

Knowledge

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
♦ learning goals in a pluralistic society
♦ the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans
♦ systems theory
♦ information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies
♦ effective communication
♦ effective consensus-building and negotiation skills

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
♦ the educability of all
♦ a school vision of high standards of learning
♦ continuous school improvement
♦ the inclusion of all members of the school community
♦ ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults
♦ a willingness to continuously examine one’s own assumptions, beliefs, and practices
♦ doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
♦ the vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members
♦ the vision and mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities
♦ the core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders
♦ the vision is developed with and among stakeholders
♦ the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated
♦ progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders
♦ the school community is involved in school improvement efforts
♦ the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions
an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated

- assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals
- relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals
- barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed
- needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission and goals
- existing resources are used in support of the school vision and goals
- the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised

Chapter 1 gives readers background in several relevant leadership theories. The focus of the chapter is on understanding how major theories can assist administrators in thinking about their own leadership paradigms and how these paradigms will lead to the fulfillment of the wording in ISLLC Standard 1. Furthermore, Chapter 1 illustrates the changing roles of educational leaders in various structural settings.

Chapter 2 focuses on creating, fostering, and sustaining a common set of values and beliefs for a school community. Designing a mission statement shared by all constituents is a feature of this chapter. Ensuring that this mission statement, which is believed and espoused by all school stakeholders, focuses on student learning further acknowledges the requirements of ISLLC Standard 1.

The knowledge, skills, and dispositions inherent in ISLLC Standard 1 create a solid foundation from which to begin our study of administrative theory and practices.
Think About It

There are theories behind all of our actions, a fact of which we are often unaware. This reality is an important reason why an understanding of leadership theories provides an essential foundation to successful school administration. Consider how this plays out with Mrs. Lonnie Beavers, assistant principal at Cooper High School.

As assistant principal, Mrs. Beavers is responsible for textbook inventory, transportation, and tenth grade student discipline. In her two years at Cooper High, she has felt inundated with discipline issues, feeling as though her entire morning is spent talking with students, following up on issues, and contacting and responding to parents. Mrs. Beavers believes that if she could just stay on top of discipline issues, perhaps they wouldn’t consume so much of her time.

Dr. Rosetta Smitts sits down with Mrs. Beavers and suggests that she walk through the halls stopping briefly at all tenth grade classrooms at the beginning of each school day. Although this will be challenging, as there...
are many other tasks to attend to, Dr. Smitts believes that being present in all of the classrooms briefly will deter some discipline issues, thereby ultimately leading to more manageable and peaceful days. Dr. Smitts further explains that if Mrs. Beavers lets all students in the tenth grade know that she is watching, their behaviors will improve and discipline referrals will decline.

This chapter highlights and explains several significant leadership theories and applies them to educational settings, including Theory X and Theory Y, The Iowa Studies, and The Ohio State Studies. As you read the chapter, try to determine what these theories say about the behaviors and/or beliefs of Mrs. Beavers and Dr. Smitts. Think about how these theories form a foundation for the actions that these two educational leaders take, as well as the words that these two educational leaders say.

In describing the roles and behaviors of school administrators several, often conflicting, terms and phrases are brought to mind. Some refer to the administrator as the manager of resources—human and otherwise. Others see administration as a middle-management position, subordinate to some and superordinate to many. Still others focus on the term leader with all of the various meanings that such a term can elicit. While each may be an accurate explanation of a part of the school administrator’s work, a thorough understanding of the scope of school administration may only come about through the combination of many of these words and phrases.

For our purposes, the focus of study is on the leadership role of the school administrator. Defining and succinctly describing this role is challenging, to say the least. For the last fifty to seventy-five years, extensive research and study has been devoted to the topic of leadership. The result of all this research has been the creation of a vast number of definitions, which oftentimes compounds the difficulty of trying to actually understand the concept at all. Even though more than 3,000 empirical studies have been conducted to examine leadership, there are some consistent themes that have emerged.

One emergent theme is the distinction between leadership and management. Warren Bennis, one of the most respected authors on leadership topics, wrote with Burt Nanus that “a manager does the thing right; a leader does the right thing” (p. 4). This oft-quoted statement has been the foundation upon which many other studies and writings have been designed. The image of the leader as an individual who does what is right, often without regard to consequences, has been created as a sharp contrast to the rule-following, law-abiding manager. While the manager follows directions, it is the leader who often sets out in search of new and better directions.

There is no sense in disputing that educational institutions need good managers in order to meet stakeholder demands. The dealings with day-to-day functions and the overseeing of routine tasks are well within the realm of sound management. Without such adherence to detail and routine, schools run the risk of failure. There are, as will be elaborated on throughout the text and in Chapter
6, in particular, a whole host of administrative tasks that depend on sound management skills. Failure to adhere to these tasks will lead to a rapid failure on the part of a school administrator.

However, schools also sorely need strong leadership. To consistently move forward and improve, school administrators must regularly exhibit positive leadership characteristics. An overmanaged school, while paying great attention to detail, runs the risk of missing out on important innovations and opportunities. As the business of schooling becomes increasingly competitive, the need to stay ahead and innovate is becoming more critical to the school administrator’s success. Along these lines, some critics claim that many of our best American companies are currently overmanaged and underled. This, it can be argued, is even more of an issue in our schools. Management of school operations is essential. If it comes at the expense of effective leadership, however, too much management may become disastrous.

An overmanaged school can be defined as one that sacrifices people for tasks. As the theories relating to Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 1 illustrate, the most effective leaders are those individuals who balance their commitments to people with their desires for increased productivity. Overmanagement can leave the people part out. Schools cannot afford to make this mistake, just as they cannot afford to focus solely on individual needs, at the expense of productivity and achievement. Leadership and management, detailed in depth throughout this book, must work hand-in-hand.

But how do we begin to understand which leadership characteristics are the best for school administrators to internalize? How do we differentiate between different types of leadership and distinct sources of leader influences? The answers to these questions are found in a careful analysis of contemporary and timeless research. This body of research has prompted the development of many leadership theories. The study of theory, although not overly exciting to many practitioners, is essential as it gives us a basis from which to begin constructing meaning in our own environments. What follows is an explanation of many theories or theoretical constructs with relevance to educational leadership. In each case, practical applications are included to help the theory make sense in an educational context.

**Theory X**

Douglas McGregor (1960) developed Theory X and its counterpart, aptly named Theory Y, to describe two conflicting assumptions that leaders make about worker motivation, behavior, and performance. The focus of McGregor’s theories is on the assumptions made by leaders; not on the actual performance of workers. Essentially, Theory X leaders believe that

♦ The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if at all possible.
Most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward achievement of organizational objectives.

The average person prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has little ambition, and desires security (pp. 33–34).

The behaviors of school leaders with Theory X assumptions involve a very directive style of leadership. Administrators identifying with Theory X direct teachers and staff members, monitor them closely, and have a heavy hand in organizing most actions within the school. Furthermore, these leaders keep control over staff members through punishments and rewards.

Many educational scholars have argued that the assumptions of Theory X inhibit growth in schools, and thus are not good models for educational leaders. In his book, *Leadership for the Schoolhouse*, Thomas Sergiovanni (1996) says, “Leadership is different from commanding or bribing compliance in that it involves influencing others by persuasion or example, or by tapping inner moral forces” (p. 87). He goes on to say,

[[leadership for meaning, leadership for problem solving, collegial leadership, leadership as shared responsibility, leadership that serves school purposes, leadership that is tough enough to demand a great deal from everyone, and leadership that is tender enough to encourage the heart—these are the images we need for schools.... (pp. 184–185)

Clearly, Theory X assumptions do not present educational leaders with a broad enough picture on which to base their own personal theories of leadership.

**Theory Y**

As another side of the leadership coin, McGregor (1960) developed Theory Y. Quite the opposite of Theory X, Theory Y is based on the following assumptions:

- The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
- People will exercise self-direction and self-control in serving objectives to which they are committed.
- Commitment to objectives is the function of the rewards associated with their achievement, specifically ego and self-actualization.
- The average human being not only accepts responsibility, but also seeks it.
- People are genuinely creative, imaginative, and possess ingenuity.
- In most work environments, the intellectual potential of the average person is only partially utilized. (pp. 47–48)
School leaders who embody the assumptions associated with Theory Y are much more empowering to their staff members. Believing that commitment to objectives is a key component of worker motivation and productivity, these school leaders devote considerable time and effort to creating a school culture that all staff members can and usually do feel committed to. Rather than coercing employees to maximize their productivity as a leader with Theory X assumptions would, a Theory Y leader uses recognition, responsibility, and achievement to motivate employees to produce. Such an approach is consistent with the findings of Frederick Herzberg, whose Hygiene-Motivation Theory is explored in Chapter 4. Herzberg found that achievement, recognition, and responsibility led to an increase in job satisfaction, whereas factors such as salary and working conditions merely increased job dissatisfaction when they were absent.

It is important to note that Theory X and Theory Y refer to the assumptions that managers make of workers. Consequently, subscribing to any one theory does not necessarily indicate a particular management style. Although particular styles and behaviors are somewhat predictable based on an individual’s orientation to Theory X or Theory Y, it remains prudent to note that the theories merely describe the assumptions.

**Transformational Leadership**

Originally based on James MacGregor Burns’ (1978) concepts of transformational and transactional political leaders, the idea of transformational leadership style as beneficial to school leadership is one that has received considerable attention in modern times. Essentially, the doctrine of transformational leadership is based on the personal values and beliefs of leaders. Transformational leaders have the ability to unite followers and change their beliefs in such a way as to produce higher levels of performance than originally believed to be possible (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Bennis & Nanus, 1985). By expressing their personal beliefs, transformational leaders identify and secure support for activities that serve the organization’s mission, but which may not directly benefit individual employees (Burns, 1978).

Rather than focusing on incentives to lead employees toward accomplishing organizational goals, transformational leaders build and strengthen employee commitments to the organization’s norms, values, and goals. The transformational leader avoids specifically defining tasks for employees and also refrains from establishing specific work routines to achieve specified results (Mitchell & Tucker, 1992). After assessing the organization’s needs, including the strengths and weaknesses of employees, transformational leaders encourage members of the organization to commit to a unified vision of the future. This concept and the images created by these words is very consistent with those created by the wording of ISLLC Standard 1.

Bass and Avolio (1994) noted that transformational leaders, while stimulating others to begin seeing their work and their purpose from fresh perspectives, exhibit the following behaviors:
They demonstrate high standards of ethical and moral conduct.
They consider the needs of employees over their own needs.
They share risks with employees in goal setting.
They use power only when necessary and never for personal gain.

Transactional Leadership

Providing a sharp contrast to transformational leadership, transactional leadership style is based on incentives such as monetary rewards, recognition, and work promotions to persuade followers to strive for the attainment of goals that are important to the organization (Foster, 1986). In the simplest of terms, transactional leaders give followers things that they want in exchange for things that leaders want (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987).

While transformational leaders concern themselves with the needs of their employees and even place those needs above their own, transactional leaders use incentives to secure employee compliance. The result is that the needs and aspirations of the employees are often ignored. The exchange of rewards for compliance leaves little room for the recognition of what employees want and how those wants can be molded to benefit the organization.

Another difference between transformational and transactional leadership styles is centered on the use of power. Transformational leaders never use their status or power to gain employee compliance, unless such power will benefit the entire organization. Transactional leaders, conversely, use power to gain employee compliance. Although this does not necessarily imply abuse of power, in some cases transactional leadership style’s use of power leads employees to perform so as to please the leader and not necessarily to benefit the organization. Consider the following illustration as an example of how transformational and transactional principals might conduct a faculty meeting to address the need for improved student performance.

*The Transformational Principal*—Reminding teachers that they all share a common vision of excellence for all students, the transformational leader discusses the current state of affairs regarding student achievement. Laying out data that shows students are not performing to their potential, the transformational leader makes it clear that this is not because of a lack of effort on the part of teachers. Instead, this leader explains, the entire school community must discover new methods for reaching students who are falling behind. Involving teachers in the discussion, the transformational principal seeks their advice, praises them for their efforts, and demonstrates that he/she believes success is possible. Followup meetings help the teachers focus more clearly on instructional improvements, and the transformational principal offers staff development and personal assistance all along the journey.
The Transactional Principal—This principal opens the meeting by explaining the current state of affairs and insisting that improvements be made. After showing the data, the transactional principal offers incentives to teachers who show improvement. Those teachers whose students are already achieving at high levels are recognized, and it may be suggested that other teachers seek their advice and counsel. Followup meetings are planned to assess effectiveness, and a clear system of rewards and sanctions is laid out to gain teacher compliance.

Most research indicates that school leaders use both transformational and transactional leadership in their administration of a school. Although the transformational style of a leader contributes more to employee satisfaction, a point elaborated on during the discussion of ISLLC Standard 2, transactional leadership style is effective in the management aspects of school administration. These aspects receive great attention in the chapters dealing with ISLLC Standard 3.

Five Types of Power

In 1968, John R.P. French and Bertram Raven identified five types of power that leaders use to achieve objectives. Since their taxonomy was first published, other scholars have attempted to classify these sources of power differently. Although there may be other terms or classifications to use, French and Raven’s taxonomy remains the most useful for understanding how leaders influence subordinates in the work environment. The five types of power are as follow:

- **Legitimate Power** is vested in the position that the leader holds within the organization. It is earned the day that the leader assumes his or her official leadership role. Legitimate power has, as its basis, a mutually accepted understanding that subordinates must follow the directives of the leader because the leader holds a superordinate position over them. In a school setting, the principal has legitimate power over the teachers. From the day the principal begins his/her tenure, the principal has this type of power.

- **Reward Power** stems from the leader’s ability to reward employees for performance. To differing degrees, most leaders have reward power at their disposal. Unlike legitimate power, which is perceived immediately by both the leader and the subordinates, the strength of reward power lies in the subordinates’ perceptions of the reward’s value. If a leader has the authority to issue a pay raise, for example, the strength of that reward may be more powerful than if the leader merely has the authority to reward the subordinate with a new box of chalk. The subordinates’ desire to earn the reward is very important.

- **Coercive Power**, the opposite of reward power, describes the leader’s ability to punish subordinates for failure to comply or for the exhi-
bition of some undesirable behavior. Reprimands, threats, de-
mo- 

tions, and undesirable work assignments are all manifesta-
tions of coercive power. As with reward power, the subordi-
nates’ perceptions of the punishment’s strengths have a strong influence over 
the degree to which coercive power actually influences behavior.

- **Expert Power** influences subordinates’ performance when they be-
lieve that the leader has expertise or specialized knowledge that is of real benefit. Leaders who possess knowledge that the group needs in order to achieve objectives are seen as capable and as possessing special ability. Expert power comes from education, experience, and training and tends to be extremely important in school settings. Teachers tend to follow leaders who they believe have expertise in the subject matter and in pedagogy.

- **Referent Power** is often referred to as charisma or a personality that makes subordinates want to follow. Leaders with referent power have a personality that draws respect and attracts the subordinate to the leader. Additionally, referent power may stem from the leader’s association with another powerful figure within the organization. In the school setting, for example, some assistant principals have referent power by virtue of the staff’s perceptions that they are closely aligned with the principal and often act on his/her behalf. Some of history’s most revered leaders (John F. Kennedy, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Mother Teresa) have been individuals with a high degree of referent power.

School leaders should pay careful attention to these types of power in examining how they influence staff members to accomplish goals and objectives. Research conducted since these five types were first described (Yukl, 1994; Shetty, 1978) makes some consistent claims that leaders should understand in order to maximize their effectiveness in contemporary school settings. Among these claims, scholars have pointed out:

1. Legitimate power is often short-lived. That is, it can be counted on to initially give the leader power, but it will quickly dissolve if the leader fails to utilize other power sources. The new principal, for example, has power based on the virtue of the principal’s formal position. If this leader fails to exhibit any of the other types of power, the leader is at great risk of losing the respect of subordinates and the ability to influence their behaviors.

2. Reward power can be very strong in the short run. As psychological experiments have consistently shown, however, overdependence on rewards can ultimately lead to noncompliance. Subordinates who experience prolonged use of rewards may become dependent and, in the worst case, may cease being motivated by or interested
in the reward. A similar parallel is seen in overindulged or spoiled children.

3. Coercive power, particularly in cases of prolonged use, often leads subordinates to feelings of fear, frustration, alienation, and disdain. While its use does lead to compliance initially, as with reward power, it is overreliance on coercive power that is usually its downfall.

4. Expert power is most often found in a climate that is high in openness and trust. Subordinates who believe that their leader has expertise or specialized knowledge are usually receptive of the leader’s influence. Leaders with expert power find that they spend less time directly monitoring employee performance than do leaders who rely heavily on reward power and coercive power.

5. Referent power can lead to a greater sense of commitment and trust than can any of the other four types of power. Leaders who use referent power usually lead subordinates who are enthusiastic and loyal. As with expert power, there is considerably less monitoring of employees required by leaders using referent power than there is by leaders relying on reward and coercive power.

In the school setting, there are occasions for leaders to use all five types of power described here. Understanding the benefits and shortcomings of each type allows leaders to facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community outlined by ISLLC Standard 1. Leaders who are newly appointed to their position of authority must be cognizant that the legitimate power vested in their position allows them to begin the facilitation process. This is welcome news to school administrators who may not have had occasions to demonstrate their expert or referent power so soon after being hired. The best leaders are aware that this legitimate power is short-lived, though. Therefore, these individuals quickly begin demonstrating their expertise to the school staff they are leading. In many ways, the legitimate power is the foot in the door so that facilitation can begin. However, expert power will go a long way toward allowing the leader to develop, articulate, implement, and steward a vision of learning that is appropriate for the school setting. The referent power, which the school leader must also demonstrate as early in their tenure as possible, will help the leader transfer this vision to the rest of the school community. It is referent power, combined with expert power that allows school leaders to demonstrate that they know what is best for the school community, while also getting the school community to buy into and support this vision. Although legitimate power provides the foundation, school leaders must make every effort to demonstrate, and thus earn, expert and referent power so as to successfully embody ISLLC Standard 1.

Even though the above paragraph ignored reward power and coercive power, they, too, have their place in school leadership. They must be used sparingly to be effective, and they do not have nearly as much power and sustenance as
do expert and referent power. The best leaders throughout history had strong expert power or strong referent power or, in most cases, a strong dose of both.

Alfie Kohn, author of Punished by Rewards (1993), illustrates the ineffectiveness of reward power with children. The same level of ineffectiveness or, at best, short-term effectiveness, can be witnessed when leaders over rely on reward power with adults. As Alfie Kohn stated in a 1995 interview published in Educational Leadership:

There are at least 70 studies showing that extrinsic motivators—including A’s, sometimes praise, and other rewards—are not merely ineffective over the long haul but counterproductive with respect to the things that concern us most: desire to learn, commitment to good values, and so on. Another group of studies shows that when people are offered a reward for doing a task that involves some degree of problem solving or creativity—or for doing it well—they will tend to do lower quality work than those offered no reward. (http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/edlead/9509/kohn.html)

The Iowa Studies

The Iowa Studies, conducted in 1939 at Iowa State University, were an attempt at analyzing and comparing the behaviors of leaders. While Theory X and Theory Y speak to the assumptions leaders make about people and the Five Types of Power examine the actions of leaders and the basis of those actions, the emphasis from the Iowa Studies is more on what leaders do than what leaders are.

As a result of the Iowa Studies, three different types of leadership styles emerged. These constructs were based on how leaders handled several different decision-making tasks and situations throughout the duration of the experiments. They are:

♦ **Authoritarian Leadership**—Leaders took full authority and responsibility for the tasks at hand. They were highly structured and dictated the structure of the entire work situation. These leaders were highly directive and sought no participation from subordinates in decision making.

♦ **Democratic Leadership**—Leaders encouraged the group to be involved in the decision-making process. They informed subordinates about all conditions affecting their work, and they encouraged subordinates to express their feelings and ideas openly.

♦ **Laissez-faire Leadership**—Leaders gave subordinates complete decision-making authority and freedom. They provided no direction whatsoever, and essentially provided no leadership.
While the Iowa Studies have been the focus of some criticism during the last 60+ years because of the researchers’ apparent failure to control for many of the variables present, they remain a very viable and credible source of information for leaders about subordinate preferences. The Iowa Studies are considered to be landmark studies because of their attempt to identify the effects of leadership behaviors on a group’s attitudes about their work. Among the findings were the following:

**Figure 1.1 Leadership Style Approaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Laissez-faire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Approaches and Results</em></td>
<td>♦ Leader determined all policies for group members. ♦ Leader specified allowable actions and interactions. ♦ Leader provided praise and criticism. ♦ Production level remained high when group was satisfied with its efforts. ♦ Members were increasingly more submissive and demanded the leader’s attention and approval. Productivity was about the same as democratic, but required leader’s presence.</td>
<td>♦ Leader encouraged group to create policies. ♦ Leader gave overview of task and steps before work began. ♦ Members gained satisfaction in making their own decisions. ♦ Members showed less tension and hostility; more cohesion and cooperation. About as productive as authoritarian, but also productive in leader’s absence.</td>
<td>♦ Leaders encouraged complete freedom. ♦ Resources were provided, but leader gave information only when asked. ♦ Members had little sense of accomplishment. ♦ Overall, lower productivity, satisfaction, and cohesiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
♦ Measured productivity was slightly higher under authoritarian leadership than it was under democratic leadership. It was the lowest under laissez-faire leadership.

♦ Subordinates reported that they preferred democratic leadership over the other two styles. Not only does this seem logical, but a democratic style of leadership has become the norm today as the contemporary organizational models stress a wider use of participatory management.

♦ Given the choice, subordinates prefer laissez-faire leadership to authoritarian leadership. Though they are less productive under laissez-faire leadership, this demonstrates that chaos is an organizational trait preferred over rigidity.

♦ Although authoritarian leadership led to an initial increase in productivity, this style tended to yield either aggressive or apathetic behavior from subordinates. This was thought to be the result of frustration subordinates felt from the authoritarian leadership style.

♦ Those subordinates who expressed apathy under authoritarian leadership became aggressive when the leadership style changed to laissez-faire. In fact, laissez-faire leadership produced the most aggressive behaviors of all three styles studied.

The implications the Iowa Studies have for the school administrator who internalizes ISLLC Standard 1 are profound. As the language of Standard 1 specifically indicates the need for the leader to be a facilitator, then one must look at the teachings of the Iowa Studies and lift from these results information about which leadership style lends itself best to facilitating.

It appears difficult, for example, to see authoritarian leadership as being facilitative in nature. Leaders who direct all actions of their subordinates and who fail to relinquish any responsibility or authority find that facilitating is a challenging way in which to lead groups. Similarly, a laissez-faire leader who allows subordinates complete responsibility and authority for decisions and tasks may find it difficult to facilitate group work and interactions. Merriam-Webster’s (2007) dictionary defines facilitate as “to make easier: help bring about.” A facilitator, therefore, must provide the resources to make things easier for subordinates to accomplish, while also providing the guidance and/or assistance necessary for success. Democratic leadership, by its very nature, describes these behaviors far more effectively than do the other two styles.

### The Ohio State Studies

Some of the most influential research in leadership behavior, incorporating the surveying of subordinates to gain perceptions on leadership, was pioneered in the 1950s and 1960s at the Ohio State University (Yukl, 1994). The Personnel Research Board of the Ohio State University developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) at a time when there was little concrete in-
formation available about employee perceptions of their leader’s behavior. This questionnaire, and the studies surrounding it, identified two separate leadership dimensions:

1. Consideration—the extent to which the leader is likely to have job relationships characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinates’ ideas, friendship, warmth, and consideration of their feelings. This dimension of leadership behavior is primarily relationship-oriented (Bensimon, Neumann, & Binbaum, 1989; Yukl, 1994). A high consideration score on the LBDQ is indicative of psychological closeness between leaders and their subordinates.

2. Initiating structure—the extent to which the leader is likely to structure his or her role toward goal achievement and to set well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job completed. High-initiating-structure leaders play an active role in directing group activities, communicating task information, scheduling, and problem solving. Furthermore, these leaders encourage uniformity of procedures, standards, and expectations.

Most studies show that consideration is generally related to high employee satisfaction. Research has further indicated that consideration is related much less often to high performance than is initiating structure. In some studies, initiating structure was found to be related to job satisfaction but less often to high productivity, low absenteeism, and low turnover (Bass & Stogdill, 1990). Figure 1.2 depicts the Ohio State leadership studies results.

**Figure 1.2 Ohio State Leadership Studies Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager’s Initiating Structure</th>
<th>High Performance</th>
<th>Low Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s Consideration High</td>
<td>Low Grievance Rate</td>
<td>High Grievance Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Turnover</td>
<td>Low Turnover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low High</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High High</td>
<td>High Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Low</td>
<td>Low High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research relating these studies to educational leaders has found, quite expectedly, that effective school principals scored higher on both consideration
and initiating structure than did ineffective principals (Brown, 1967). Similar results have been consistently found in studies relating consideration and initiating structure to stakeholder perceptions of superintendents’ effectiveness.

The Ohio State studies had a profound impact on leadership thinking and research. Perhaps their major effect is that wide use has been made of the LBDQ, for measuring consideration and initiating structure. The LBDQ was established as a method whereby group members would be able to describe the leader behavior of designated leaders in formal organizations (Halpin, 1957; Stodgill, 1963). The instrument contained items describing the manner in which a leader might behave, along with the respondent rating of the way in which the leader is perceived to engage in each type of behavior (Halpin, 1957). These concepts have become part of the conventional wisdom about leadership and are the basis of many programs to train leaders (Blake & Mouton, 1969; Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Upon examination of ISLLC Standard 1, it is clear that leaders who internalize and exhibit this standard are most likely to be those showing high consideration and a high degree of initiating structure. As Standard 1 states:

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

A high degree of initiating structure is clearly necessary for school leaders to facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning. Those leaders who direct subordinates’ behavior and keep subordinates and themselves focused on goals have exhibited the skills that will enable them to do what the standard directs. Similarly, leaders with a high degree of consideration will be best suited to ensure that this vision of learning is shared and supported by the school community. Just as research has indicated the need for school administrators to score high in initiating structure and consideration in order that subordinates will consider them effective, so too must they score high in both areas to accomplish the goals set forth by ISLLC Standard 1.

Both initiating structure and consideration can be viewed as dependent variables in the development of school leaders. As both of these variables are measurable, it is logical to expect that leaders can be trained to increase their personal levels of consideration and initiating structure in order to maximize effectiveness. This is particularly necessary as leaders and leadership programs align their expectations with accepted standards of performance.

Summary

Research is replete with studies that distinguish between leadership styles and behaviors to arrive at theories which best describe the essence of strong school leadership. ISLLC Standard 1 uses terminology such as “facilitating, ar-
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“facilitate, articulate, and implement” to describe one aspect of leadership necessary for the administration of effective schools. Many of the theories discussed in this chapter attempt to illustrate how leaders “facilitate, articulate, and implement” their vision for an organization.

The sharp contrast created between Theory X and Theory Y assumptions, for example, creates one lens through which to view leadership behaviors based on contrasting assumptions. Through an examination of Theory X and Theory Y, behaviors necessary for the attainment of ISLLC Standard 1 are apparent. A similar contrast exists when looking at transformational and transactional leadership styles. These two styles, which are believed to both contribute to effective schooling to some degree, create sharp contrasts between leadership behaviors. Some of these behaviors, namely those associated with transformational leader-
ship, are more closely aligned with the intent of ISLLC Standard 1. Similar contrasts are drawn after an examination of the five types of power, as delineated by French and Raven.

The Iowa Studies and the Ohio State Studies are two landmark studies that have further assisted in the identification of leadership behaviors most closely associated with terminology like “articulating, facilitation, and implementation.” By examining the results of these studies, school leaders can more readily see which behaviors are best aligned with ISLLC Standard 1. Although all of the leadership styles and behaviors identified through these studies are used at one point or another in school leadership, there are clearly behaviors that are more closely associated with ISLLC Standard 1. As the other five standards are presented throughout the remainder of this textbook, opportunities will arise for noting contrasting behaviors that may be beneficial in the attainment of those standards.

Chapter Highlights

- Theory X and Theory Y describe two conflicting assumptions that leaders make about worker motivation, behavior, and performance. Essentially, a Theory X assumption is that the average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if at all possible. A Theory Y assumption is that the average human being not only accepts responsibility, but also seeks it.
- Leaders can be identified as transformational or transactional. Transformational leaders concern themselves with the needs of their employees and even place those needs above their own, whereas transactional leaders use incentives to secure employee compliance.
- Five types of power often used by leaders are legitimate, reward, coercive, expert, and referent. Expert and referent power are the most lasting and powerful in terms of their ability to generate followership.
- The Iowa studies identified three distinct leadership styles: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire.
- The Ohio State studies had a profound impact on leadership thinking and research. Perhaps their major effect is that wide use has been made of the LBDQ, for measuring consideration and initiating structure.
Application Questions

1. Theory X and Theory Y are based on the assumptions that leaders make about followers. Think about colleagues with whom you work in school. Are Theory X assumptions or Theory Y assumptions more appropriate in examining the motivation and performance of these colleagues? Does your school principal lead more with Theory X assumptions or with Theory Y assumptions? How would you differ if you were leading your current faculty? Why?

2. In your school district, how many leaders are you aware of who exhibit strong referent and strong expert power? Are there any behaviors of these leaders that you wish to emulate? Now, think about those leaders who you regularly see using reward and coercive power. What about these leaders would you like to emulate?

3. How can information gained from the Iowa Studies and the Ohio State Studies help you as a future school leader? Are there findings from these studies that you disagree with? If so, what is the basis of this disagreement?

Field Activity

Conduct a brief, yet structured interview with two different administrators in your school district. Explain that the purpose of this interview is to discover how the administrators gain compliance from followers. Any administrative position with any group of followers is appropriate for this interview. For example, an assistant principal can talk about how he or she gets students to follow the suggestions or commands that they are given; a principal can talk about how he or she gets teachers to follow suggestions for improved classroom performance; the director of transportation can talk about how he or she gets school bus drivers to follow suggestions/directives. These brief interviews should then be analyzed to assist you in determining the extent to which the administrators operate with Theory X or Theory Y assumptions; the type(s) of power most often used by the administrators; and the leadership style to which the administrators appear to prescribe.

Finally, compare the responses made by these administrators to the responses you would like to give if you are faced with these same questions while in a future administrative position. Are they the same or considerably different? If the responses you would like to give are different, what steps do you think you will need to take to be in a position where different responses will yield better results?
Have You Thought About It?

In some ways, Mrs. Beavers would benefit from using some Theory X assumptions when trying to prevent disciplinary issues. That is, Mrs. Beavers should be visible to students, thereby letting them know that she is watching. While being visible, Mrs. Beavers might also be well served to use Coercive Power and show the students that she can and will punish misbehavior. Ultimately, Mrs. Beavers could make Theory Y assumptions, and she can work to earn Expert and Referent Power from her students. At first, she needs to show toughness and demonstrate that she is in charge.

What do you think?
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Think About It

Dr. Edwin Felix is principal of Townsend High School, one of the largest schools in the state, with an enrollment of almost 3,000. Dr. Felix feels that building a master schedule each spring and summer has become an unmanageable task, even with the assistance of his three assistant principals and two administrative interns. It is one of the administrative tasks that Dr. Felix has the most disdain for, but he writes it off as a necessary evil of school administration.

Compounding the scheduling challenges facing Dr. Felix is the superintendent’s decision that Townsend will change to a 4×4 block schedule next year. Despite the new scheduling format that will be required, Dr. Felix is concerned because he hasn’t read much of the research on the effectiveness of the 4×4 block schedule. The little bit he knows tells him that many believe the schedule increases teacher and student productivity. Student learning, the result of increased productivity, appeals to Dr. Felix. How will the people feel about it though, he wonders? Will people suffer, even though productivity increases? Or, perhaps the reverse will be true. Dr. Felix plans on looking at this issue closely, certainly before it is time to build next year’s schedule.
As you read Chapter 2, be cognizant of Dr. Felix’s struggle to balance the needs of production with the needs of people. Also, think about the manner in which the 4×4 block schedule was introduced as the new scheduling plan for Townsend. Are there any red flags for you?

In attempting to define school leadership, many theorists and practitioners refer to the necessity of bringing diverse viewpoints together. Although definitions differ in their typical views of power structures and control, an almost universally accepted notion is that leaders are people who bring followers’ viewpoints and beliefs to a common end. School leaders, in particular it seems, must be adept at creating a shared purpose and common set of guiding principles that governs the behavior of all school stakeholders. The wording of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 1 necessitates that school leaders exhibit skill in facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

To best accomplish the aforementioned task, it behooves leaders to understand their own beliefs and motivations. Knowledge of oneself is a critical prerequisite to effectively understanding and leading others. Adding to Sir Francis Bacon’s assertion that “knowledge is power,” we can assume that self-knowledge is the foundation of power. Self-knowledge can further be understood by examining the contemporary concept of intrapersonal intelligence. Howard Gardner, Harvard professor of education, introduced the concept of intrapersonal intelligence in his book, *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (1983). Essentially, intrapersonal intelligence is defined as the ability for self-analysis and reflection—to be able to quietly contemplate and assess one’s accomplishments, to review one’s behavior and innermost feelings, and to make plans and set goals. In a sense, intrapersonal intelligence can be understood as an individual’s capacity to know one’s self. Although interpersonal intelligence, discussed later in this chapter, is necessary so that leaders can understand and relate to others, it is a leader’s intrapersonal intelligence that allows the leader to first understand his or her own beliefs, vision, and mission.

But how do leaders develop intrapersonal intelligence? Can such intelligence be taught? To answer these questions, it is of great value for prospective school leaders to continually examine the behaviors of school leaders with whom they are acquainted. This can be done informally, through observation, or it can occur more formally, through interviews. In studying leaders, however it is done, we find some who seem to be very aware of what they really believe in. These leaders seem to have a moral compass which guides all of their actions. They are not persuaded by quick-fix reforms, but are instead governed by a sense of what they really believe is right and most important.

When you encounter leaders like those described above, the odds are that they have spent considerable time reflecting on their beliefs and allowing them to develop over time and through an innate system of values. Although situations may change and circumstances may require different approaches, the be-
beliefs that govern behaviors of the most effective leaders are both constant and grounded.

Stephen Covey’s *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People* (1989) has as its foundation three habits that constitute what Covey terms the “private victory.” When people internalize these first three habits, it is assumed that they have gained an understanding of themselves and are then ready to work on the habits that constitute the “public victory.” Although an oversimplification of Dr. Covey’s work, the essence is that we first get control of our own beliefs, goals, and mission before we can begin to effectively work with others. The “private victory” occurs when we have truly developed intrapersonal intelligence.

Of particular value is Covey’s habit 2, begin with the end in mind. This habit refers to an individual’s ability to begin shaping their own destiny through a true understanding of what they believe is important. It is based on the principle of vision. School leaders must understand themselves and what they see or envision so as to lead others to a common vision. To accomplish this, Covey suggests the creation of a personal mission statement. In quiet, contemplative times, we are able to best articulate what really matters to us, what we really think is important. If we all take the time to begin listing all of the people, relationships, values, and beliefs that are dearest to our hearts, then we can begin to make more sense of the world and of our place within the world. The creation of a personal mission statement is a powerful exercise that, if done contemplatively, can lead to a genuine understanding of what our own personal missions are. When school mission statements, so common in school buildings all across America, fail it is usually because the words of the school mission statement do not resonate with the individuals who work and live there. If a school leader is to help others reach a common vision or mission, then it is logical to assume that the leader must first be keenly aware of his or her own mission in life. If you have never taken the opportunity to do so before, now would be an excellent time to begin crafting your own personal mission statement. Arguably more than any other individual task, this exercise will lead you to a better understanding of why you make the leadership choices that you make in your daily life. All those aspiring to school leadership positions must understand the driving force behind the decisions that they make on a moment by moment basis. Although the process of decision making is further explored later, the idea that decisions are tied to beliefs, vision, and mission is essential to understand now. More than 200 years ago, Benjamin Franklin understood this personal leadership imperative when he said,

We stand at the crossroads, each minute, each hour, each day, making choices. We choose the thoughts we allow ourselves to think, the passions we allow ourselves to feel, and the actions we allow ourselves to perform. Each choice is made in the context of whatever value system we’ve selected to govern our lives. In selecting the value system, we are, in a very real way, making the most important choice we will ever make. (Franklin, 1996)
Creating a personal mission statement requires an individual to consider the different roles that the individual performs in life. It requires that one focuses clearly on the relationships that are important and on how those relationships lead to a better and more fulfilling life. Furthermore, creating a personal mission statement requires an individual to understand what he or she hopes to accomplish in life and how relationships with others inform and contribute to those accomplishments.

The same facts hold true for school leaders who wish to develop schoolwide mission statements. The relationships among and between school stakeholders and how those relationships contribute to the overall purpose of schooling must be considered as the mission statement is crafted. Leaders are people who understand the interdependence of people. It is up to the leader, particularly in light of ISLLC Standard 1, to lead others toward the creation of a common purpose for schooling.

It is important to note that an understanding of the cultural history of a school is an imperative prerequisite if a school leader has any hopes of being successful in facilitating the development of a schoolwide mission statement. As Terrence Deal (1985) pointed out,

> Each school has its story of origin, the people or circumstances that launched it, and those who presided over its course thereafter. Through evolutionary development—crises and resolutions, internal innovations and external pressures, plans, and chance occurrences—the original concept was shaped and reshaped into an organic collection of traditions and distinctive ways. Through a school’s history, a parade of students, teachers, principals, and parents cast sustaining memories. Great accomplishments meld with dramatic failures to form a potentially cherishable lore. (p. 615)

As is explored more completely in Chapter 5, an understanding and appreciation of and a respect for the culture of a school is a great aid to any school leader desirous of changing or even continuing the course that a school is on. As a school leader attempts to create a common purpose for the school’s existence, and as the leader labors through the joyful and valuable task of facilitating the development of a schoolwide mission, having a sense of the school’s history and being seen as a valuable part of its presence and its future is essential.

**Creating a Common Purpose for Schooling**

Once a school leader has achieved the personal mastery or private victory described by Covey, the leader must assist others in the school community to develop a common set of beliefs that guide the practices of all school stakeholders. This leads to the creation of a school mission statement. Such statements, which exist in virtually every school across the country, have sadly been rendered meaningless in many school communities because they do not really capture the essence of what the school is all about. ISLLC Standard 1 refers to the
importance of creating a vision of learning that really is shared by everyone. Before attempting to do this, it is imperative that the school leader exhibits the intrapersonal intelligence necessary to first understand his or her own beliefs and motivations.

To facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community, a leader must be concerned with the people who make up the school community, as well as the need for all stakeholders to successfully perform their duties. These two critical dimensions of leadership have been described by several different leadership models proposed within the last fifty years. One of the more popular approaches to identifying leadership styles of practitioners is Robert Blake and Jane Mouton’s Leadership Grid. Originally called the Managerial Grid when it was first proposed in 1985, the Leadership Grid defines two separate dimensions of leadership orientation. These dimensions, labeled concern for people and concern for production, are plotted on a 9×9 grid with the horizontal axis representing concern for production and the vertical axis representing concern for people.

![Figure 2.1 The Managerial Grid](image)

The grid is used to identify leadership orientations on the basis of the ways in which leaders exhibit task-oriented (concern for production) and people-oriented (concern for people) behaviors.

Although each axis represents a score range of one (low) to nine (high) resulting in eighty-one possible leadership styles, it is the following four extreme styles and one central style that have been labeled and assigned descriptive language.

**Country Club**

1,9

**Team**

9,9

**Organization Man**

5,5

**Impoverished**

1,1

**Authority-Obedience**

9,1

**Introduction to Educational Administration: Standards, Theories and Practice (2nd Edition)** by Douglas J. Fiore, Ph.D. © 2009. Eye On Education. All rights reserved. No reproduction or distribution without written permission from Publisher.
1,1 Impoverished Management—Leaders with this style achieved the lowest possible score in both concern for people and concern for production. The result is the minimum level of effort possible to achieve the organization’s objectives and to make people feel valued and appreciated. Although it is difficult to even think of an individual scoring at this point on the grid, in truth, it does happen.

1,9 Country Club Management—The highest possible score in concern for people combined with the lowest possible score in concern for production describes the type of leadership style in which all emphasis appears to be on making colleagues and subordinates feel good and valued. Although the atmosphere under this style of leadership may be comfortable, the production suffers drastically because all leadership attention is being focused on people’s feelings and attitudes.

5,5 Organization-Man Management—This style of leadership leads to an environment in which people feel adequately valued and the organization achieves objectives at a minimally acceptable standard. Leaders exhibiting this style of leadership are rarely able to move the organization too far forward, and are instead often maintainers of the status quo.

9,1 Authority-Obedience—The highest possible score in concern for production combined with the lowest possible score in concern for people describes the type of leadership style in which production is maximized while employee feelings and attitudes are virtually ignored. Leaders with this style find that the human element of running the organization often gets in the way of production and success.

9,9 Team Management—When leaders are highly concerned with both people and production the resulting environment is a productive one in which committed, dedicated people work for common goals. Leaders exhibiting this style are considered motivational, and they strive to keep members of the organization involved, while keeping dissent to a minimum through skills in conflict resolution.

As might be assumed, evidence verifies that the 9,9 Team Management approach is preferred and is considered to be the most effective way to lead any organization. While 5,5 Organization-Man Management is typically judged as adequate, the leadership required for contemporary school settings indicates that leaders are best served to move out of such a “middle,” or neutral, level of performance as indicated by a score of 5,5. It is important to note that Blake and Mouton have developed instruments to stimulate feedback from colleagues and subordinates in regard to their perception of the leader’s concern for both people
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In this way, the Leadership Grid can be used as a developmental tool for school administrators desirous of continuous improvement.

Consider, as previously referred to, the need for all schools to have mission statements reflecting their beliefs and purpose. Which of the five leadership types described above would be the best one for leading others to the creation of a schoolwide mission statement? At first glance, the answer may not be obvious. In fact, a case could be made for each of the five types of leaders described by the leadership grid. While one may be preferred in certain situations, there are likely other occasions in which different styles yield the most desirable results. Figure 2.2 illustrates this point.

**Figure 2.2 Creating a Schoolwide Mission Statement**

**Impoverished Management**

This leader probably designs the mission statement by him- or herself. If others are involved, they are provided little direction and encouragement in the process. As they are also not scrutinized very closely because the results of their efforts are inconsequential to the leader, others who are involved can probably design the mission statement rather easily. The result is a statement that likely has little meaning to the school's constituents.

**Country Club Management**

This leader is sure to seek input so as to make everybody feel ownership in the mission statement. More than likely, the process of developing the mission statement will be driven solely by what the individuals involved want. The result will be a mission statement that people are happy with, but that may not reflect the actual mission of the school.

**Organization-Man Management**

This leader will likely develop a mission statement very similar to the one already in place in the school. If no mission statement is in place, this leader will likely lead others toward creating one that is modeled after another school's. People will be involved and there will be some emphasis on the goals of the organization. The result will be a mission statement that is typical of that found in many schools across America.

**Authority-Obedience**

This leader will see to it that the school's mission statement is created in the most efficient way possible. The focus of the mission statement will likely be on the goals that this leader believes are important for the school. The mission statement will probably involve little outside input and will demonstrate the strong desire this leader has for moving the school forward.
Team Management

This leader will lead others toward the creation of a mission statement that everybody supports and that reflects the needs of the school. The end product will most likely be a mission statement that truly reflects what is important to the stakeholders of this leader’s particular school.

Although it is clear that a team management approach is the one most likely to get the desired results of an effective mission statement supported by the school community, this is not the style that would be the most effective in all situations. While a team management approach to leadership has been found to be the preferred leadership style of most subordinates, the fact remains that certain situations require a leader to exhibit more concern for production than for people and vice versa. Even the best leaders, those who understand the need to balance concern for people with concern for production, will state that they have been faced with situations that required them to make decisions solely on the basis of what was best for people and others solely on the basis of what was best for production. They work to keep these situations to a minimum, but the fact is that there are times in which a leader’s style must tilt more in one direction than in another.

Four Frames of Leadership and Management

Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal sifted through many of the complex theories and literature shared earlier and combined with their own analyses, theories, and experiences identified four “frames” as a way of understanding organizations and in identifying ways in which leaders define situations around them (Bolman & Deal, 1992, p. 15). Frames, as the term has been coined, are described as the lenses through which individuals see the world and place that world in order. Frames help people filter out the things in the world they do not want to see, thus frames are inherently inaccurate and skewed in terms of individual reality. But people need frames to make sense of the world and any experience in it; frames help people determine and guide their behaviors. Through the use of frames, it is possible for people to view the same situation in entirely different ways. The four frameworks proposed by Bolman and Deal (1992) are the Structural, the Human Resource, the Political, and the Symbolic.

According to Bolman and Deal (2002, p. 60), these four frames represent the different ways in which leaders perceive organizational situations, and in turn shape how these situations can be managed most effectively. The first two frames, Structural and Human Resource are related to managerial effectiveness, whereas the Political and Symbolic frames are better related to leadership effectiveness. Brief examples of how the frames apply to school leadership are as follows:
♦ **Structural**—The structural frame emphasizes specialized roles and formal relationships. Oftentimes classroom observations and evaluation conferences are viewed through a structural lens. That is, the school administrator and the teacher are conscious of the role differences in the evaluation process.

♦ **Human Resource**—The human resource frame considers the needs of the individual above all else. When school leaders examine situations through a human resource lens, they are consciously considering the impact that the individual has on the organization, as well as the impact the organization has on the individual.

♦ **Political**—The political frame relates well to referent power. This frame focuses on bargaining, negotiating, coercion, and compromise. School leaders perceiving a situation through the political frame are conscious of the effects they have on people. They use tools at their disposal to move people forward and to get them to accomplish goals.

♦ **Symbolic**—The symbolic frame emphasizes organizations as cultures with rituals and ceremonies. As such, it is through this frame that school leaders adapt their leadership behavior to best fit the situation. When school leaders view the organization through a symbolic frame, they see the underlying norms and behaviors that make people act as they do.

Bolman and Deal’s (2002, p. 66) theory further assumes that a leader possessing leadership orientations from all four frames will yield the most powerful leadership style. In contemporary educational environments, there is a greater demand for differentiation and individualism. Leaders need the ability to adapt cognitively to a variety of situations and therefore, effective school leaders are required to understand multiple frames and know how to use them in practice if they are to reach their full potential.

**Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership**

Similar to Blake and Mouton’s Leadership Grid, situational leadership theory concentrates on two key leadership behaviors. Whereas Blake and Mouton labeled their two leadership dimensions as *concern for production* and *concern for people*, Hersey and Blanchard examine *task behavior* and *relationship behavior*.

♦ **Task Behavior**—The leader engages in one-way communication by outlining what each worker is to do. The communication is characterized as one-way because there is no room for workers to give feedback to the leader. The leader not only explains what to do, but the leader also includes when, where, and how tasks are to be carried out.
- **Relationship Behavior**—The leader and the workers engage in two-way communication. Workers have ample opportunities for feedback, and the leader is able to offer support and guidance and to act as a true facilitator.

Hersey and Blanchard took these two dimensions and created a four-quadrant model with task and relationship ranging from low to high on each of the two axes. These four quadrants were labeled as structuring, coaching, supporting, and delegating (Figure 2.3).

![Figure 2.3 Situational Leadership Model](image)

Hersey and Blanchard then took the traditional two dimensions and added a third consideration to the equation. That consideration is the maturity or readiness of the followers. To determine which of the four leadership styles (structuring, coaching, supporting, or delegating) was best for any given situation, Hersey and Blanchard posit that the leader must carefully consider the readiness of the followers. Furthermore, the leader must be aware that a follower’s readiness or maturity is task specific. That is, an individual may be quite mature in one situation but far more immature in another.

Taking cues from Fred Fiedler’s Contingency Theory, presented in detail during the discussion of ISLLC Standard 5, Hersey and Blanchard looked at two types of maturity as being particularly important: job maturity and psychological maturity.

- **Job Maturity**—Essentially, this type of maturity refers to an individual’s experience and education. A teacher who is considered to be
competent and has many years of experience in his or her position would be considered an individual with strong job maturity.

Psychological Maturity—A psychologically mature teacher is one who consistently works hard for students because the teacher knows that the students rely on him or her. This individual essentially has a high level of motivation reflected in a willingness to accept responsibility and in a desire for achievement.

Hersey and Blanchard’s model earns the name Situational Leadership Theory because of the belief that a leader’s decisions regarding the appropriateness of task behaviors and relationship behaviors are tied directly to their perceptions of the followers’ job maturity and psychological maturity. In this way, leadership truly is situational.

In matching the situation with the appropriate leadership style, school administrators can enhance greatly their leadership abilities. Additionally, school administrators who apply Situational Leadership Theory to their daily practice will find that followers feel much more confident in the leader’s ability to respond to issues of differing magnitudes and in different arenas. Essentially, the four leadership styles identified by Hersey and Blanchard are best used in the following manners:

Structuring—This style is most effective when followers are low in motivation and in ability. It is a high-task, low-relationship leadership style, characterized by the leader’s need to be specific in directing followers. Because the leader perceives the followers to have low ability and low motivation, the task can only be completed with strong direction and less concern for relationships.

Coaching—This style is most effective when followers are motivated but lacking in ability. It is a high-task, high-relationship style of leadership, characterized by the need for the leader to be both specific and direct in instructions while maintaining high concern for the followers and their feelings. The followers most in need of coaching want to perform the task well, but they lack the ability to do so.

Supporting—This style is most effective when followers have ability but are lacking in motivation. It is a low-task, high-relationship style of leadership, characterized by the need for the leader to demonstrate great concern for people and relationships. Although little direction is needed, as these followers understand how to perform the task, their low motivation necessitates that the leader focus energies on meeting their personal needs.

Delegating—This style is most effective when followers are high in both ability and motivation. It is a high-task, low-relationship lead-
ership style, characterized by the leader’s need to merely monitor followers’ performance. As followers demonstrate both ability and desire to accomplish the task, the leader is able to turn the task over to them and merely monitor their progress from a distance.

Consider the following two scenarios. In each one, try to identify which of the above four leadership styles ought to be used by the principal. Of greater significance, try to identify why the leader ought to use that particular style.

**Scenario 1**

Principal Jacobs is pondering how best to approach Ms. Winton, one of Bayside Middle School’s most effective teachers. After 29 years of teaching English composition, Ms. Winton has encountered almost every conceivable type of learner. Her tremendous skills at differentiating instruction have earned Ms. Winton the reputation as one of the county’s top teachers of English. For some reason, however, Ms. Winton just doesn’t seem as excited about teaching anymore. She has only two more years to go before retirement, and although she is a gifted educator, her motivation to face a new batch of 100 Bayside students has dramatically subsided.

**Scenario 2**

Coach Octavio Hernandez has wanted to coach football since he first stepped onto the field as a high school student himself, just eight short years ago. Throughout his four years on Monmouth’s varsity squad and continuing through his days in college, Octavio longed for the day when he could teach high school biology and coach for the varsity football team. Now, as special teams’ assistant, his dream has become a reality. Principal Johnson sat before Coach Hernandez trying to find the words to help the inexperienced coach through his current dilemma. It seems that many of the players fail to listen to Coach Hernandez whenever the other coaches are out of earshot. Although Coach Hernandez has more enthusiasm and energy for coaching football than do any of Monmouth’s other coaches, for some reason, the players just don’t seem to take him seriously.

Through these scenarios, it becomes apparent that Hersey and Blanchard are correct in their assumption that different situations call for a different style of leadership. A one-size-fits-all model of leadership is ineffective for our schools. School leaders must understand when to use different methods to accomplish the objectives of the school and continuously improve student learning.

There is great support for *Situational Leadership Theory* among school administrators. It is widely considered to be valuable to recognize that different situations call for different styles of leadership. What is often missed in analyses of *Situational Leadership Theory*, however, is that it is dependent on the leader’s abil-
ity to recognize the readiness level of followers. School administrators often find that their ability to understand the maturity level of all school staff members in all situations is made more challenging because of the many demands of the administrator’s job. This is true, and it indicates the need for administrators to be able to apply the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 3 to their daily work. Still, it is clear that the quickest route toward becoming a master of Situational Leadership Theory is to get to know as much about the people who work in the school as the leader possibly can.

This relates well to the wording of ISLLC Standard 1, and it explains why this theory was included in this section of the book. As Standard 1 says,

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

Can a school administrator possibly facilitate the development, articulation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community without first understanding the maturity level of the individuals comprising that community? Can the appropriate leadership style be chosen to create this vision without such knowledge? Reflecting back on earlier parts of this chapter, can a school administrator create a vision for many without first having created an individual vision? These are questions that must be answered.

**Applying Theory to ISLLC Standard 1**

Chapters 1 and 2 have both introduced administrative theories and models relevant to ISLLC Standard 1. The depth and breadth of the theories presented actually makes them relevant to several, or in some cases all, of the ISLLC standards. Each time a theory or model was introduced and discussed, effort was made to relate it to ISLLC Standard 1. However, many of these theories will be revisited in future chapters as their applicability to multiple ISLLC standards becomes apparent. Likewise, new theories will be introduced throughout this book that will continue having relevance for ISLLC Standard 1. In those cases, the connection will be made between the theory’s context and all of the standards to which it applies.

As a means of summarizing, the table below shows the knowledge, dispositions, and performances indicated by ISLLC Standard 1. After carefully examining the table’s contents, ask yourself how the theories and models presented thus far can prepare school leaders for accomplishing the spirit of ISLLC Standard 1.

**Standard 1**

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

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

- learning goals in a pluralistic society
- the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans
- systems theory
- information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies
- effective communication
- effective consensus-building and negotiation skills

**Dispositions**

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- the educability of all
- a school vision of high standards of learning
- continuous school improvement
- the inclusion of all members of the school community
- ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults
- a willingness to continuously examine one’s own assumptions, beliefs, and practices
- doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance

**Performances**

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

- the vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members
- the vision and mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities
- the core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders
- the vision is developed with and among stakeholders
- the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated
- progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders
- the school community is involved in school improvement efforts
- the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions
- an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated
- assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals
- relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals
barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed
needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission and goals
existing resources are used in support of the school vision and goals
the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised

Summary

School leaders who begin with the end in mind understand what is really important to them as they set out to lead a school. These leaders, after establishing their own vision for student learning, then assist others in the school at creating a common vision that is shared by all school stakeholders.

To ensure that the vision is, in fact, shared by all, a school leader must be concerned enough with people and their needs to understand what they really deem to be important parts of the vision. Blake and Mouton’s Leadership Grid is one tool that assists leaders in recognizing their personal concern for people and how this concern compares/contrasts with their concern for production. Even though the styles of individual leaders differ, a strong concern for both people and production is the most effective combination for accomplishing what is intended by ISLLC Standard 1.

Hersey and Blanchard have shown that leadership is, indeed, situational. Task behaviors and relationship behaviors of leaders are examined in combination with the maturity or readiness of followers in order to arrive at the type of leadership required in a given situation. Again, situational leadership requires that leaders are familiar enough with their followers to understand when it is most appropriate to lead them in certain ways.

The knowledge, dispositions, and performances indicated by ISLLC Standard 1 require that leaders have both intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence. The most effective school leaders are those individuals who understand how to combine their beliefs about student learning with the beliefs of all school stakeholders. These leaders are able to create schoolwide beliefs and to base actions and decisions on these beliefs so as to improve opportunities for all students.

Chapter Highlights

School leaders must be adept at creating a shared purpose and common set of guiding principles that govern the behavior of all school stakeholders. To best accomplish this task, it behooves leaders to understand their own beliefs and motivations.

To facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by
the school community, a leader must be concerned with the people who make up the school community, as well as the need for all stakeholders to successfully perform their duties.

- Blake and Mouton’s Leadership Grid defines two separate dimensions of leadership orientation, concern for people and concern for production. The best leaders are able to strike a healthy balance between the two dimensions.

---

**Point**

A mission statement helps to create a compelling vision of the future. Properly written, a school’s mission statement provides all stakeholders with a direction and helps them to establish priorities. In many ways, a mission statement serves as a rallying cry for the school. It helps to bring everybody together with a crystal clear sense of purpose. Without a strong mission statement, it is virtually impossible for an educational leader to guide and to lead a school. Therefore, the development of a mission statement must be a main priority of any school leader.

**Counterpoint**

Mission statements are often too vague and too grandiose. A vague mission statement can do more harm than good because it is open to so many different interpretations. What does educating the “whole child” really mean? Similarly, a mission statement that is too grandiose can create a discouraging atmosphere. If a school demonstrates significant student learning gains as measured by testing, the gains will still look disappointing if the mission calls for “every child to succeed.” Developing a mission statement is sloppy work, and it rarely results in anything meaningful getting accomplished.

**Questions**

- Consider the mission statement in your school. Are there any parts that seem too vague or too grandiose?
- What steps can educational leaders take to ensure that their school’s mission statement really does define the school’s mission?
- When was your school’s mission statement developed? Has it been revisited in any way since?
♦ Situational leadership theory states that a leader’s decisions regarding the appropriateness of task behaviors and relationship behaviors are tied directly to their perceptions of the followers’ job maturity and psychological maturity.

♦ An important truth related to ISLLC Standard 1 is that the quickest route toward becoming a master of situational leadership theory is to get to know as much about the people who work in the school as the leader possibly can.

**Application Questions**

1. It was said that self-knowledge is the foundation of power. What does this statement mean to you? How is it relevant to effective school leadership?

2. Assess your current school principal using the four extreme styles and one central style as explained by Blake and Mouton’s Leadership Grid. Which of these five terms best describes your principal in your estimation? How does this description benefit or deter from your school’s overall effectiveness.

3. Some argue that situational leadership theory contradicts the notion that effective leaders know what they believe in and base their actions on these beliefs. If one is grounded in a particular set of beliefs or values, some argue, then leadership cannot be situational, but must be based solely on these held values. Defend situational leadership theory. How can leadership be situational while leaders continue to hold onto strongly held beliefs?

**Field Activity**

Examine your school’s mission statement. Look closely at the words and consider their meaning for you. If you were part of the group that created the mission statement, think back to the discussions that took place as the statement was crafted. If you were not part of the group that created the mission statement, then speak with somebody who was. Ask them to recall the discussions that took place while their team worked on writing the mission statement. Consider the following questions:

♦ Were efforts made to ensure that the mission statement reflected the beliefs and values of all staff members?

♦ Did the creation of the mission statement include parents?

♦ Were students given a voice when the mission statement was designed?

♦ Was the mission statement created for the school or was it designed to please an external group (i.e., an accrediting body)?
♦ Have things changed at the school in a way that would necessitate a change in the mission statement?
♦ Are there programs or practices in the school that apparently contradict the wording of the mission statement?
♦ Have the leaders in your school provided the type of leadership necessary to foster, create, and sustain the development of a school-wide mission?
♦ Do the different publics in your school (i.e., teachers, staff, parents, students) share a common purpose for schooling?

As you reflect on these questions or as you discuss them with colleagues, do they suggest a plan of action for you? Are there steps that you could take to improve the answers to any of the above questions? Design a plan for improving your school’s mission statement in a way that reflects the beliefs and values of all stakeholders. Discuss this plan with a school administrator.

**Have You Thought About It?**

It doesn’t appear as though Dr. Felix had much input in deciding on the 4×4 block schedule. Nevertheless, he needs to be mindful of Situational Leadership Theory as he plans to introduce this idea to his faculty and staff. If Dr. Felix uses a Human Resources frame in implementing the 4×4 block schedule in his school, he may have a better chance at success.

What do you think?
Chapter 3 and 4 examine the significant role school principals play as curriculum leaders. This role continues to gain importance as accountability demands become stronger and more pervasive. School leaders simply cannot be managers of people and resources as they sacrifice teaching and learning at the altar of efficiency. Such a model of school leadership was deemed adequate in some schools as recently as the 1970s. Those days are long gone now. All students in all schools need administrators who are masters of teaching and learning first and efficient managers of people and resources second.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 2 highlights the task of promoting the success of all students, not just those who would succeed despite the best efforts of education professionals. A relationship can be drawn between this statement and the shared vision mandated by ISLLC Standard 1. The relationship implies that school leaders who truly master Standard 1, that is, they do facilitate the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared vision, are the same leaders who promote “the success of all students.” For example, if a school principal is the steward of a vision that all children can learn, then that principal will be one who recognizes and cherishes his or her role as curriculum leader.

Furthermore, the leadership referred to by ISLLC Standard 2 extends the principal’s curriculum leadership beyond the confines of the regular school curriculum and the ordinary school day. The intent of ISLLC Standard 2 is to illustrate that this curriculum leadership, so vital to educational leadership, is extended to extracurricular offerings and professional learning and development of school staff members.

Standard Two

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
The role of the contemporary school leader is one that advocates, nurtures, and sustains “a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.” Beginning with a vision and assisting other stakeholders in sharing in the vision sets the framework for ISLLC Standard 2 objectives to be met. Creating, fostering, and sustaining a positive school culture is a responsibility of school administrators that is heightened because of the tremendous influence principals have in shaping such cultures. Chapter 5 continues the discussion around ISLLC Standard 2 by addressing this responsibility in concrete ways.

Look at the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of ISLLC Standard 2 depicted below. Think about these and revisit them as you read Chapters 3, 4, and 5. By studying the concepts and theories presented in these three chapters in light of the Standard, ISLLC Standard 2 ought to become more concrete and tangible.

**Standard 2**

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

**Knowledge**

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
- student growth and development
- applied learning theories
- applied motivational theories
- curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement
- principles of effective instruction
- measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies
- diversity and its meaning for educational programs
- adult learning and professional development models
- the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals
- the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth
- school cultures

**Dispositions**

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
- student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling
- the proposition that all students can learn
- the variety of ways in which students can learn
- life long learning for self and others
- professional development as an integral part of school improvement
the benefits that diversity brings to the school community
- a safe and supportive learning environment
- preparing students to be contributing members of society

**Performances**

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
- all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect
- professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals
- students and staff feel valued and important
- the responsibilities and contributions of each individual are acknowledged
- barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed
- diversity is considered in developing learning experiences
- lifelong learning is encouraged and modeled
- there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance
- technologies are used in teaching and learning
- student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated
- multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students
- the school is organized and aligned for success
- curricular, cocurricular, and extracurricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined
- curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies
- the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis
- a variety of sources of information is used to make decisions
- student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques
- multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students
- a variety of supervisory and evaluation models is employed
- pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families

Chapter 3 contains a brief historical perspective on curriculum development. The emphasis here is on the role the school administrator had in this area throughout American public school history. From there, using contemporary thought, the focus is on the skills and behaviors necessary to be a true instructional leader in today’s schools. Nurturing the instructional program and ensuring that it meets the needs of all students is the key.

Chapter 4 examines the myriad responsibilities of school leaders in maintaining an effective, student-centered, extracurricular program. Again, the emphasis is on having offerings for all students. This chapter also looks at how
school leaders recognize and honor student accomplishments, academically and otherwise. Motivational theory is examined in light of student recognition as well. Finally, Chapter 4 explores the role of school administrators in developing, nurturing, and sustaining an effective staff development program that meets the needs of all staff members.

Chapter 5 begins by defining school culture and concretely explaining how principals shape cultures through their behaviors. Subsequently, information is presented to assist in understanding how to read the culture of a school. Finally, elements of effective cultures of any learning organization are presented in order that they can be replicated or duplicated in other school settings.

It is important to note that the elements of a positive school culture ordinarily are present when school administrators act with integrity and behave in a fair and ethical manner. The knowledge, dispositions, and performances associated with ISLLC Standard 5 specify this behavior in more depth. Although Chapter 11 is devoted to elements of ISLLC Standard 5, it is impossible not to recognize their presence in much of what is talked about in this section. As mentioned in the Preface, the ISLLC Standards should not be understood as pieces of a puzzle with distinct borders that separate them from each other. The relationships between standards cannot, and should not be avoided. For this reason, as Chapters 4 and 5 unfold, it would be prudent to also consider their relationship to ISLLC Standard 5.

ISLLC Standard 2 states that “a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.” This is, perhaps, one of the most important standards in this age of accountability. At the very least, it is a standard that is characteristic of the changing face of educational leadership.
Educational Accountability, typically measured by student test performance data, increasingly has been the focus of public school education. Mr. James Newby accepts this reality, and he believes that Walnut Elementary School has improved in many ways as a direct result of increased accountability. In fact, he believes that “accountability acknowledged through assessment” should become the new mantra at Walnut Elementary. What we are accountable for, we assess. What we assess, we do. Every decision made should be made with a plan of assessing it, he believes.

The majority of teachers at Walnut Elementary are concerned about changes to the statewide testing program being planned for the next school year. Through representation, they explain to Mr. Newby that the new assessments do not clearly match the material listed in the state adopted curriculum. Worse still, they explain, there is a disconnect between what is stated in the statewide curriculum and what is actually being taught at Walnut. Walnut students have traditionally done well on statewide testing despite any lack of connection between the assessments and what actually happens in the classrooms at Walnut. If the new assessment measures are more difficult, will the children be able to perform well despite an instructional program that is not aligned with the assessment system of the state?
Chapter 3 puts issues of curriculum, instruction, and assessment in an historical perspective. Consider historical developments in American public school education as you read this chapter. Pay particular attention to the alignment necessary between curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Why is this alignment so important? What does alignment have to do with the situation at Walnut Elementary School?

The notion of the principal as curriculum leader is a contemporary one. Beyond representing a somewhat modern view of a principal’s work, however, the role of a principal as the curriculum leader of a school is viewed by certain practitioners as being both impractical and impossible. The myriad responsibilities of the principalship, as referenced throughout this textbook, lead many school administrators to the conclusion that curriculum leadership is virtually impossible. Management responsibilities, particularly in the contemporary educational environment characterized by uncontrolled growth in many localities, have become too time-consuming. Besides, some principals argue, curriculum leadership is difficult as most principals have only one area of instructional expertise. Many administrators claim that leading in an area in which one questions one’s own level of expertise can be somewhat threatening.

It is time to view the principal’s role as curriculum leader in a different light. If we understood the role to be “nurturer of the instructional program,” then we might be less fearful that we are ill equipped to assume it. But really, the role, as defined in the above language is all that a school community could ever hope a principal to be. The best teachers in any given school, for example, do not regularly look to their principal to provide leadership in the curricular and/or instructional arena. At least, they are not seeking leadership in the sense that most administrators define it. What a great teacher needs is a principal who can nurture the instructional environment. As such, these teachers seek educational leaders who understand the importance of teaching, who provide resources that assist teachers, who work to create environments in which teachers can flourish, and who understand and manage the delicate balance between curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Seen this way, we do not need principals who are experts in all curricular areas. We do need principals who understand the value of what occurs in classrooms and who assist teachers in making the most of the instructional time they have with their students, instead. Such a description ought not be frightening and overwhelming. In fact, the principal as nurturer of the instructional program is an exciting, fulfilling role for any educational leader.

**Collaborative Leadership**

To provide the support and nurturing environment in which curriculum leadership can take hold, a school principal must collaborate with others who have expertise in various instructional areas. It takes the entire school staff to genuinely affect curriculum, as curriculum, in its broadest sense, is defined by everything that happens within the school. The skills required of a collaborator are, therefore, more apparent when the principal focuses on curricular and
instructional leadership than they are with any other aspect of the school principal’s job. Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 2 advocates the necessity for educational leaders to advocate, nurture, and sustain an instructional program conducive to student learning. It does not say that an educational leader ought to “master” or “lead” such an instructional program. Simply put, curricular and instructional leadership require collaboration.

Cordeiro (1999) recognizes the following four distinct competencies as essential components of collaborative leadership:

♦ Technical competencies
♦ Human resource competencies
♦ Political competencies
♦ Architectural competencies

When referring to technical competencies, Cordeiro includes necessary skills in curriculum development, discipline mastery, and the knowledge of both group processes and the school community’s social and educational values. Cordeiro recognizes that a principal’s roles differ greatly from one school to another, so much so that the actual depth and breadth of the curriculum development skills required are difficult to define. Typically, school principals do not directly write and develop curriculum, but they do play a role in overseeing the writing and development process. This being noted, the technical skills of understanding how to work with groups and the knowledge of what these groups value are critical components of the curriculum leadership process. This is essentially a mandate that principals understand the culture of their schools. The concept of school culture and the tremendous value understanding it has to school improvement is explored in depth in Chapter 5.

The human resource competencies place great emphasis on interpersonal skills. There are human relations, or interpersonal, implications in all six of the ISLLC Standards. In fact, a large number of theorists whose works are explored in this textbook (e.g., Adams, Alderfer, Blake and Mouton, Herzberg, Mayo, and Sergiovanni) recognize the need for leaders to focus on human relations in order to inspire or motivate followers. As a curriculum leader, a school principal must be able to see the value of such questions as: How are different stakeholders motivated? What are their perceptions of the curriculum and any proposed changes? How can I create, foster, and sustain a school culture in which people know that their perceptions are valued? What are the specific needs, relative to curriculum, of the various stakeholder groups (staff, students, parents, and the community)?

Ubben and Hughes (1997) state that a school principal must know “both how to work in the system and how to work the system” (p. 8). This is a succinct way of acknowledging the importance of political competencies in becoming a collaborative leader. Many school principals, as well as the prospective leaders targeted by this textbook, are wary of the politics of education. However, developing political competencies does not inherently doom one to a life of “politics”
per se. Instead, developing political competencies helps educational leaders to manage the inevitable competition that exists for resources, and in some cases, for power. Even the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) understands that principals must have the political skills necessary to interact with the external public and influence policy. The 2006–2007 NAESP platform states:

NAESP further urges elementary and middle school principals to actively participate in studies of school-based decision making implementation issues and in continuing professional development programs that enhance their ability to implement necessary restructuring within their schools. (1991, 1992, 1997, 2002, 2007)

NAESP urges that educational reform be based on the findings and recommendations of current research.

NAESP encourages school principals and local and state associations to exert leadership in:

1. Seeking solutions appropriate to the evidence-based needs of local schools and districts;
2. Opening and maintaining dialogues on issues addressed in research;
3. Building consensus among school, community, and district personnel on appropriate actions for the improvement of public education; and

The architectural competencies, as referenced by Cordeiro, include those skills necessary in framing the roles and relationships of those working within the organization. ISLLC Standards 1 to 3, in particular, emphasize the need for principals to have a strong sense of mission and vision and to manage effectively and efficiently the overall school organization. The architectural competencies assist in collaborative leadership by giving the leader a sense of direction and an understanding of who can best accomplish which particular roles.

**Leading a Learning Organization**

In 1990, when Peter Senge wrote his groundbreaking book, *The Fifth Discipline*, the concept of learning organizations took root and became a model for educational leaders to consider in describing the leadership necessary for schools in the new millennium.

Essentially, the leader in a learning organization continuously provides opportunities for learning to occur for all members of the organization. As people learn, it is believed, their abilities expand. Therefore, an organization that gener-
ates learning for all is able to grow and develop in an infinite number of ways. This, it would seem, is consistent with the goals we have for being instructional and/or curricular leaders. If school leaders provide opportunities that allow for and encourage learning and growth to occur, then the possibilities for the school are endless. This is true leadership, particularly in the instructional sense.

Inherent in providing opportunities like those mentioned above is the need for the leaders of learning organizations to be proactive in their approach. The essence of being proactive is described by Stephen Covey (1989) in *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. In this book and in many subsequent writing and speaking engagements, Covey refers to the simple fact that we are all in charge of our destiny. This means that we have to get out of the victim mindset and not blame circumstances. We have to decide what is truly important. We are not a function of our environment, as we have often been led to believe. Instead, we are a function of our decisions, or at least we can be if we so choose. Being proactive is the antithesis of being reactive. A proactive person recognizes that, as Covey puts it, between stimulus and response, we have the right to choose (p. 37). Being a curriculum leader and sitting in a leadership position within a thriving learning organization are choices that we have to make. Claiming that there is not enough time or resources to behave in this manner is reactive and it dooms school leaders to a career of managing the status quo.

The leader in a learning organization is described by Senge with words like designer, teacher, and steward. It is a leadership role that is quite different from what many readers have grown accustomed to. In a learning organization the leader is “responsible for building organizations where people are continually expanding their capabilities to shape their future—that is leaders are responsible for learning” (Senge, 1990, p. 9). Being such a leader, according to Senge, requires new skills, such as systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building shared visions, and team learning. These terms are described in detail in the next section. For now, it is important to note that these skills alone will not create a learning organization. Instead, they will create the conditions for a learning organization to develop. It is nurturing leadership that will create a learning organization.

**The Five Necessary Skills**

**Systems thinking**, the first of the five skill areas identified by Senge (1990), is derived from the works of Getzels and Guba (1957) and Etzione (1961). These researchers were among the most notable to focus on what is known as systems theory. The model created by Getzels and Guba is explained and illustrated in Chapter 5. Essentially, systems theory concerns itself with the understanding that all parts of the organization are interrelated and affect each other. Senge was referring to systems thinking, an outgrowth of systems theory, when he coined the phrase the “fifth discipline.” Systems thinking was given such a prominent place in Senge’s work because of the pivotal role that he saw it playing in the learning and change process.
Personal mastery, the second of the five necessary skills, is considered to be the cornerstone of a learning organization. Senge (1990) defines personal mastery as “the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and of seeing reality objectively” (p. 7). It is a personal commitment to vision, excellence, and lifelong learning. This sense of commitment, when taken collectively, is the driving force behind a learning organization’s success. The leader of a learning organization must be adept at harnessing and nurturing this collective commitment so that it, ultimately, creates further and deeper commitments.

Mental models, the third necessary skill, are defined by Senge (1990) as “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (p. 8). These mental models, or paradigms as they are often phrased, must be challenged by leaders of learning organizations. Collaborative leadership requires us to challenge our own mental models as they often come in conflict with those of other people. This is the real value of mental models; the understanding that we must challenge our own in light of other’s. As Senge writes, the necessity is to turn “the mirror inward; learning to unearth our internal pictures of the world, to bring them to the surface and hold them rigorously to scrutiny” (p. 9).

Sharing an image of the future you want to realize together is the essence of the skill called shared vision. As complex as schools are today in terms of organizational structure and functionality, it is absurd to think that the leader alone can create and implement a vision. Moreover, it is absurd to think that such an individual creation would benefit the school in any meaningful way. Learning organizations benefit from shared vision; that is, the understanding that the vision and mission of the organization is owned by all of its stakeholders.

The final necessary skill of a learning organization is that of team learning. Team learning is based on the idea that “two heads are better than one.” As Senge (1990) points out, when two or more people in an organization collectively analyze issues and discuss situations and possible outcomes, they tend to “discover insights not attainable individually” (p. 10). If schools are to be seen as learning organizations, then the concept of team learning is an absolute necessity for their survival. We know much about the importance of a coherent curriculum in which new knowledge builds on prior learning. Only through team learning, that is when two or more people actively think through issues, can new ways for linking learning occur. The whole is, as the old adage goes, greater than the sum of its parts. Team learning exemplifies this kind of thinking.

The concept of schools as learning organizations is consistent with ISLLC Standard 2 in many ways. As Standard 2 states,

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
The very nature of a learning organization as a place where learning occurs in infinite ways for all members is analogous to Standard 2’s statement of advocating, nurturing, and sustaining an instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. Similarly, Standard 2’s focus on school culture is a fit with the whole concept of learning organizations as Senge (1990) describes them in *The Fifth Discipline*. A learning organization is not something we try out. It is not a model to be adopted for or adapted to a particular school. It is, instead, a mindset. It is a system of beliefs and it is a way of understanding the purpose of our educational organizations. It is the culture of schooling that we must focus on.

**The CIA: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment**

The balanced relationship between curriculum, instruction, and assessment is the key to providing the kind of nurturing support school administrators must give to teachers as they nurture the instructional program. Overemphasis on any of the three elements can lead to an imbalance that ultimately harms the students attending the school. In situations where too much emphasis is given to assessment, for example, school administrators may begin to be viewed as leaders who only concern themselves with the bottom line results of assessment measures. This label can be very damaging as the school administrator encounters teachers who need assistance with instruction. A teacher struggling with instruction is less likely to seek counsel from an administrator who only concerns him- or herself with assessment, but more likely if the administrator is considered to be a true instructional leader.

Thus to nurture the instructional program, a school administrator must first understand the goals of the program. These program goals must exceed those that are set in individual classrooms by individual teachers. The goals of the instructional program are not limited to a collection of goals stated by members of the teaching staff. Instead, there are goals that are handed down from state agencies and other governmental and political entities. It is important for school administrators to realize that these goals can often lead to frustration among a teaching staff that is striving to balance them with local goals. Consequently, the school administrator as nurturer of the instructional program must know what goals are coming from outside constituents and help the teaching staff to merge those goals in with the curricular goals already planned in place.

*No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) is described by the U.S. Department of Education as a landmark in education reform that is designed to improve student achievement and close achievement gaps. It went from an idea, consistently supported by educators, to a law, not always supported by educators, during the early 2000s under President George W. Bush. NCLB represented the most comprehensive law on educational accountability that American public education had witnessed in history. In 2007, one year after it was reauthorized, President
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Bush outlined goals for strengthening NCLB. Figure 3.1 illustrates some of these goals. The goals are expressed as necessary additions to NCLB, *the foundation upon which we must build*, according to President Bush. Note the depth, breadth, and consequences of the goals as you imagine how stressful they could be to a teaching staff that works without strong instructional leadership from the principal.

**Figure 3.1 Steps for Strengthening NCLB**

- Strengthen efforts to close the achievement gap through high standards, accountability, and more options for parents.
- Give states flexibility to better measure individual student progress, target resources to students most in need, and improve assessments for students with disabilities and limited English proficiency.
- Prepare high school students for success by promoting rigorous and advanced coursework and providing new resources for schools serving low-income students.
- Provide greater resources for teachers to further close the achievement gap through improved math and science instruction, intensive aid for struggling students, continuation of Reading First, and rewards for great progress in challenging environments.
- Offer additional tools to help local educators turn around chronically underperforming schools and empower parents with information and options.

Looking closer at the goals, consider the following highlights that were proposed by the U.S. Department of Education to build on successes that schools have achieved since NCLB was enacted.

**HIGHLIGHTS OF BUILDING ON RESULTS:**

1. **Every Child Performing at or Above Grade Level by 2014**
   - **Accountability**—States will be held accountable for ensuring that all students can read and do math at grade level by 2014. They will disaggregate test scores, participate in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), and report state and NAEP results to parents on the same report card.

2. **Flexibility for Innovation and Improvement**
   - **Growth Models**—States will be able to use growth models to measure individual progress towards grade-level proficiency by 2014, as long as they have robust data systems and well-established assessments, and set annual goals based on proficiency, not on students’ backgrounds.
   - **Prioritized Support for Schools**—States will be able to focus more federal resources, interventions, and technical assistance on schools...
with the greatest needs, such as those identified for improvement or corrective action.

- **Flexibility**—States will be able to prioritize their school improvement activities based on the specific needs and successes of the school. To help states and districts tailor programs for their needs, 100 percent of specified federal funds may be moved among programs.

- **Students with Disabilities**—Allows states to tailor assessments to small groups of students with disabilities with modified or alternate achievement standards as long as they are of high technical quality and promote challenging instruction.

- **English Language Learners**—Schools will be recognized by state accountability systems for making significant progress in teaching limited English proficient (LEP) children critical English language skills.

- **Safe Schools**—In order to create safe and healthy learning environments, states will be given funds to provide districts with training, technical assistance, and information on best practices. In addition, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools grant program will be consolidated and focused.

### 3. Challenging Our Students and Preparing Them to Succeed

- **Graduation Rates**—All 50 Governors have agreed to use a more accurate graduation rate. By 2011–12, this school-level data must be disaggregated and reported in state accountability calculations.

- **Rigorous Coursework**—By 2010–11, states must develop course-level academic standards for English and mathematics that prepare high school students to succeed in college and the global workplace. By 2012–13, states will administer assessments aligned to these standards for two years of English and mathematics and publicly report the extent to which all students are on track to enter college or the workplace fully prepared.

- **Advanced Classes**—More teachers will be trained to lead Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate classes. In addition, Academic Competitiveness Grants will continue to provide financial incentives for students to take a rigorous course of study in high school and college.

- **High School Students**—Federal Title I funds will be substantially increased to serve low-income high school students. Funding for low-income elementary and middle schools will be protected.

- **Adjunct Teacher Corps**—Talented and qualified professionals from math, science, and technology fields will be encouraged to teach middle and high school courses, especially in low-income schools.
4. Helping Teachers Close the Achievement Gap

- **Teacher Incentive Fund**—The Fund will help states and districts reward teachers and principals who make progress in raising student achievement levels or closing achievement gaps, as well as educators who choose to serve in the neediest schools.

- **Math Achievement**—To improve math achievement, the President’s Math Now for Elementary School Students and Math Now for Middle School Students programs will provide competitive grants to train teachers in proven instructional methods, including upcoming findings of the National Math Panel.

- **Science Achievement**—Beginning in 2008–09, disaggregated results from science assessments will factor into state accountability calculations, with grade-level proficiency expected for all students in science by 2019–20.

- **Reading Achievement**—The Striving Readers program, which provides intensive intervention to students in grades 6–12 who are struggling to reach grade level in reading/language arts, will be expanded to reach more students. We will continue to invest in Reading First, the largest, most successful early reading initiative ever undertaken in this country.

- **Rural School Districts**—New teachers in small, rural school districts will have additional time to meet Highly Qualified Teacher requirements. Larger rural districts will have the flexibility to use federal funds that are currently available to only the smallest districts. Finally, larger per-child Supplemental Educational Services (SES) amounts will be provided for qualified rural students.

5. Strengthening Public Schools and Empowering Parents

- **School Improvement Fund**—Funds will be targeted to ensure improvement in some of the nation’s most challenging schools. School Improvement Grants will support implementation of the schools’ improvement plans and will assist states’ efforts to closely monitor and review those plans while providing technical assistance to turn around low-performing schools.

- **Promise Scholarships**—Public schools that go into restructuring status will be required to offer private school choice, intensive tutoring, or interdistrict public school choice through Promise Scholarships to low-income students in grades 3–12. Federal funds will follow the child to his or her new school, to be supplemented by a federal scholarship of $2,500.

- **Opportunity Scholarships**—This new program will support local efforts to expand public and private school choice options within a set geographic area. Modeled after the Washington, D.C. choice program that the federal government has funded since 2004, it would enable students to attend a private school through a locally designed schol-
arship program. Families could also seek additional tutoring for their children.

- **Staffing Freedom at the Most Troubled Schools**—Schools that are required to be restructured will be able to remove limitations on teacher transfers from their collective bargaining agreements, similar to contract revisions permitted under bankruptcy law, so that the school leadership is able to put the most effective staff in place.

- **Charter Schools**—The federal charter school program will support all viable charter applications that improve academic outcomes. In addition, local decisions to convert schools identified for restructuring into charter schools will be allowed, even if the total number of charter schools would then surpass a state’s charter cap.

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES)**—Tutoring and after-school instruction will be offered to all low-income students who attend a school in improvement status from the first year forward, one year earlier than before. In addition, districts will be asked to spend all relevant federal funds or risk their forfeiture, eliminating the disincentive to support SES and choice programs.


There are also goals that are related to the assessment measures used in each school district. Nurturing instruction at the classroom level will not always permit the school leader to respond to all of these constituent groups. The only way for a school administrator to truly nurture the instructional program is for the administrator to pay equal attention to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. By doing so, a school administrator can respond to the goals of all constituent groups, while creating the kind of positive culture that is focused on learning in all of its forms. The key is to keep a balance between curriculum, instruction, and assessment. To understand this balance, consider Figure 3.2 (page 56). The first triangle depicts a healthy balance between the three elements. The second triangle illustrates what happens when school administrators pay too much attention to one of the three elements, in this case the assessment. Note how unbalanced the second triangle appears.

In recent years, because the necessity for students to perform at a higher level on standardized assessments has been pronounced, the best schools have recognized that both the curriculum and the instruction must be enhanced as long as assessment is a major focus. Schools in which all emphasis has been placed on the assessment measures have routinely discovered that improvements are not as great. Simply put, for assessment results to be enhanced, matching the curriculum and the instructional methods to the assessment is necessary. All three must receive equal attention.
In tracing the origins of curriculum development in the United States, one can see that the need for balance was not always quite as pronounced as it is today. There are many reasons for this, not the least of which is that today’s public is far more knowledgeable about what happens in school than past publics were. Although the public knowledge is not always accurate, it legitimately grows out of the fact that virtually every member of our community has experienced school before. In a bygone era, this was not always the case, as the population was not nearly as educated as it is today. Along with this public knowledge comes public demand for accountability. And as the public demands greater accountability, greater attention begins being paid to assessment and the general public becomes more involved in curricular decisions. The result is a far different environment in which school administrators today must navigate the waters of instructional leadership.

As further illustration of this point, let us briefly examine some major developments and historical figures and points in curriculum development. Such a historical examination will give us a glimpse at how the areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment gained in importance over time. This examination will show us that the major forces in shaping curriculum, instruction, and assessment procedures were political and academic leaders. As a comparison with today’s environment, we know that these same figures have influence but it is influence that is shared among members of the public who seek an even louder voice. It also will illustrate that attempts to arrive at what curriculum, instruction, and assessment really mean have been ongoing. Finally, this brief historical look will lead us to gain an even greater appreciation of the role of the school administrator as a nurturer of the instructional program.
A Brief Historical Development of American Curriculum

The National Period: 1776–1850

The primary mission for education during the National Period was to link free public schooling with popular government and political freedom. Many early leaders, such as James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, were strong supporters of free public schooling for all children. By the dawn of the nineteenth century, secular forces of democracy and a strong federal government led to a growing trend toward an American language, an American culture, and an American education system free of English influences. Noted leaders in advancing educational goals during this period were Thomas Jefferson, Noah Webster, and William McGuffey.

Thomas Jefferson wanted an education system to be public and tax supported. To this extent, he introduced a bill in 1779 in Virginia that would have provided a state system of education for Virginia. This was the first of its kind, although Benjamin Franklin and Benjamin Rush from Pennsylvania had similar thoughts in their state. Jefferson included schools at the elementary, secondary, and college level in his plan. His well-conceived plan was not enacted until after the Civil War, however.

Noah Webster pushed for an American system of language as well as for the American government to loosen ties to England. Webster set out to eliminate the remains of the British language, and create uniform American speech free of localisms and provincialism. He believed that the school was the place in which children learned language. He proposed that an American language be taught deliberately and systematically.

William McGuffey was responsible for creating the first set of graded readers. The famed series was sold between 1836 and 1920. These readers were graded collections of excerpts from great books, reflecting McGuffey’s view that the proper education of young people required their introduction to a wide variety of topics and practical matters. They became standard texts in nearly all states, eclipsing all rival textbook publications for half a century and reaching a reputed total sale of more than 125 million copies.

At the same time that Americans were working toward a new identity with freedom from European heritage, they still were influenced by Europe’s educational practices and reforms. German educators, in particular, were introducing more romantic and progressive ideas. Their curricula and methods of instruction were more focused on the needs and interests of the students. In both Europe and America, the traditional curriculum that emphasized Latin, Greek, and the classics was on its way out. New instructional practices replaced rote learning and memorization.
Universal Education: 1820–1920

The tremendous geographical expansions in the United States during this time period underscored the need for mass education. The belief that education was necessary for a democratic society helped to extend education beyond the common (elementary) school to high school and colleges.

Common schools were first established in 1826 in Massachusetts. The common school curriculum was devoted to elementary education with an emphasis on reading, writing, and arithmetic. The schools were called “common” because they were open to children from all backgrounds. Because of this, teachers were required to plan lessons for children of all ages. Teachers also had other responsibilities unheard of today, such as taking care of the school room and fetching firewood. The school, for the first time, also became the center for community activities. The tradition of neighborhood schools, local control, and government support took hold with the common schools.

Horace Mann is a noted educator whose name merits mention here. He enlisted public support for schools that would produce citizens who could create a stable society, with productive workers and citizens who would obey laws. Mann was convinced that schools were the great equalizer and would promote a national identity.

The first tax-supported high school was established in Kalamazoo, Michigan, in 1874. The idea of a high school education for all children was a major educational reform of the day. Previously, most children ended their schooling at around fourteen years of age. Secondary curriculum expanded from classical studies, adding higher math, philosophy, language, science, and bookkeeping.

The Traditional Period: 1893–1918

During this period the emphasis in curriculum on the classical studies continued. These studies were thought to be the best way to develop mental abilities and intelligence even at the elementary and secondary levels. The ideas of knowledge of subject matter and mental rigor were rooted in a philosophy known as perennialism. As more subjects were added, however, it became apparent that the curriculum needed organization and more uniformity, particularly at the secondary level.

Although high schools gained in popularity, most children still ended their schooling at the elementary level. Another problem at the secondary level was that the curriculum was generally aimed at preparation for college, and the majority of high school students did not go on to college. Reformers considered the need for two tracks at the elementary level, one for high-school-bound and one for non-high-school-bound students.

In 1916, John Dewey published Democracy and Education. In this book, Dewey showed the relationship between democracy and education: democracy as a social process that is enhanced through education and education as the instrument of democracy. In general, Dewey argued that subjects should not be placed in a hierarchy. Any body of knowledge could expand the child’s experience and
intellectual capabilities. Traditional subjects like Latin or Greek were no more valuable than music or art in Dewey’s estimation.

Two years later, in 1918, The Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education published the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*. This Commission stressed the whole child, education for all, diversified areas of study, common culture, and ideals for a democratic society. The Cardinal Principles reflected how far American educators had moved from the traditional or classical curriculum. High school curriculum began to take on its current form. Basic or essential subjects included English, math, science, social studies, and modern languages. Classical studies took a back seat to modern languages. A growing movement to interdisciplinary and flexible studies was evolving. The era of progressive education was beginning to become a reality.

**Curriculum as a Field of Study: 1918–1949**

Franklin Bobbitt published *The Curriculum* in 1918, considered by some to be the first book devoted to curriculum as a science. The purpose of a curriculum, according to Bobbitt, was to outline what knowledge was important for each subject—and how to get it. The next step was to develop objectives and activities to train the learner and enhance performance. Bobbitt further developed his objectives and activities approach in the 1920s in a book called *How to Make a Curriculum*. This book identified 800 objectives and related activities. His guidelines for curriculum development were as follows:

- Eliminate objectives that are impractical and cannot be accomplished
- Emphasize objectives that are needed for adult living
- Avoid objectives that are opposed by the community
- Involve the community in setting the objectives
- Differentiate objectives—for all, for some
- Sequence objectives

W.W. Charters advocated a similar scientific approach in his book, *Curriculum Construction*. Charters saw curriculum as the analysis of job operations. He further proposed that curriculum be derived from specific objectives and precise activities. He began to develop a method of selecting objectives based on social consensus. Combined, Bobbitt’s and Charters’ contributions include the following:

- Development of principles of curriculum making—aims, objectives, needs, and learning experiences and activities
- Use of behavioral objectives
- Notion that objectives come from study of needs and verified by analysis (needs assessment)

View of curriculum making as a discipline and process that cuts across subject matter. *The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, published in 1930, included criticism of traditional practices, a synthesis of
progressive practices and programs, and the current state of the art in curriculum making. The description of an ideal curriculum is one that might be used today. The book identified the following nine characteristics of an ideal curriculum.

1. Focuses on the affairs of human life.
2. Deals with the facts and problems of the local, national, and international community.
3. Enables students to think critically about various forms of government.
4. Informs and develops an attitude of open-mindedness.
5. Considers student interests and needs as well as opportunities for debate, discussion, and exchange of ideas.
6. Deals with the issues of modern life and the cultural and historical aspects of society.
8. Consists of carefully graded organization of problems and exercises.
9. Deals with humanitarian themes, and purposeful and constructive attitudes and insights.

Finally, in 1949, Ralph Tyler wrote *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. This text was first written as a course syllabus for students at the University of Chicago. As one of the best known authorities on curriculum, Tyler articulated the curriculum development process. He identified the following four key questions for curriculum planning:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
2. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

This brief history, although not comprehensive, synthesizes historical accounts taken from a number of sources. It creates an understanding of the major changes in curriculum planning that took place in the United States over a period of more than 200 years. As such, important people and concepts may be omitted. It is clear from this account, however, that the purpose of schooling has changed. Whereas formal education was once rooted in classics with little regard for student needs, an evolution toward making schooling more practical, useful, and respectful of students' needs has occurred. Obviously, such a change has a tremendous impact on the work of school leaders. If one considers the wording of ISLLC Standard 2, for example, it is evident that such a leadership goal never could have existed at an earlier period in American history. ISLLC Standard 2 states that
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[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

The focus on an instructional program conducive to student learning indicates the importance of acknowledging how students learn, which pieces of knowledge are of most worth, and how to go about assessing such learning. The “success of all students,” such an important piece of all ISLLC Standards, further emphasizes the role of the school administrator as an advocate for all children. Again, an historical view of curriculum illustrates that many children were often left out of the educational picture during previous time periods. This, too, represents a significant change in how educational leaders must now view their work.

In short, the curricular developments that have occurred throughout American history have changed the very nature of schooling. In doing so, these changes have necessitated changes in the professional performance of the educators who work in our schools. In particular, the role of the school administrator as nurturer of the instructional program has emerged, and it has done so at a time when the responsibilities of school administrators are ever growing.

**Increasing Responsibility, Not Time**

A question that is raised as one ponders the role of the school administrator in being a true curriculum leader is, “How?” How can an administrator, with the increased responsibilities facing those of our present times, adhere to all of the job requirements and still be seen as a nurturer of the instructional program? How can administrators be present in classrooms, the sites with abundant opportunities for showing curricular leadership? To begin answering these questions, consider the structure of an ordinary school day. Are there opportunities within the school day for administrators to be present in classrooms that are currently underutilized? Is there a way to accomplish the myriad tasks facing contemporary school administrators that allow for a stronger classroom presence?

A body of research on effective instructional leadership behavior focuses on the administrator’s management of time. Specifically studied is the amount of time school leaders spend performing Management by Wandering Around (MBWA). This concept provides school administrators with a mechanism for attending to management tasks without sacrificing the fundamental needs of people and without minimizing the importance of the instructional environment. Frase and Melton (1992) wrote,

> MBWA leaders are seldom found in their offices during school hours. MBWA principals are on their feet, wandering with a purpose. They spend their time in classrooms and hallways, with teachers and students. This is the most crucial underlying value of MBWA: the commitment to be with the people, and the belief that the classroom and the teachers...
and students are the source of diagnostic information and solutions to problems.

The authors further provide nine practical ideas for school administrators desiring to spend more time out of their offices:

1. Establish people as your number one priority.
2. Control your time.
3. Eliminate ineffective office management practices.
4. Schedule yourself out of your office—practice MBWA.
5. Know what you’re looking for when you practice MBWA.
6. Lead by example.
7. Let your secretary help you save time.
8. Do demonstration lessons.
9. Seek feedback. (pp. 19–23)

Managing purposefully and leading effectively encompasses the nine ideas outlined above. Research indicates that such a paradigm shift is apparent in effective instructional leaders. These leaders realize the importance of being visible to constituents. They understand that nurturing the instructional program requires that they be present in learning environments. Such presence need not be overly time-consuming. In fact, more than 25 years ago, administrators in all industries were provided with the image of the effective one-minute manager. As Blanchard and Johnson (1981) explain,

The One Minute Manager’s symbol—a one minute readout from the face of a modern digital watch—is intended to remind each of us to take a minute out of our day to look into the faces of the people we manage. And to realize that they are our most important resources. (p. 8)

**Summary**

Perhaps the most important role of the school administrator is that of instructional leader. As accountability movements gain in momentum and the assessment of student achievement becomes the norm in determining a school’s effectiveness, the school administrator’s knowledge of and ability to nurture the instructional program is paramount. The *No Child Left Behind Act* (2001) solidifies this need in concrete ways unlike any that school administrators had seen previously.

In serving as nurturer of the instructional program, school administrators are called upon to be collaborators much more so than they are called upon to be experts in all instructional areas. Although administrators must understand good pedagogical theory and be able to assist others in crafting meaningful lessons, designing appropriate assessments, and managing an effective learning environment, they should not be expected to be masters of all curricular areas.
By collaborating with others and by using some of the leadership skills introduced in the context of ISLLC Standards 1 and 2, school administrators can begin creating learning organizations in which they nurture the instructional program through working collaboratively with others.

Leadership in a learning organization requires new skills, such as systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building shared visions, and team learning. These skills, labeled by Peter Senge as the five necessary skills, are the cornerstone for nurturing leadership than can lead schools to a balanced focus on the three areas of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

To best understand how the school administrator’s role has changed in terms of these three areas, it is worthwhile to consider how curriculum theory and planning has changed throughout American history. In examining the societal, cultural, political, and pedagogical influences on American school curricula
it is clear that the role of the school administrator as instructional leader is a contemporary one. As such, it is considered the foundation upon which a new understanding of school administration must be built.

Redefining school administration, particularly when such a process can lead to the misconception that the role is expanding instead of transforming, requires administrators to consider their abilities as managers of their time. Stephen Covey urged all people to remember that those things which matter the most in their lives must never be at the mercy of those which matter the least. Time management, therefore, requires that school administrators understand what the most important aspects of their role are. Nurturing the instructional program, particularly through nurturing relationships with all stakeholders impacted by it, must be at the top of this list.

**Chapter Highlights**

- Our schools need principals who understand the value of what occurs in classrooms and who assist teachers in making the most of the instructional time they have with their students.
- Cordeiro recognized four distinct competencies as essential components of collaborative leadership: technical, human resource, political, and architectural competencies.
- The leader in a learning organization continuously provides opportunities for learning to occur for all members of the organization. As people learn, it is believed, their abilities expand. Therefore, an organization that generates learning for all is able to grow and develop in an infinite number of ways.
- The balanced relationship between curriculum, instruction, and assessment is the key to providing the kind of nurturing support school administrators must give to teachers as they nurture the instructional program.
- The curricular developments that have occurred throughout American history have changed the nature of schooling. In particular, the role of the school administrator as nurturer of the instructional program has emerged, and it has done so at a time when the responsibilities of school administrators are ever growing.
- The concept of Managing By Wandering Around (MBWA) provides school administrators with a mechanism for attending to management tasks without sacrificing the fundamental needs of people and without minimizing the importance of the instructional environment.
**Application Questions**

1. If you were named principal of your school tomorrow, what are the specific parts of the learning program that you would be prepared to supervise and lead? Are there areas (i.e., subjects or grades) that you would not feel prepared to apply leadership in? If so, what would you do to nurture these parts of the instructional program?

2. Consider the two triangles depicted in Figure 3.2 on page 56. If you created a triangle to illustrate your school’s focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment, what would it look like? If the triangle is not balanced, what can school administrators do to restore balance?

3. This chapter presented a brief historical overview of curriculum history in the United States. Which of the people or time periods mentioned had the most profound effect on what currently happens in your classroom or in a colleague’s classroom? Why did you choose the person or time period that you chose? How would classrooms across this country be different without this contribution?

**Field Activity**

Interview an administrator who is charged with overseeing curricular development and/or implementation in your school district (e.g., director of curriculum, assistant superintendent for instruction). Ask them questions designed to discover how curricular decisions are made in the district. Look for influences from the federal government, the state board of education, and the local school board in the individual’s responses. Ask the individual what he or she does to ensure that there is balance between curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Turn your focus to the role of building-level administrators as instructional leaders. Ask the interviewee what his or her expectations are of building-level administrators in regards to the curriculum and the instructional program. Ask questions to discover how, if at all, building-level administrators are involved in district curricular decisions. Try to discover if principals are provided any staff development in the area of instructional leadership. Finally, ask if a principal’s evaluation is based at all on his or her abilities as an instructional leader.

**Have You Thought About It?**

Mr. Newby faces a dilemma to which school administrators across the country can relate. In being too quick to assess students, many leaders fail to assure that their assessment measures, their curriculum, and the instructional methodologies within their schools are in alignment. A walk through American public education history illustrates a shifting focus from instruction to assessment. It ought not to be a zero-sum game, however.
Curriculum, instruction, and assessment all have a place at the table. The keys lie in alignment and emphasis.

What do you think?
Dr. Deborah Miles has been principal of John Tyler Middle School for the past six years, and she has had the opportunity to replace more than one-third of the teaching force during her tenure because of retirements. One of the key qualities that Dr. Miles has looked for in hiring teachers has been a high level of motivation and enthusiasm. A motivated teacher is an effective teacher, Dr. Miles believes. As long as the teacher is motivated, student motivation will increase. And motivation, according to Dr. Miles, is sorely needed among middle school students.

For the past few weeks, Stanley Harris, a teacher with 14 years of experience, has not been his usual upbeat self. Whereas Mr. Harris was always smiling, often heard laughing in the teacher’s lounge, and considered by all Tyler students to be an exciting teacher, his demeanor of late has been downtrodden and bordering on depressed. Dr. Miles has asked Mr. Harris if everything was alright at least twice during the past few weeks. When asked, Mr. Harris always claims that everything is going fine. Something is just not right, Dr. Miles feels, but what could it possibly be?

This chapter introduces you to content theories of motivation. Consider how knowledge of these theories can be helpful to Dr. Miles, as she tries to work with...
Mr. Harris. As you read, you should also think about what steps Dr. Miles could take to help Mr. Harris regain his motivation. Is it just burnout? Or, could something really be wrong with Mr. Harris?

Although nurturing the instructional program is surely the most important task of school administrators as instructional leaders, it is also vital that school administrators acknowledge and value all of the extracurricular offerings of the school. Particularly in light of the fact that in many communities American students are spending more time at school than they had in years past, school administrators need to show the necessary leadership skills to make the experiences students engage in outside of the regular instructional program meaningful, inclusive, and valuable to their success as lifelong learners. School administrators who used to provide leadership to students, staff, and parents during the hours that made up the instructional day, must now provide that leadership for a school day that is sometimes longer and always filled with more extracurricular programs than was the case in a bygone era.

The challenges and opportunities this change has given administrators are numerous. For one, administrators must provide leadership for more diverse settings as extracurricular offerings increase. The typical school administrator is now called upon to provide leadership for athletic programs, a wide variety of arts programs, before and after school childcare, a character education program, any number of clubs tied to other school disciplines, and an increasing number of community-oriented activities. These activities reach an increasingly diverse population and are often intended to connect stakeholders to the school in ways that were previously not considered or valued. Such an opportunity for leadership requires school administrators to understand the needs of the participants in these extracurricular offerings and the relationship of those needs with the needs and goals of the school. Furthermore, the increase in extracurricular activity necessitates that the school administrators be somewhat versed in the language of each extracurricular offering. Finally, the impetus is on school administrators to understand how individuals are motivated and why certain people choose to be involved in some organizations and not others. A firm grasp of motivational theory and how to put such theory into practice is far more important now than it ever was before. If school administrators are to provide the leadership called for by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, particularly Standard 2, then they must become expert motivators. Such a demand provides one opportunity for theory and practice to merge. ISLLC Standard 2 is based on the practices of school administrators that promote the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. In a time of expanding curricula, such a calling makes it necessary for all school leaders to devote energies toward keeping students and staff motivated and contented.
Content Theories of Motivation

Motivational theories are generally placed into one of two distinct categories: content theories and process theories. Content theories of motivation concern themselves with the what of motivation. Specifically, these theories help us to understand the content of what motivates people. Process theories of motivation, conversely, examine the process of motivation. Specifically, these theories help us to understand how individuals are motivated. Process theories, although somewhat applicable to ISLLC Standard 2, are examined in later chapters, as these theories have tremendous linkage to the knowledge, disposition, and performance of ISLLC Standard 5. For now, however, our focus is on the content theories of motivation.

Maslow’s Need Hierarchy

Abraham Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory is the most widely studied and understood content theory of motivation, particularly in organizational contexts. Through this model, Maslow posits that there are five distinct groups of human needs. Moreover, these groups of needs emerge in a specific sequence or hierarchy of importance for each individual. When an individual satisfies one group of needs, then the next group in the hierarchy begins to demand satisfaction. The next group on the hierarchy will not demand to be satisfied until this current group of needs is satisfied. According to Maslow, human needs follow this hierarchical organization until the ultimate need, self-actualization, emerges and is satisfied. Figure 4.1 depicts Maslow’s Need Hierarchy in its familiar pyramid shape.

Figure 4.1 Maslow’s Need Hierarchy

[Diagram of Maslow's Need Hierarchy]
The five distinct groups of needs identified by Maslow are psychological needs, safety needs, social needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs. As the satisfaction of these need groups is very individualized, an organization can have stakeholders whose individual needs are in any of these five categories. The challenge this creates for leaders is that they must determine which need group(s) is(are) not satisfied in each individual so as to best understand what motivates each stakeholder. To better understand this, consider the following descriptions of each need category:

- **Physiological Needs**—The most basic level of needs identified by Maslow, the physiological needs include food, water, and shelter. If this need group is not satisfied, then an individual will not be motivated by other need groups further up the hierarchy. To illustrate this, one need only to think of a student who is not being adequately fed at home and/or is not receiving enough rest. Such a student may arrive at school seeking nothing more than shelter and a meal. Expecting this student to be motivated by higher things seems ridiculous. Even in the workplace among adults, there are individuals whose physiological needs are not being met. In schools with poor heating/cooling systems and inadequate ventilation, for example, teachers and students may quickly feel as though their physiological need for adequate shelter is not being met. This is just one reason why school administrators must concern themselves with the maintenance of the school facility.

- **Safety Needs**—This next level on Maslow’s Need Hierarchy includes the need to feel free from threats and protected against all dangers. As the hierarchy indicates, safety needs cannot be satisfied until physiological needs have first been met. However, once the physiological need group has been satisfied, individuals need to feel safe and secure. Again, we can look to our students to see vivid examples of this. If a student is afraid to come to school because the student fears a bully, then nothing further up on the need hierarchy will be motivating. The primary concern of this student will be on ensuring that he or she will not be harmed. For this reason, school administrators must pay careful attention to school building safety and security. They must be diligent in ensuring that school is a safe place for all students. Furthermore, school administrators must be cognizant of which teachers and staff members feel unsafe while at school. Creating school cultures in which all stakeholders flourish cannot be done without these universal feelings of safety and security.

- **Social Needs**—Social needs include love, affection, friendship, and a sense of belonging. Once an individual is at this level in Maslow’s hierarchy, their physiological and safety needs have been met. The
way to motivate these individuals is by assisting them in feeling as though they belong and have friends. Again, by examining the behavior of students, illustrations of social needs are apparent. The peer pressure felt by many students involves their desires to fit in and belong to a social group. A student who does not have lower needs met, such as a student suffering from inadequate nourishment, will not be motivated by the desire for having social needs met. Among school staff members, feelings of belonging and affection can be nurtured by school administrators as the administrators develop and encourage opportunities for teamwork among staff members.

♦ **Esteem Needs**—Close to the top of Maslow’s Need Hierarchy are esteem needs. This group consists of the needs for self-respect and for expressions of respect and appreciation from others. Individuals who are motivated by the desire to have esteem needs satisfied are individuals who already have physiological, safety, and social needs met. Although these three need groups must be satisfied first, there is great irony in the fact that many schools focus student recognition efforts on the fulfillment of esteem needs even though many students are not yet at a point where all of the lower need groups have already been satisfied. School administrators must, therefore, be aware of which employees and which students are, in fact, at a point where recognition and self-fulfillment will be motivating before focusing all energies on programs that reward and recognize outstanding achievement.

♦ **Self-actualization Needs**—High atop Maslow’s Need Hierarchy sits the need to realize one’s full potential, to be all that one is capable of being. This self-actualization need, more so than any of the previous need groups, manifests itself very differently from person to person. An individual, for example, may feel as though his or her need for self-actualization is met upon graduation with an advanced degree. Another person may not feel self-actualized until he or she has achieved a certain position in an organization. Athletes may be self-actualized through athletic achievements, whereas artists may not realize their maximum potential unless it is in an artistic endeavor. Because people achieve self-actualization at different times and for different reasons, it is a very individual process. Some theorists posit that few people are actually motivated by this high level, as having all of the previous need groups met is thought to be a rarity. Nevertheless, school administrators must recognize which stakeholders seek self-actualization and provide them with opportunities to be involved in the planning of activities that maximize their individual skills.
Although there is great support in educational communities for Maslow's theory, largely because of its commonsense appeal, there are also those who argue that it is incorrect to assume that all people must advance through the hierarchy in the way that Maslow describes. In fact, some ten years after Maslow's theory had begun enjoying wide acceptance, Wahba and Bridwell (1976) questioned the prepotency of the five levels. Even though most studies indicate that many individuals classified their own needs into five distinct categories and that there are lower-level needs and higher-level needs, there is scant evidence that five distinct levels exist and that the levels are arranged hierarchically. For example, it is widely believed that an individual can simultaneously have strong social and esteem needs. Despite this criticism, Maslow's Need Hierarchy gives school administrators a model by which to view the content of what motivates individuals within their school community. ISLLC Standard 2 can be realized by school administrators who pay attention to the needs of stakeholders and create cultures in which everybody's needs are met to the maximum extent possible.

**ERG Theory**

Another important content theory was developed in 1972 by Clayton Alderfer. This theory, known as ERG, is an extension of Maslow's Need Hierarchy in that it too is based on the assumption that needs are important determinants of an individual's motivation. The acronym ERG stands for *existence*, *relatedness*, and *growth*. Like Maslow's five groups, the three groups of needs recognized by Alderfer can be arranged in a hierarchy with existence needs being the bottom or lowest level needs and growth representing the top or highest level of needs. Briefly described, the three levels Alderfer describes are:

1. **Existence**—These needs are parallel with Maslow's physiological and safety needs of food, drink, shelter, and safety. In a work environment such as a school, existence needs are represented by such things as salary, job security, and working conditions. They are the lowest-level needs, but their importance in creating a positive culture in which employees are motivated is not to be understated.

2. **Relatedness**—Similar to Maslow's social needs and certain aspects of his esteem needs, relatedness needs referred to by Alderfer include all interpersonal relationships. These relationships may be with colleagues, superiors, subordinates, or family and friends. Also, according to Alderfer these interpersonal relationships may be positive or negative. For example, sometimes people need to convey negative, even hostile feelings. These expressions, like expressions of love and support are all part of the relatedness needs.

3. **Growth**—Growth needs represent the intrinsic desires individuals have to maximize their potential, be fulfilled, and find contentment in an environment. Corresponding to part of Maslow's esteem
needs and his self-actualization needs, growth needs are fulfilled in
the workplace by being involved in the planning of activities that
stretch one’s own innate abilities and skills.

There are two noteworthy differences between ERG theory and the Need
Hierarchy theory. First, whereas Maslow believes that a lower-level need must
be satisfied before an individual can be motivated by a higher-level need, Al-
derfer posits that people can be motivated by more than one need simultane-
ously. According to Alderfer, for example, an individual can crave relationships
while still needing to have some existence needs satisfied. Second, Maslow’s
theory states that a satisfied need ceases to be motivating. Alderfer, on the other
hand, maintains that as individuals become frustrated at not being able to satisfy
higher-level needs, they may regress and be motivated by previously satisfied
lower-level needs.

Although there is still room for research on the validity of ERG and Need
Hierarchy theories, most people tend to favor the flexibility of ERG Theory. Par-
ticularly, there is support among behavioral scientists for the notion that people
can move back and forth between need levels. This two-way movement, rather
than Maslow’s strict one-way hierarchy, has gained acceptance as a theory for
describing what motivates employees in the work environment. To assist in see-
ing the similarities between the two theories, Figure 4.2 is a side-by-side com-
parison of Maslow’s Need Hierarchy and Alderfer’s ERG Theory.

Figure 4.2 A Comparison Between Maslow’s
Need Hierarchy and Alderfer’s ERG Theory

Before further examining motivational theories, it is prudent to pause and
reflect on the relationship these theories have with the work of school adminis-
trators as it relates to expanding curricula and creating programs in which all
children can find some form of success. First, as stated at this chapter’s onset,
there are myriad tasks facing contemporary school administrators as cocurricular and extracurricular responsibilities of schools seem to grow and expand. These tasks require, above all else, for school administrators to understand what motivates certain staff members to assume responsibility for extra duties, while others never seem willing or able to be involved. School administrators are also required to understand how certain cocurricular and extracurricular activities meet the needs of a diverse student population so that there is at least one activity that is fulfilling for each and every student in the school. Furthermore, school administrators in contemporary settings must be adept at creating, fostering, and sustaining positive school cultures, a concept given great attention in Chapter 5. Thus administrators again must understand what it is that makes school a positive place for all school stakeholders.

Content theories of motivation, like ERG and Need Hierarchy, can assist school administrators in doing all that is mentioned above. By recognizing that individual needs can be categorized and that there is at least some hierarchical orientation to people’s needs, school administrators can begin to understand and even predict what will be motivating to whom. An underlying prerequisite to all of this, however, seems to be for school administrators to know the people that make up the school community they are charged to administer to. Failure to do this will negate any and all gains made by understanding content theories of motivation. It is one thing to have theories explain what motivates people in a broad sense. It is quite another thing to understand specifically what motivates the individuals who make up a particular school community.

Now, let us examine one more content theory of motivation that has the potential to assist school administrators in differentiating between those factors that motivate people and assist them in gaining satisfaction at work and those that create dissatisfaction in the work environment.

**Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

Also known as two-factor theory and dual-factor theory, Frederick Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory distinguishes between those factors that motivate people and lead to job satisfaction (motivation factors) and those that lead to job dissatisfaction (hygiene factors). This differs from the intents of Maslow’s and Alderfer’s theories in that both of those theories focus on the needs energized within the individual. Herzberg, through extensive research of accountants and engineers from nine companies in the Pittsburgh area, focused his research on motivation within the workplace.

Essentially, Herzberg asked the subjects of his research to think of times when they felt good about their jobs. Next, he asked subjects to describe what was happening, or what the conditions were, that led to these feelings. This method, known as the critical incident method, allowed for easy replication of this research with other populations. The results that Herzberg obtained were relatively consistent across subjects. When people were asked about what was happening at work during times in which they felt good about their jobs, fac-
tors like achievement, recognition, advancement, growth, and responsibility emerged. These factors, or job satisfiers, were called motivation factors.

Conversely, when Herzberg’s subjects reported negative feelings at work, factors such as working conditions, salary, interpersonal relationships, supervision, and company policy emerged. These factors, or job dissatisfiers, were called hygiene factors.

According to Herzberg, satisfaction at work and dissatisfaction at work are not opposite conditions; instead they are separate dimensions of an individual’s attitude toward work. As Herzberg discovered, the gratification of motivation factors increased job satisfaction. When these motivation factors were not gratified, then only minimal job dissatisfaction occurred. Conversely, the gratification of hygiene factors only minimally increased job satisfaction. When hygiene factors were not gratified, then negative attitudes and feelings of job dissatisfaction occurred. In summary, Herzberg found that motivation factors contribute more to job satisfaction than to job dissatisfaction. Hygiene factors contribute more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction.

Figure 4.3 (page 76) provides an illustration of Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Note as you examine this exhibit that some factors are close to being labeled as either motivation factors or hygiene factors, whereas others are clearly labeled as one or the other. This is important to note because it provides assistance when faced with an individual who believes that some element is inappropriately labeled. Consider, for example, the issue of salary. According to the response Herzberg was given by subjects, salary is clearly a hygiene factor. The mere fact that there were many individuals who labeled it a motivation factor, however, gives credence to the argument some would make that salary is, indeed, motivating. The important factor in Motivation-Hygiene Theory is the understanding that few elements of the workplace are viewed consistently between all subjects. It is the majority, and in some cases the strong majority, response that must be considered.

An interesting study was completed in 2002 which looked at the “hygiene” and “motivator” factors of the principal’s job that might account for the high job satisfaction reported by many principals (Malone, Sharp, & Walter, 2002). This study used Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory as its framework, and the findings are closely related to what Herzberg originally reported. For example, Malone et al. asked principals surveyed to respond to statements by rating each statement from one to five, where “1” indicated a weak reason for liking their job and “5” indicated a very strong reason for liking their job. Of the twenty statements in the survey, the ones receiving the highest percentage of “5” responses were the following:

- “I enjoy the contact with students.” (76.0%)
- “I have an opportunity to impact students.” (74.3%)
- “I can make a difference in teaching and learning.” (65.5%)
- “I enjoy the school culture.” (60.2%)
Figure 4.3 Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Factors characterizing 1,844 events on the job that led to extreme dissatisfaction

- Achievement
- Recognition
- Work itself
- Responsibility
- Advancement
- Growth

Factors characterizing 1,753 events on the job that led to extreme satisfaction

- Company policy/administration
- Supervision
- Relationship with supervisor
- Work conditions
- Salary
- Relationship with peers
- Personal life
- Relationship with Subordinates
- Status
- Security

All factors contributing to job: dissatisfaction satisfaction

- Motivators: 31%
- Hygiene: 69%
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Conversely, among responses receiving the lowest percentage of “5” responses were:

- “I am well paid for this job.” (11.8%)
- “I can influence community decisions.” (11.7%)
- “I can control my daily schedule.” (12.9%)

These results very closely follow what Herzberg originally reported. Hygiene factors, such as a high salary, do not lead to job satisfaction nearly as often as do motivating factors such as a sense of achievement. The recent work of Malone et al. simply confirms this.

Even though none of the three content theories of motivation will provide much assistance in determining how people are motivated, they do provide great insights into what people find motivating. The three theories can help school administrators determine what has the greatest likelihood of being motivating to their employees and other school stakeholders. Incumbent upon the administrator, however, is reliable knowledge about the individuals who comprise the school community they wish to motivate. School administrators who proceed with the assumption that human relations is of some secondary importance to specific job-related tasks find that motivating their employees to give their best efforts is challenging. Content theories of motivation are helpful, but these theories cannot succeed in their usefulness without knowledge about the lives and desires of the school staff. Applying ERG Theory, for example, is only possible if an administrator understands something about the growth needs of all employees. With such knowledge, the school administrator can create conditions designed to provide staff members with their sought after growth opportunities.

This concept becomes most apparent when the school administrator is designing the staff development program. As the next section of this chapter indicates, in order for staff development to be effective, the program must be designed with the needs and desires of the staff members in consideration.

### Designing Meaningful Staff Development

One of the most positive educational trends to emerge in recent years is the understanding that teachers need ongoing professional development in order to best meet the needs of learners. Although it can be argued that professional staff development has existed almost as long as the teaching profession has, the increased emphasis on accountability characteristic of the dawn of this century has led to a rebirth of staff development’s importance. More than ever educators are recognizing the potential that meaningful staff development has to improve our schools. Consider the following words from a 1997 article that appeared in the *Phi Delta Kappan*:

"I have opportunities to interact with a wide variety of people.”  
(60.2%)

"I have substantial input into the direction of our school.”  
(59.4%)
We in education are probably in a better position to realize improvement than most of the private sector. For one thing, unlike many businesses, schools suffer no harm from sharing information. It is time for schools and districts to move beyond competition and to begin searching aggressively to emulate and adapt one another’s best practice. (Schmoker, 1997, p. 563)

In fulfilling the objectives of the ISLLC Standards, school administrators play a pivotal role in creating the conditions necessary for ongoing professional development to occur. While it is essential that administrators exercise their planning skills and their knowledge about areas in which the staff would benefit from professional learning, it is first essential that administrators create school cultures in which the ongoing professional development of the teaching staff is valued and supported. In school cultures that radiate attitudes of continuous growth and improvement, professional development ceases to be seen as an add-on, and is instead viewed by all stakeholders as a natural, common occurrence. The administrator’s role in creating, fostering, and sustaining these cultures is explored in Chapter 5.

One of the first steps taken by an administrator designing a staff development program is to conduct some form of needs assessment. Whether the needs assessment is a more formalized pencil-and-paper task that asks teachers to indicate their interests and perceived needs (depicted in Figure 4.4) or an outgrowth of informal dialogue and observations, it is important that the administrator has some way of gauging the receptivity of the staff to any proposed development plan.

**Figure 4.4 Sample Needs Assessment**

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this needs-assessment survey. Your honest, thoughtful responses will be used to plan for professional development opportunities during the upcoming school year.

1. What is the total number of years of teaching experience that you have? ________
2. What grade level/subject do you teach? _________________________
3. What is your preference of day and time for professional development experiences? Please rank order your top five choices with one representing your strongest preference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>_____ _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>_____ _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>_____ _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>_____ _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>_____ _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. From the following list, please indicate three topics that you feel would benefit you to learn more about.
   - Authentic Assessment
   - Brain-based Learning
   - Classroom Management
   - Conflict Resolution
   - Curriculum Revision
   - Data Analysis
   - Efficacy and Achievement
   - Multiple Intelligences
   - Parent/Teacher Relationships
   - School/Business Partnerships
   - School Culture/Climate
   - Technology and Learning
   - The Teacher and the Law
   - Other (please explain)
   - Other (please explain)

5. Would you be willing to present some of your own expertise as part of the staff development program? If so, please give your name, school, and a brief description of your expertise in the space below:

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

Needs assessments, such as the one depicted in Figure 4.4, must be considered in light of the mission that the school stakeholders have already established. One of the failures of many staff development plans is that they do not fit in with the stated mission of the school, nor are their goals reflected in the vision and/or values stated by the school stakeholders. This leads to a very important point for school administrators to consider. Namely, effective professional development is designed around the needs and desires of the professional staff, while assisting in leading them toward fulfillment of their collective mission. Failure to connect the goals to the mission will likely lead to the perception that staff development is little more than isolated bits of information, or hobby learning. This characterization is an all too common criticism of many staff development programs.

All professional staff development should be linked to the improvement of student learning. If the growth of the teaching staff will serve a purpose other than the improvement of student learning, then a school administrator cannot make it a priority. This is not to imply that teachers cannot reap some other personal and professional benefits as a result of staff development. In fact, great
benefits for teachers should be expected to grow out of staff development that is designed with teacher needs in mind. These benefits, however, cannot occur without a clear and direct link to improved student learning. Consider the following scenario as an explanation of this point:

**Staff Development Scenario**

Alberta Smith is a second-year teacher who is struggling with classroom management this year. Alberta arrived as a new teacher to Marshall Middle School last year after receiving the highest possible recommendations from her university professors and student-teaching supervisor. After a first year characterized by cooperative students and parents and appreciation for the unique learning experiences provided to her students, Alberta entered this year full of promise and optimism. However, four students in her second period class and two students in her fourth period class have thus far provided Alberta with unexpected challenges.

After attending two staff-development sessions offered in her school district, Alberta has gained some valuable insights into the groupings of students in these two classes who have been providing her with trouble. Also, she has been afforded opportunities to try new techniques for managing the learning environment under the watchful eye of a mentor teacher identified during the first staff-development session. Alberta has also been allowed to watch other teachers manage their classroom environments when three of the troubling students were present in their classes.

As a result of this assistance, Alberta feels that she has a much better handle on managing her classroom and has renewed confidence in her overall teaching abilities. She has certainly gained some important professional and personal assistance that will serve her long after these challenging students have moved on. The important thing is that Alberta is now better able to focus on the teaching and learning process without being consumed by classroom management issues. This will quickly lead to improved student learning.

From this scenario, it is clear that teachers can and should benefit from professional staff development. As long as student learning can improve as a result, then the staff development activities are appropriate. Good staff development provides opportunities for many stakeholder groups to benefit.

Thomas Sergiovanni (1996) recognizes several outcomes of good staff development for teachers. He states that schools need to create teacher growth strategies that

- Encourage teachers to reflect on their own practice.
- Acknowledge that teachers develop at different rates and that at any given time are more ready to learn some things than others.
Acknowledge that teachers have different talents and interests.
Give high priority to conversation and dialogue among teachers.
Provide for collaborative learning among teachers.
Emphasize caring relationships and felt interdependencies.
Call upon teachers to respond morally to their work.
View teachers as supervisors of learning communities. (p. 142)

By adhering to these words and focusing on student learning, staff development done correctly can be one of the most important things that a school administrator does. With a foundation built on an understanding of the school’s mission and needs and the needs of the stakeholders making up the school community, the administrator can design and build a staff development program that really makes a difference.

**Effective Staff Development**

Although a needs assessment such as the one depicted in Figure 4.4 is an important start, it does not guarantee that the staff development program will be effective or meaningful. The school administrator must follow up the needs assessment with a plan that not only meets the expressed needs but also has a built in system for measuring its effectiveness. Without criteria for determining whether or not staff development efforts have been effective, there is no benchmark against which to measure growth and success.

John Seyfarth (2007) describes the following eight characteristics of effective staff development:

1. **Relevance**—Staff development activities that are relevant closely link their goals with the teachers’ responsibilities in the classroom. The staff development clearly addresses an identified need or a topic of interest to the teachers.
2. **Clear Objectives**—Clear objectives identify the knowledge and the skills that teachers are supposed to acquire through participation in the staff development activities. When the objectives are clear, they are completely understood by both the presenter and the participants.
3. **Attractive Incentives**—Staff development activities that give teachers the perception that they will gain some intrinsic or extrinsic rewards as a result of participation offer attractive incentives to participants. Although new knowledge is an attractive incentive in many cases, there are other ways to offer incentives to teachers.
4. **Application**—Staff development activities are most effective when participants can clearly identify how to apply the material directly to their teaching. Somewhat related to relevance, application refers to the extent to which participants can easily apply what they’ve learned in their classrooms.
5. **Maintenance**—Teachers who try out new methods as a result of staff development activities need support in their efforts. Maintenance refers to the fact that staff development activities should be closely followed by follow-up opportunities for teachers to receive support. Asking teachers to internalize a new skill without follow-up support dooms many staff development programs to failure.

6. **Instructor Knowledge**—The instructor of a staff development activity must be highly knowledgeable in the subject matter being presented. Additionally, staff development is most effective when the instructor can present the material in an interesting and engaging way.

7. **Classroom Fit**—The content of a staff development session must fit both the teaching style of the participants and the special circumstances of the teachers' classrooms. In this regard, the content must be developmentally appropriate to the students that participants work with and it must be able to be implemented in the classrooms with very few adjustments needed.

8. **Duration**—Ongoing staff development that occurs over a period of weeks or months gives teachers the appropriate time to practice and internalize new techniques. Staff development that is offered one time for a brief period is not of a duration conducive to teacher learning.

School administrators should develop both formal and informal means of measuring whether or not the staff development activities that they design and offer meet these criteria. If they do and if they grow out of an examination of teachers' needs and desires, then they have a much greater chance of being effective.

One final note for this chapter is the reminder that all staff development and/or extracurricular programming in the school must lead in some way to the success of all students. The eight characteristics of effective staff development programs presented above are sound and worthwhile. They contain the unspoken edict, however, that student learning must be improved as a result of them. Schools have as their primary responsibility the improvement of life for students. The focus, therefore, is always on student success and learning before it is on teacher success and learning. When both happen simultaneously, as happens in the best schools across the country, then the self-actualization explained by Maslow can become a reality for many.

**Summary**

In fulfilling the roles expressed by ISLLC Standard 2, school administrators must concern themselves with all aspects of the instructional program. Whereas Chapter 3 focused on the curriculum and the instructional program for students, this chapter reminds us that extracurricular and cocurricular offerings are also
What teachers perceive as areas in need of improvement should be the focus of quality staff development. Teachers should be the drivers of staff development design, including how much development they need, the content of the development they need, and the format in which the development is delivered. Failure to utilize the perspective of teachers as the catalyst for staff development design is the main reason why so many of our nation’s teachers feel as though the staff development designed for them is out of touch with what they really need. If school administrators focused more on content theories of motivation, they would be more keenly aware of what teachers need. Combining this awareness with the results of needs assessments filled out by teachers regarding their perceived staff development needs would substantially improve the quality and usefulness of staff development in our school systems.

School administrators are charged with the responsibility of serving as instructional leaders. They are responsible for the quality of instruction that their students receive, but they are equally responsible for ensuring that their teachers receive appropriate, high-quality instruction that will improve their teaching. Surveying teachers to ascertain their perceptions of their own staff development needs is a good idea. However, if teacher surveys become the driving force behind staff development designs, there is a high risk that teachers will misdiagnose their needs and consequently receive less meaningful staff development. If we are to improve the staff development received by teachers in our schools, then school administrators need to be the instructional leaders they are charged to be and design staff development plans that they know will be of the greatest benefit to their teachers.

Questions

• In your experience on the receiving end of staff development, what role have teachers played in the design and implementation of the activities?
• As a school principal, how can you best contribute to the design and delivery of staff development for teachers?
• With the widely varying development needs of teachers across the spectrum, is it possible to create staff development opportunities that meet these diverse needs?
integral parts of the overall school experience for many young people. School administrators must be inclusive in that they provide offerings that extend the school day for all students. Inherent in their ability to accomplish this is their understanding of the needs and desires that different students within the school have.

Motivational theories, particularly the three content theories of motivation presented in this chapter, offer school administrators an opportunity to know what it is that motivates different people to show interest in different activities. Maslow's Need Hierarchy and Alderfer's ERG Theory help administrators understand why individuals respond to different needs. Whereas some people may strive for ultimate growth or self-actualization, others are concerned about their basic physiological or existence needs. It is incumbent on the administrator to know all he or she can about the different stakeholders within their school so as to best determine the individual needs and desires these stakeholders have. Another content theory of motivation, Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory, examines factors that lead to satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the workplace. This is particularly useful for school administrators as they strive to keep their staff motivated to perform their duties to the best of their abilities. The essential difference between Motivation-Hygiene Theory and the theories of Maslow and Alderfer lies in the fact that Motivation-Hygiene Theory draws a distinction between those factors leading to dissatisfaction (hygiene factors) and those leading to satisfaction (motivation factors) within the workplace. Working on improving hygiene factors, Herzberg posits, will not lead to a more motivated staff.

It is important for school administrators to be concerned about motivation as they create a staff development plan for their schools. In addition to creating a culture that nurtures student learning, ISLLC Standard 2 calls on the administrator to focus attention on the continuous professional growth of the school staff. Knowing the needs and desires of the professional staff is an important first step in this process. Acknowledging those needs in light of the school's mission can lead the administrator to an understanding of what the content of the staff development program for the school ought to be. Developing some form of needs assessment that values the feedback staff members give regarding their needs is the final step in ensuring that the planned staff development is pertinent to people's needs.

Once staff development plans are in place, then the school administrator must regularly check on the effectiveness of the activities. Eight characteristics of effective staff development activities or programs were presented in this chapter. When those eight characteristics are included in the design and implementation of the staff development activities, the chance that they will positively impact the work of the staff is increased dramatically.

Undergirding all of this is the understanding that all school activities must be tied to improved student learning. The ISLLC Standards outline the performances school administrators should engage in to promote the success of all students. Whether we are talking about extracurricular activities for students
or professional development activities for teachers, they are only worthwhile if they lead to improved student learning and the success of all students.

**Chapter Highlights**

♦ School administrators are now called upon to provide leadership for athletic programs, a wide variety of arts programs, before and after school childcare, a character education program, any number of clubs tied to other school disciplines, and an increasing number of community-oriented activities.

♦ If school administrators are to provide the leadership called for by the ISLLC Standards, particularly Standard 2, then they must become expert motivators.

♦ Content theories of motivation concern themselves with the *what* of motivation. Specifically, these theories help us to understand the content of what motivates people.

♦ Three examples of content theories of motivation are Maslow’s Need Hierarchy, Alderfer’s ERG Theory, and Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory.

♦ In fulfilling the objectives of the ISLLC Standards, school administrators play a pivotal role in creating the conditions necessary for ongoing professional development to occur.

♦ All professional staff development should be linked to the improvement of student learning.

**Application Questions**

1. Examine the extracurricular programs offered in your school. Are there individual students or groups of students who do not participate in these programs? Can content theories of motivation explain why some of these students choose not to participate? Is there a mismatch between the objectives of the extracurricular programming and the needs of the students that contributes to the choice not to participate?

2. Are there any factors identified by Herzberg that surprise you in terms of their classification as either hygiene factors or motivation factors? If you replicated Herzberg’s research in your own school, would you expect the results to be similar? Why/why not?

3. Consider the last staff development session sponsored by your school district that you attended. Was it meaningful to you? Did the knowledge you gained by attending the session lead to improved student learning? In your opinion, how many of Seyfarth’s eight characteristics of effective staff development were present?
Field Activity

Examine your school/district’s staff development plan for the current school year. Either review a written plan or interview the staff development coordinator to ascertain the extent to which the plan meets the eight characteristics of effective staff development presented in this chapter. Also, look for evidence of a needs assessment in determining the goals of the plan. Finally, compare the staff development plan to the mission of the school/district that it was written for. Is there congruence between the two? Share your observations with an administrator at the appropriate school/district level.

Have You Thought About It?

Inherent in strong educational leadership is the knowledge that teachers are people first. As such, teachers have lives outside of school that have a tremendous impact on their ability to remain excited, upbeat, and motivated about their work. There are many reasons why Mr. Harris has changed. Many of them may be related to his basic needs. Or Mr. Harris may be experiencing problems in relationships outside of school that carry over into his daily demeanor. Perhaps Mr. Harris may no longer feel as if his work provides opportunities for growth or renewal. Although I’m not sure what Mr. Harris is feeling, I am sure that Dr. Miles should try to find out.

What do you think?
School climate and school culture have always been synonymous terms in the mind of Mr. Inez Conway, principal of Lincoln Heights Elementary School. Both terms, he assumed, referred to the way it feels inside of a school. Mr. Conway was proud of how good it currently felt inside of Lincoln Heights Elementary, even though it had taken six years and lots of hard work to get it that way.

To walk through the corridors of Lincoln Heights was a positive assault on the senses. Beautiful, high-quality student work was displayed prominently on bulletin boards throughout the hallways. Outside of each classroom door were pictures so rich in color and awash in welcoming feelings that one had to feel good passing the doorways. There always seemed to be great smells coming from the cafeteria, and the only sound heard in the building were the choirs of children singing in the music classroom and the occasional low hallway chatter. Yes, being in Lincoln Heights Elementary School felt great!

Despite these great feelings, Lincoln Heights was a lonely school after hours. Most teachers left as soon as their required hours were over, and the school had nothing worth mentioning in terms of extracurricular of-
As you read Chapter 5, consider the power of school culture and the subtle, yet important ways in which it is distinguishable from school climate. Think about whether or not Mr. Inez Conway truly understands these concepts and decide what steps he should take to make the situation better.

School culture is an important concept that has gotten increased attention in recent years because of a realization on the part of many educators that the environment of schools has a great deal to do with the success of its students and the morale of its staff. These environments, founded on the beliefs and values of stakeholders and governed by deeply ingrained norms, have the power to create or destroy the academic focus of schools. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the culture of a school, particularly when it emphasizes achievement for all stakeholders, has a great effect on the ultimate success of that particular school.

Our schools need cultures that are focused on academic achievement now more than they ever have before. Legislation, such as former President George W. Bush’s *No Child Left Behind Act*, has strengthened American education’s focus on academic achievement. Perhaps for the first time in history, all public schools are facing strong governmental mandates that students perform at predetermined levels. In many cases, for schools to rise to the new challenges created by such demands, the culture of schooling must change. For it is the culture of a school, that system of norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors, that forms the foundation on which academic achievement rests. As a result of the lasting nature of cultures, many educators fear that schools will not be able to experience these cultural shifts as quickly as they must. There is growing concern that a reactive response to mandates may become necessary, as many school leaders across the nation claim that they simply do not have time to facilitate the school culture changes necessary to meet new accountability demands.

Educators can attest that a school’s culture takes a long time to change. With strong school leadership, the change can take anywhere from three to five years. Under weaker leadership, the prognosis for changing a school’s culture is even grimmer. Of course, a change in culture can be achieved more rapidly if all constituents believe that change is in their best interest. The communication skills required of principals to assist constituents in arriving at a decision to change are a focus of this textbook’s section devoted primarily to Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 4.

Before going further, it is important that all readers understand the definition of school culture being used to frame this chapter. Adopting themes from Deal, Peterson, Sergiovanni, and others, I define culture as the collective values, beliefs, mores, and behaviors governing the actions taken by people associated...
with the school. It is not so much what people do, but why they do it. Several studies have been conducted (Marks, 2002; Fiore, 1999; Fyans & Maehr, 1990) to illustrate the positive and negative effects that certain cultural patterns can have on a school’s ability to function effectively. The beliefs and resulting behaviors of all school stakeholders are critically important for any administrator to understand. They become even more important if the administrator in question endeavors to create a culture of growth for all children and for all staff. Such a culture can only exist, as research indicates, in environments led by administrators who understand the beliefs and the needs of the stakeholders with which they work.

Of even greater importance is the reader’s ability to distinguish school culture from school climate, especially as it relates to change. Unfortunately, these two terms are often used interchangeably. Although related to one another, culture and climate have different meanings and much different effects on a school’s ability to function efficiently and effectively. Below I propose a simple analogy for comparing school culture with school climate to gain a better understanding of what culture really is. From this understanding, it will be easier to develop knowledge about the role the school leader has in changing a school’s culture in a way that promotes academic and professional growth.

**School Culture vs. School Climate**

The main reason for understanding the differences between school climate and school culture is to best internalize the effects that they both have on a school. Although both terms are related to organizational behavior and productivity, the impact of the concepts on a school’s effectiveness may be dramatically different (Sweeney, 1986). The climate of a school, for example, reflects one facet of personality and self-image. There is considerable evidence that self-image influences the decisions individuals make about their work, the effort they put into making those decisions, and the length of time they persist in the effort (Bandura, 1986). Self-image is, however, a surface concept in this regard. Although climate is analogous to an individual’s self-image in many respects, it is not analogous to the reasons behind the self-image. These deeper reasons are, instead, reflected in the culture.

School culture, at its deepest levels, represents strongly held beliefs, values, and assumptions of a group. The needs and desires of the group result in norms of day-to-day behavior and impact the decisions individuals make on a day-to-day basis (Kilmann, 1989). It is the underlying reason behind the self-image. A school’s culture can be strong or weak, positive or negative. Its deep roots make it difficult to change. It can and must, however, be managed.

To assist in understanding the differences further, consider the following *iceberg* analogy. The image created, analogous to a giant iceberg floating along somewhere in the cold sea, helps us understand the subtle differences between school climate and school culture. The mass of ice floating in the frigid waters represents school climate. That is, this mass of ice is readily observable. Any-
body can perceive the characteristics and qualities of that iceberg in much the same way that we perceive characteristics and qualities of a school. It does not take long to make observations about the iceberg, just as it does not take long to observe the climate of a school.

**Figure 5.1 Iceberg Analogy**

Conversely, we all know that there is much more to an iceberg than merely the large block of ice we see floating in cold waters. Instead, there is a giant mass of ice below the surface of the water that is not visible, or readily observable by us. In fact, this mass of ice below sea level is larger, often more complex, and provides the supporting structures for the part of the iceberg that we do see. School culture is analogous to this image. For the culture is the supporting structure on which the climate rests. To observe it and to perceive its qualities and characteristics requires much deeper study. The shape of it undergoes slower and more purposeful change than does the more easily observable climate. Likewise with an iceberg, the mass below the water’s surface is stable and difficult to modify. It is its counterpart floating above the water that is victim to environmental factors, such as sun, wind, and rain, which can cause more rapid changes. In time, the whole iceberg, including the cultural representative under the water, can be transformed. It takes time and purpose, however. Understanding this is vitally important, for too many school leaders have “given up” in frustration because they were unaware of the time commitment required to change an existing culture. This is one reason why vision, as discussed in light of ISLLC Standard 1, is so important. Leaders with vision recognize that small changes are being made
in their school, even when such changes are not immediately visible. These lead-
ers exhibit patience, they do not give up on their vision, and they understand
that eventually they will reap all that they have sown.

Elements of a Positive Organizational Culture

Although school administrators are the most influential stakeholders in any
given school, their vision cannot shape the culture of a school by itself. Instead,
the collective buy-in of all stakeholders is necessary if a leader wants to trans-
form his or her vision into something that permeates the culture and becomes
lasting. Research conducted in 261 schools (Fiore, 1999) identified some key be-
haviors that principals of schools with positive cultures ordinarily engage in.
Although it is not necessary to exhibit all of these qualities all of the time, the
frequency with which these behaviors and attitudes are displayed has much to
do with their ultimate effect on the positive culture of a school.

Summarized and enumerated below are ten key behaviors that principals
ought to adopt so as to create a more positive culture. These behaviors, though
grounded in research, are presented and intended to be ready to emulate. This
list was originally presented in my book, Creating Connections for Better Schools:

1. Be visible to all school stakeholders. Research and sound practice have
proven that school leaders who are visible to stakeholders help cre-
ate and foster positive school cultures (Fiore, 1999). This is largely
due to the overwhelming sense of comfort reported when the prin-
cipal is visible regularly and in various settings. In addition, vis-
ibility, exhibited through such behaviors as Management by Walk-
ing Around, makes the management tasks of school leaders more
efficient (Frase & Melton, 1992). It takes little more than a strong
commitment to push aside management tasks and leave the office
at key times throughout the day.

2. Communicate regularly and purposefully. Effective communication
must occur in good times, as well as in bad times. If the principal is
known to communicate with students, staff members, and parents
only when there are problems, then there will be a negative impact
felt on the culture of the school. The best school leaders use var-
ied forms of communication to regularly provide feedback to all
stakeholders. The principal’s understanding of the importance of
visibility makes this easier and more natural.

3. Never forget that principals are role models. Less-effective administra-
tors fail to see themselves as role models (Fiore, 1999). They mistak-
enly believe that teachers are viewed as role models, while missing
the point that many members of a school community see principals
in that capacity (Foriska, 1994). Principals must be aware that they
are the most influential people in a school system. Teachers, staff, parents, students, and community members do look to the school leaders as role models. With this in mind, principals should model behaviors consistent with the sustenance of a positive school culture.

4. Be passionate about your work. The most effective school leaders seem to love the work they are engaged in. They have a passion for schools and a passion for leadership that their followers can clearly witness. The imperative for all school leaders is to become more passionate about their work and clearer about what they hope to accomplish (Greenfield, 1985). This may be a difficult one, for passion comes from within and is difficult to copy.

5. Understand how responsible you are for the culture. The best school leaders believe that they are responsible for virtually everything that happens in their schools. Rather than bemoaning this, these leaders welcome the responsibility and use it for the betterment of education. The most effective principals realize their responsibility to protect the needs and integrity of the entire school community (Sergiovanni, 1996). They do not “pass the buck” and blame others for problems in the school. These principals are highly proactive leaders.

6. Keep yourself organized. School administrators who are organized find time management to be much less burdensome than do disorganized administrators. This gives them more time for instructional leadership, school–community relations, and personnel management. Studies have shown (Whitaker, 1997; Fiore, 1999) that stakeholders appreciate and rely on the organization of their leader. If organization is not an inherent strength of the principal, then the principal must surround him- or herself with office staff who can assist in this regard. In other words, this is a weakness that must be managed.

7. Exhibit a positive outlook. As role models, the best school administrators realize that attitudes are, indeed, contagious. To create and sustain a positive school culture, school leaders must consistently radiate positive energies. They must proactively approach their work, never forgetting the mission of the school. Furthermore, effective principals strengthen the culture of their schools by ensuring that its mission and vision are shared by the entire school community (Buell, 1992).

8. Take pride in the physical appearance of your schools. With estimates that sixty-five to eighty percent of households do not have children in our schools, school leaders must realize that the physical appear-
ance of their schools is the only aspect of which most of the public is aware. Therefore, effective leaders recognize the importance of always making sure their school looks as neat and attractive as possible. More significantly, they do not leave this to chance, relying on custodial staff and maintenance staff members to perform this task. They, instead, take responsibility themselves for ensuring that their buildings are neat and attractive.

9. **Empower others appropriately.** The leaders needed in our schools understand when and how to empower others to share leadership. They realize that people need a stake in the outcome of an event and the capacity to lead before they can be empowered. They are aware that “empowerment enables; it does not simply permit” (Schlechty, 1997). They appropriately empower teachers, support staff, students, and parents.

10. **Demonstrate stewardship.** School leaders who understand their roles as stewards of the community are inspiring to followers. Effective administrators exercise stewardship when they commit themselves to serving, caring for, and protecting their schools and their stakeholders (Sergiovanni, 1996). Principals need to make the choice to serve their school first. Without making such a choice, a leader’s capacity to lead is profoundly limited (Greenleaf, 1977).

It is not enough, however, for principals to simply memorize a list of behaviors compiled by studying some of the best principals in the country. Instead, as the ISLLC Standards intend, school leaders must develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of individuals who understand and are ready to apply these principles.

Beyond the behaviors of influential leaders, school cultures come about through the beliefs and behaviors of everybody associated with the school. Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman studied America’s best run companies and found that positive cultures were closely tied to the companies’ success. The elements of culture that Peters and Waterman discovered and identified in their bestselling book, *In Search of Excellence* (1988), can easily be applied to the cultures of schools as well. These elements are:

- **A Bias Toward Action**—The companies studied were all characterized as doers. That is, they were known to experiment and try new methods in order to achieve the results they wanted.

- **Close to the Customer**—Just as schools benefit from understanding the needs and attitudes of students and parents, the companies Peters and Waterman studied got direction from their customers before creating new products or services.
♦ Autonomy and Entrepreneurship—The companies studied placed high value on innovation and risk taking. Some failure as a result of this risk taking was expected and accepted.

♦ Productivity Through People—The companies studied all involved people in the decision making process. Just as schools benefit from the infusion of stakeholder’s ideas, these companies valued their employees’ input and considered their employees to be part of an extended company family.

♦ Hands-on, Value-driven Effort—Substantial attention was paid to the cultural values of employees in the excellent companies studied. Likewise, the companies worked hard to communicate explicit core values to their employees.

♦ Sticking to the Knitting—The companies studied knew what they were good at and they stayed in the business that they were created to run. Sage advice for school leaders is hidden in this quality. Great schools know their customers (parents, students), and they know what they are able to deliver in terms of a quality education.

♦ Simple Form, Lean Staff—Acknowledging the value of the workforce, these successful companies kept their corporate leadership staff small. Similarly, they used simple organizational structures to enhance the flow of communication.

All of the elements of America’s best-run companies, as noted by Peters and Waterman, can be applied in some way to our schools. In fact, when the ten leadership characteristics previously mentioned are in place, it is difficult to imagine a school that does not exhibit the elements above. Nevertheless, the work of Carl Steinhoff and Robert Owens has provided educators with some easy to understand metaphors of the different types of school cultures that exist in schools throughout the United States and beyond. These distinct culture phenotypes were developed after the researchers carefully studied the culture of schools using survey methodology. Steinhoff and Owens (1989) identified six interlocking dimensions that defined the culture of a school:

1. The history of the school;
2. The values and beliefs of the school;
3. Myths and stories that explain the school;
4. The cultural norms of the school;
5. Traditions, rituals, and ceremonies characteristic of the school; and
6. The heroes and heroines of the school.

From this taxonomy, Steinhoff and Owens developed the Organizational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI). Data collected from the wide distribu-
tion of this instrument were analyzed and this process led to the formation of the four culture phenotypes of schools.

♦ Family Culture: A school with a family culture is friendly, cooperative, and protective. As in a family, staff members in a family culture are alternately submissive and rebellious. The school is described with metaphors like family, home, or team.

♦ Machine Culture: A school with a machine culture can be described with terms like well-oiled or rusty. While machine cultures, like family cultures, may be tightly organized, their focus is on protection and not warmth. The school as a machine is viewed in instrumental terms which result in the school being seen as a machine that educators use to accomplish goals.

♦ Cabaret Culture: A school with a cabaret culture is one in which teachers are performers and efforts are focused on getting reactions from the audience. These schools are often described with terms like circus, well choreographed, and Broadway. Although there is some of the same closeness in cabaret cultures that staff experience in family cultures, the focus is more on the audience reactions than it is on authentic relationships among colleagues.

♦ Little Shop of Horrors Culture: A school with a little shop of horrors culture is unpredictable and loaded with tension. Quite the opposite of family cultures or cabaret cultures, staff members in little shop of horrors cultures are isolated and often alone. This culture can be described as paranoid, cold, and unforgiving.

The rich imagery and vivid language from these phenotypes has made them very useful in examining the cultures of schools. Almost every educator can identify their school in one of these descriptors. Furthermore, the phenotypes bear some resemblance to the cultures described earlier by Peters and Waterman. Taken together, these models provide accessible language with which to make sense out of school cultures.

**Nurturing a Culture of Learning**

It is one thing for a school administrator to understand his or her role in creating, fostering, and sustaining a positive school culture. It is quite another, however, to ensure that such a culture is focused on student learning. To do this, a school administrator first must understand his or her role as an instructional leader (outlined in Chapters 3 and 4). Failure to do so negates an administrator’s ability to develop such a culture. The cultures of today’s schools need administrators who focus on high-quality education. Quality, in this regard, is what contemporary accountability demands are based on. This focus is reminiscent of an element of Japanese management techniques and the works of W.
Edwards Deming and the practice he called Total Quality Management (TQM). While these groundbreaking works were originally based in the business and commerce world as American firms looked to their Japanese counterparts some thirty years ago in an attempt to understand the seemingly superior effectiveness of the Japanese, they have been applied well to the understanding of the types of cultures our schools need so as to remain effective and competitive. Let us examine them further in light of ISLLC Standard 2 and as somewhat of an initial transition into our examination of ISLLC Standard 3.

**Theory Z**

In response to America’s growing fascination with Japanese business techniques that developed after World War II, William Ouchi, an American researcher and theorist, developed Theory Z. Reminiscent in name to McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y, Theory Z was the result of Ouchi’s examination of high-producing companies in both the United States and Japan.

While Theory Z in some ways is an extension of Theory X and Theory Y, there is one principal distinguishing difference. Whereas Theory X and Theory Y focus on the personal leadership styles of individual supervisors, Theory Z focuses on the culture of the entire organization. Unlike Theory X and Theory Y which both concern themselves with the behaviors of individuals, Theory Z is concerned with the difference the organizational culture makes in the way the whole organization is managed. For this reason, it is an important aide in the school administrator’s understanding of ISLLC Standard 2. The Theory Z culture, as explained by Ouchi (1993), has the following elements:

- Individual responsibility
- Consensual decision making
- Long-term employment
- Slow evaluation and promotion
- Explicit measures of performance
- Commitment to all aspects of employee life, including family life

When these elements are viewed within the culture of Japanese businesses, like those studied by Ouchi in the late 1970s and early 1980s, they create a work environment that produces high employee commitment, motivation, and productivity. For example, Ouchi learned that many Japanese employees are guaranteed a position with their employer for life, thereby increasing the employee’s loyalty to that company. Careful evaluation occurs over a period of time, and the responsibility for success or failure is shared among employees and management. Most employees do not specialize in one skill area, but work at several different tasks, learning more about the company as they develop. Also, Japanese companies are often concerned about all aspects of their employees’ lives, both on and off the job. According to Ouchi, Type Z organizations tend to have stable employment, high productivity, and high employee morale and satisfaction.
Many of these outcomes are somewhat reminiscent of Theory Y leadership, and research will continue to evaluate the feasibility of implementing some of them in American companies and, in particular, in the American educational system.

ISLLC Standard 2 states that “a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.” It is easy to see why Theory Z is relevant to this standard. In examining the elements of Theory Z listed above, the focus on individuals and their needs becomes apparent. The best school administrators consistently report that when they focus on individual needs, they have the best chance of affecting schoolwide improvement. It is the school administrator who ignores individual stakeholder needs that creates a school environment contrary to Theory Z. The result of such ignorance is often a school culture set far apart from the type of culture envisioned by ISLLC Standard 2.

To further assist in relating Theory Z and ISLLC Standard 2 to administrative work, consider a motivational tool known as *Friday Focus* (Figure 5.2, page 98). Developed by Todd Whitaker (1999) and in use in many schools throughout the country, Friday Focus contains many of the elements of Theory Z, as described by Ouchi. Essentially, Friday Focus, a weekly memo that is placed in all teachers’ mailboxes before they arrive at school on Friday mornings, is designed with the following goals in mind:

- To communicate important logistical information about upcoming events in the school. This allows staff meetings to be much more productive.
- To be used as a staff development or inservice tool by consistently keeping the beliefs and vision of the school in front of the staff.
- To be used as a motivational tool by mentioning good, positive things about the school.
- To assist with planning. Because of the important logistical information contained in Friday Focus, staff members can be more organized and prepared about upcoming events.

The fact that Friday Focus is so positive in nature makes it an important part of the positive school cultures alluded to by ISLLC Standard 2. Its ability to highlight good things that administrators see employees doing helps in achieving the Theory Z principle of explicit measures of performance. Also, because Friday Focus can become quite personalized, as Figure 5.2 shows, it can go far in assisting the concerned administrator with demonstrating a commitment to all aspects of employee life, including family life.
I had the fortunate opportunity to observe Sarah P.’s class launching their model rockets on Wednesday afternoon. The excitement on the children’s faces as their rockets launched off the lifting pad showed me how much fun learning can be. These kids had a great deal to share with all onlookers about how rockets work. If there were any spies from NASA lurking around the schoolyard, I’m certain they were impressed. Sarah, you have done a wonderful job injecting excitement back into our science program.

Congratulations to Betsy for recently being selected Jefferson’s Teacher of the Year. You are deserving of this honor, and it stands as a testament of your hard work on behalf of students. I know I speak for many when I say that we are all so proud of you!

I have just been informed that our custodial crew has been recognized by the school board as the outstanding custodial crew for the school district in 2007–2008. Lenny, Tammy, and Bea deserve all of our accolades for the tireless efforts they put into making our school look so beautiful. The three of you are important reasons why Jefferson is the best school in the state. Thank you and congratulations on a well-deserved honor.

Yesterday’s Field Day activities were a huge success because of the hard work and fun spirits that each and every one of you brought with you to school. The kids had fun, got exercise, and enjoyed letting their hair down with the staff a bit. When they are all grown, these kids will look back on their years at Jefferson and remember the fun they had with caring adults. Than you all so very much!

Remember, there is no school Monday in observance of Memorial Day. I hope the long weekend provides all of you with time to reflect on those things that are most important to you in your lives. As we approach the end of another school year, I know that I’ll be reflecting on how important each and every one of you is to our success and happiness at Jefferson!

In short, positive, motivational tools like Friday Focus can help administrators to continuously point out the elements of the school’s culture that they wish to highlight. As a culture of growth for both students and adult professionals is needed in all schools, then Friday Focus should highlight those positive elements that are consistent with this type of culture. Although some elements of Theory Z, such as consensual decision making, may not be contained within a tool like Friday Focus, there are many other consistencies between Friday Focus and Theory Z that enhance an administrator’s ability to focus on ISLLC Standard 2. For this reason, Friday Focus is a valuable tool for positive culture building.
Total Quality Management

In 1986, W. Edwards Deming published a book entitled *Out of the Crisis*. This book quickly became the focus of management transformations all across the world, as businesses and other industries tried to copy the steps to quality that many of their Japanese counterparts, the focus of Deming’s research, had already implemented. At roughly the same time, educational institutions became very interested in adopting Deming’s points for use in structuring and managing themselves. Comparisons between educational entities and the business world were regularly seen in research and popular literature, and the idea that Deming’s work could be applicable to schools and other educational agencies was very appealing. As we consider here the wording of ISLLC Standard 2 and the kind of leadership it requires, the teachings of Deming ring true. Although further application to the specific features of an educational environment is needed, the fourteen points Deming outlines have great relevance in the model of school leadership needed today and in the future. These fourteen points, outlined for business leaders in *Out of the Crisis*, are as follows:

1. Create constancy of purpose toward improvement of products and services.
2. Adopt the new philosophy. We are in a new economic age. Western management must awaken to the challenge, must learn their responsibilities, and take on leadership for change.
3. Cease dependence on inspection to achieve quality. Eliminate the need for inspection on a mass basis by building quality into the product in the first place.
4. End the practice of awarding business on the basis of price tag. Instead, minimize total cost.
5. Improve constantly and forever the system of production and service, to improve quality and productivity, and thus constantly decrease costs.
6. Institute training on the job.
7. Institute leadership. The aim of supervision should be to help people and machines and gadgets to do a better job.
8. Drive out fear, so that everyone may work effectively for the company.
10. Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for the work force asking for zero defects and new levels of productivity. Such exhortations only create adversarial relationships, as the bulk of the causes of low quality and low productivity belong to the system and thus lie beyond the power of the workforce.
11a. Eliminate work standards (quotas) on the factory floor. Substitute leadership.


12a. Remove barriers that rob the hourly worker of his right to joy of workmanship. The responsibility of supervisors must be changed from sheer numbers to quality.

12b. Remove barriers that rob people in management and in engineering of their right to joy of workmanship. This means abolishment of the annual merit rating and of management by objective.

13. Institute a vigorous program of education and self-improvement.

14. Put everybody in the company to work to accomplish the transformation. The transformation is everybody’s job.

The fourteen points, as articulated by Deming, need very little tweaking to be applicable and necessary for those studying educational administration to embrace. While Deming’s focus was clearly on the business world, educators also have customers (students, parents), workers (staff), and management (administrators) to consider. By adhering to the ideals Deming presents, school administrators can foster school cultures that remove their focus from fear, competition, and evaluation and place it on learning, growth, and continuous improvement. A quality school administrator ought to design staff development opportunities that assist their faculty in understanding how to apply these principles. Sitting together as a school community and rewording Deming’s fourteen points in a way that makes sense for the individual school is akin to the process of developing a schoolwide mission statement. It is also an important step in creating the kind of school culture referred to by ISLLC Standard 2.

On their school’s website there is evidence that the leadership of Mt. Edgecumbe High School in Sitka, Alaska, has done this very thing. The leadership of this school modified Deming’s fourteen points to create their own points for continuous improvement of education. Below are the fifteen points that emerged as a result of these efforts:

1. Create and maintain a constancy of purpose toward improvement of students and service. Aim to create the best quality students capable of improving all forms of processes and entering meaningful positions in society.

2. Adopt the new philosophy. Educational management must awaken to the challenge, must learn their responsibilities, and take on leadership for change.

3. Work to abolish grading and the harmful effects of rating people. Focus on the learning process, not the rating process.
4. Cease dependence on testing to achieve quality. Eliminate the need for inspections on a mass basis (standardized achievement test, minimum graduation exams, etc.) by providing learning experiences which create quality performance; learning experiences that encourage creativity and experimentation.

5. Work with the educational institutions from which students come. Minimize total cost of education by improving the relationship with student sources and helping to improve the quality of students coming into your system. A single source of students coming into a system, such as junior high students moving into a high school, is an opportunity to build long-term relationships of loyalty and trust for the benefit of students.

6. Improve constantly and forever the system of student improvement and service to improve quality and productivity in personal life and community.

7. Institute continuous training on the job for students, teachers, classified staff, and administrators; for all people connected to the human organization or community.

8. Institute leadership. The aim of supervision should be to help people use machines, gadgets, and materials to do a better job and set the pace driving human creativity.

9. Drive out fear, so that everyone may work effectively for the school system. Create an environment which encourages people to speak freely and take risks.

10. Break down barriers between departments. People in teaching, special education, accounting, food service, administration, curriculum development and research, etc., must work as a team. Develop strategies for increasing the cooperation among groups and individual people. Planning time will facilitate this dynamic.

11. Eliminate slogans, exhortations, and targets for teachers and students asking for perfect performance and new levels of productivity. Exhortations create adversarial relationships. The bulk of the causes of low quality and low productivity belong to the system and thus lie beyond the control of teachers and students.

12. Eliminate work standards (quotas) on teachers and students (e.g., raise test scores by 10% and lower dropouts by 15%). Substitute leadership and the eternal drive for quality and joy of learning.

13. Remove barriers that rob the students, teachers and management (principals, superintendents and central office support staff) of their right to pride and joy of workmanship. This means abolition of the annual or merit rating and of management by objective. The
responsibility of all educational managers must be changed from quantity to quality.


15. Put everybody in the school to work to accomplish the transformation. The transformation is everybody’s job.

(http://www.mehs.educ.state.ak.us/quality/qpoints.html)

Consider the power in these fifteen statements. While Deming’s work rings true for many educators, the work done by the stakeholders of Mt. Edgecumbe High School has resulted in a list that truly defines the type of school culture envisioned by ISLLC Standard 2. This is a culture, these fifteen points suggest, that is built on common purpose, trust, cooperation, and leadership. If school administrators truly endeavor to create school cultures in which students and staff members thrive, then perhaps a list like this one needs to be developed for all schools.

There is no intended implication here that “one size fits all” in culture building. Nor is there any attempt to convey the message that Theory Z and Deming’s Total Quality Management are the answers to creating positive school cultures in all school environments. Rather, the intention is to call awareness to the fact that some of the most relevant business leadership theories can be quite revealing for educational institutions, such as our K-12 schools. As ISLLC Standard 2 urges administrators to promote “the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth,” the necessity to pay attention to the cultural elements present in a school is obvious. Theory Z and Total Quality Management are two vehicles for conducting such a cultural examination. Combined with the emphasis of school administration as the curricular and instructional leadership of a school, as presented in Chapter 3 and 4, the theories presented here ought to provide great assistance for meeting the requirements of ISLLC Standard 2 and for beginning to erect the framework for ISLLC Standard 3.

**A Quality Education for All**

Educators often speak about students needing a “Quality Education,” yet few people have a real operational definition of what a “Quality Education” is. Clearly, when we read or hear the latest educational news from politicians, we are bombarded with slogans such as “No Child Left Behind,” or perhaps we are shown a newspaper headline putting the capability of American students at or near the bottom of a ranking of students’ math and science ability, compared to their foreign counterparts. Additionally we, ourselves, often mentally rank our schools based on the standardized test scores earned by the students within those schools, while ignoring other important factors. But one question still lingers. Does any of this refer to or lead to a “quality education”?
School administrators cannot and should not ignore, or even downplay the significance of, accountability measures. It serves no purpose to complain about the fact that a school’s success increasingly is being defined by the collective achievements of its students on standardized forms of measurement. To do so would be to object to something that has grown out of our own efforts, in many ways. More importantly, though, school administrators need to recognize that such assessment measures do not determine whether or not students are necessarily receiving a quality education. Although standardized achievement is one indication of quality, it is incumbent on all leaders to recognize that a quality education refers just as much or more to teaching and learning as it does to achievement. Focusing on the teaching and learning process and ensuring that all students are provided opportunities and supports to maximize their achievement potential are the responsibility of school administrators far more than is the improvement of achievement in isolation.

The theories and concepts presented in this chapter are designed to assist all administrators and prospective school leaders in understanding how such a focus can occur. A reality of our task as educators is that we all perform our duties and execute our work in environments that differ dramatically, in some cases, from one another. When all of us recognize the elements of a positive, student-centered culture, the likelihood of us creating and sustaining such a culture in our own schools increases considerably. It is only through school culture that the dream of providing all students with a quality education can and will become a reality. A quality education for all occurs when the culture of our schools supports such an ideal. School administrators set the tone and influence all school stakeholders to build such supports when they are cognizant of the possibilities.

This textbook highlights many concepts, tasks, and role responsibilities of school administrators. Each one has its own significance in leading individuals to maximize their potential as school administrators. As theories of administration, motivation, and organizational effectiveness are combined with best practice research on communication, decision making, and instructional leadership, what emerges automatically is an understanding of the type of school culture that best lends itself to providing the framework for a quality education. The ISLLC Standards, particularly Standard 2, underscore the need for school administrators to create, foster, and sustain positive cultures. It can be argued that this responsibility outweighs, overrides, and encompasses all others.

**Applying Instructional and Curricular Leadership to ISLLC Standard 2**

Chapters 3 and 4 examined what school administrators must do to be true instructional leaders within their schools. This included the need to understand the curriculum and its goals, but it also included the need to understand as much as possible about the people who comprise various school stakeholder groups. As evidenced by ISLLC Standard 2, it is imperative that school adminis-
trators understand how their staff members and students are motivated. School administrators must ensure, not only that they have knowledge of the school’s instructional program, but also that they understand how people’s needs fit in with the culture of the school. To ensure student success, school administrators must become a part of their school’s culture, showing concern for the people who make up the culture while keeping focus on the instructional needs of students. This is an essential message of this chapter.

It is prudent to pause here and to reexamine the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 2. These should be read in light of the theories, concepts, and practical applications that are presented in Chapters 3 and 4 and in this chapter. Although there are clearly linkages between the content of these three chapters and the other five ISLLC Standards, much of what was discussed throughout Chapters 3 and 4 and this chapter has its roots in ISLLC Standard 2.

**Standard 2**

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

**Knowledge**

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
- student growth and development
- applied learning theories
- applied motivational theories
- curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement
- principles of effective instruction
- measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies
- diversity and its meaning for educational programs
- adult learning and professional development models
- the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals
- the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth
- school cultures

**Dispositions**

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
- student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling
- the proposition that all students can learn
- the variety of ways in which students can learn
- lifelong learning for self and others
- professional development as an integral part of school improvement
the benefits that diversity brings to the school community
a safe and supportive learning environment
preparing students to be contributing members of society

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
- all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect
- professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals
- students and staff feel valued and important
- the responsibilities and contributions of each individual are acknowledged
- barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed
- diversity is considered in developing learning experiences
- lifelong learning is encouraged and modeled
- there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance
- technologies are used in teaching and learning
- student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated
- multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students
- the school is organized and aligned for success
- curricular, cocurricular, and extracurricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined
- curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies
- the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis
- a variety of sources of information is used to make decisions
- student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques
- multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students
- a variety of supervisory and evaluation models is employed
- pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families

Summary

Not only does ISLLC Standard 2 deal directly with the concept of school culture, but other bodies of literature are also increasingly recognizing that school culture is the pervasive element that explains the success or failure of school improvement efforts. For this reason, school administrators must understand how their daily behaviors directly impact and influence the kind of culture descriptive of their school.
Point

Virtually everything that happens in a school has its roots in the school’s culture. If school administrators focused their efforts on fostering, creating, and sustaining positive school cultures, then everything else would fall into place. School administrators currently work in a high-stakes, accountability-driven environment in which their success is typically tied directly to the achievement of students. Focusing on instructional improvements exclusively is short-sighted. To be truly successful, administrators should focus on improving their school’s culture with an understanding that improved student achievement will eventually follow. Although improvements may happen more slowly, if school administrators ensure that student improvements grow out of the school’s culture, then the improvements will be longer lasting and more easily sustainable.

Counterpoint

There is no doubt that measurements of a school’s success have their roots in the school’s culture. Successful school administrators need to focus on making their school’s culture as positive as possible, but they cannot focus on the culture exclusively. The high-stakes environment that currently characterizes our educational environment demands that improvements in student achievement occur immediately. A school’s culture takes anywhere from three to five years to change. The stakes are too high and the timeline is too short to wait for a cultural shift that supports improved student achievement. To be successful, administrators need to be aware of their school’s culture, but they need to focus on some short-sighted plans to create a more rapid improvement in student achievement.

Questions

♦ If a school leader works extra hard, can he/she improve the culture of a school more rapidly than the three to five years research says it takes?
♦ Is it possible to balance improvements in school culture with more rapid improvements in climate and student achievement? If so, how?

In the ten leadership behaviors described, one can easily see relationships to some of the administrative theories and leadership concepts presented throughout the first five chapters of this textbook. In some ways the leadership behav-
iors known to positively influence the culture of a school are behavioral interpretations of what theory has already proven. As the Iowa Studies indicated the preference employees have for democratic leaders, and as the Ohio State Studies illustrated the importance of leaders exhibiting both consideration for people and concern for production, so the ten leadership behaviors from this chapter demonstrate the importance of school administrators as having strong “people” characteristics and strong “organizational” characteristics.

The Organizational Culture Assessment Inventory further assists in creating phenotypes to identify varying school cultures. These phenotypes provide descriptive language for viewing school culture that easily can be understood by educators.

The works of Deming and Ouchi, even though not conducted specifically for educational institutions, provide great insight into elements of organizational effectiveness that are easily applied to school administration. Deming’s work in particular, with origins in Japanese management techniques, identifies the need for school cultures to be efficient as well as effective. His work extols Japanese practices that focus on quality, while indirectly condemning management practices that do not lead to consistency and improvements in quality. As ISLLC Standard 2 states that “a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth,” it becomes obvious that Deming’s work has great applicability. This fact helps explain why many schools, such as Mt. Edgecumbe High School in Sitka, Alaska, have adapted Deming’s fourteen points to their work and made these points lasting pieces of their school culture.

**Chapter Highlights**

♦ School culture is the collective values, beliefs, mores, and behaviors governing the actions taken by people associated with a school. It is not so much what people do, but why they do it. A school’s culture forms the foundation for the programs and practices of the school.

♦ The Organizational Culture Assessment Inventory (OCAI) is based on six interlocking dimensions that defined the culture of a school: the history of the school; the values and beliefs of the school; myths and stories that explain the school; the cultural norms of the school; traditions, rituals, and ceremonies characteristic of the school; and the heroes and heroines of the school.

♦ Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman studied America’s best run companies and found that positive cultures were closely tied to the companies’ success. The elements of culture that Peters and Waterman discovered and identified in their bestselling book, In Search of Excellence, can easily be applied to the cultures of schools as well.
The works of W. Edwards Deming and the practice he called Total Quality Management (TQM) has been applied well to the understanding of the types of cultures our schools need to remain effective and competitive.

ISLLC Standard 2 underscores the need for school administrators to create, foster, and sustain positive cultures. In many ways this responsibility outweighs, overrides, and encompasses all others, as it sets the foundation on which strong programs and practices can be built.

**Application Questions**

1. The differences and similarities between school climate and school culture are analogous to an iceberg in that climate is easy to perceive through the senses whereas culture has greater depth and forms the foundation on which climate rests. Create your own analogy to compare and contrast climate and culture. How does your analogy explain the independence and interdependence of these two variables?

2. Attempt to prioritize the ten leadership behaviors? Are there some that are more important than others in developing a positive school culture? Which of these behaviors will be the most natural for you to emulate?

3. Describe your school’s culture using one of the four OCAI phenotypes? Why do you describe it as you do? What can be done to sustain the culture you already have or to change the culture if that is warranted?

4. Critique Whitaker’s Friday Focus as a motivational tool. Specifically, acknowledge how Friday Focus could help to improve the culture of your school. Are there potential pitfalls to Friday Focus? If so, how can they be overcome?

**Field Activity**

This chapter dealt with how school administrators sustain a culture of growth in their schools. The information and theories of this chapter are underscored by the notion that school culture is deep and lasting. As such, uncovering the culture of a school can be difficult and time-consuming.

As a stakeholder in your school’s culture, spend some time analyzing the culture as perceived by different stakeholder groups. By examining the culture through different lenses you will be able to understand its many facets more easily. Write a summary of your analysis and discuss it with your school’s principal. Compare his or her perceptions with those that you discovered during your analyses.
The first step in this process should be for you to write down some of your own perceptions. Use culture classifications like the OCAI phenotypes to assist you. Then discuss your perceptions with other colleagues. Compare how the culture feels to them with your own insights.

Speak with some students about how they perceive the culture of the school. In this regard, try to stand in the shoes of some students and experience a school day as they might. Do the same thing with parents in mind. Pay attention to such details as the greeting parents receive when they come to school and their access to parking spaces and entryways. Think about how the community might view your school. What does your school look like from the street? What does it say on the marquee, if you have one?

Although this activity will not yield a thorough description of your school’s culture, it will encourage you to feel the culture and see it through other eyes. Discussing your perceptions with the principal will enrich the understanding that both of you have about the school’s culture as it is experienced by all stakeholder groups. The final question you should ask yourself is, “Are we sustaining a culture of growth in our school?”

**Have You Thought About It?**

Principal Conway needs to see the iceberg analogy. He needs to know that outward behaviors often match inward beliefs, values, and feelings, but this is not always the case. Then Principal Conway needs to accept that there are no quick fixes for his school’s insipid culture. Changing the culture of Lincoln Heights Elementary School will require Principal Conway to accept that it all starts with him. He needs to model what he believes the new culture should be about. He needs to provide strong support for those teachers, students, and parents who buy-in. Principal Conway must remain positive, and he must be a steward of the culture.

What do you think?
Standard Three

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

Chapters 6 and 7 examine the important role of the principal in managing the school environment, including the facilities, programs, employees, and stakeholders. The chapters illustrate the valuable role that school administrators play as managers, while keeping the leadership domains of administration ever in focus.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 3 highlights the need for school administrators to ensure a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. This is accomplished, Standard 3 suggests, through the management responsibilities of the school administrator. The debate this opens involves the differentiation between leadership skills, as explained throughout the chapters dealing with ISLLC Standards 1 and 2 and the management tasks as explained in Chapters 6 and 7. Although ISLLC Standard 3 clearly mentions management responsibilities, Chapters 6 and 7 help to demonstrate that an effective school administrator acts as both manager and leader when he/she ensures a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. Whether the task at hand is focused more on safety and facility management or more on human resources, a school administrator must strike the balance between leadership and management in order to be successful.

Furthermore, the administrative tasks alluded to in ISLLC Standard 3 require the school administrator to be aware of emerging trends in education. Chapter 6 explores ways in which administrators accomplish this. Also, there is a need expressed through Standard 3 for the administrator to understand principles of conflict resolution. In Chapter 7, within the context of personnel issues, this need is given attention. Further attention is given to conflict resolution strategies during the presentation of material associated with ISLLC Standard 4, as that
standard focuses even more on community interactions. Look at the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of ISLLC Standard 3 depicted below. Think about these and revisit them as you read Chapters 6 and 7. By studying the concepts and theories presented in these two chapters in light of the chart below, ISLLC Standard 3 ought to become more concrete and tangible.

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

**Knowledge**
The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
- theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development
- operational procedures at the school and district level
- principles and issues relating to school safety and security
- human resources management and development
- principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management
- principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space
- legal issues impacting school operations
- current technologies that support management functions

**Dispositions**
The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
- making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching
- taking risks to improve schools
- trusting people and their judgments
- accepting responsibility
- high-quality standards, expectations, and performances
- involving stakeholders in management processes
- a safe environment

**Performances**
The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
- knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions
- operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning
Emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate.
Operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place.
Collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed.
The school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively.
Time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals.
Potential problems and opportunities are identified.
Problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner.
Financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of schools.
The school acts entrepreneurially to support continuous improvement.
Organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed.
Stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools.
Responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability.
Effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used.
Effective conflict resolution skills are used.
Effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used.
Effective communication skills are used.
A safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained.
Human resource functions support the attainment of school goals.
Confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained.

Chapter 6 begins by examining what management is in comparison with leadership. Recognizing the significance of the managerial roles of the school administrator is a key component. Then the chapter’s focus is on the skills required to successfully manage a learning organization. Furthermore, Chapter 6 provides readers with the opportunity to examine concepts of organizational structure. Understanding that the structure of an organization has a tremendous influence on the extent to which administrators manage and lead is a key component throughout the chapter.

Chapter 7 looks specifically at how school administrators create safe environments in which learning occurs. The particular management responsibilities required in managing the facility and in implementing a safety plan are highlights of this section. Also, Chapter 7 contains information about the school administrator’s role in human resources management. Part of the focus is on ensuring that procedures and practices relative to employment guidelines are always adhered to.
ISLLC Standard 3 states that “a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.” The Standard’s significance grows, in large part, from the myriad responsibilities it encompasses. As Chapters 6 and 7 illustrate, the success of the people and programs that make up the life of a school hinge on the abilities of the school administrator.
Balancing Management and Leadership

Think About It

At Mayberry High School, Principal Shandra Brown is highly regarded as the best principal ever by her faculty and school parents. The accolades stem from Ms. Brown’s propensity for involving as many people as possible in decisions. Mayberry High has thirty-two separate functioning committees, responding to such issues as character education, school fundraisers, and hospitality. Virtually nothing happens at Mayberry without the input of a committee, and the involvement makes teachers and parents alike feel as though their voices and opinions are important. Really, the only problem faced by the Mayberry High community is the steadily declining standardized test scores, a trend that has caught the superintendent’s attention.

On the other side of town, the faculty and school parents of Stockwell High School feel less involved. They often complain that Principal Harold Straub is never concerned with their opinions and that he bases all decisions solely on rules and policies. Worse, he rarely is willing to even listen to people’s questions without having them first filtered through one of
his three assistant principals. Student achievement is not really an issue at Stockwell, but the impersonality shown by Principal Straub is hurting morale and damaging the climate of Stockwell High School.

It is apparent that the styles of these two principals are quite different from one another. Some of the theories presented earlier in this book likely explain why. However, as you read this chapter, pay close attention to issues in the organizational structure that might be affecting morale, decisions, and even student achievement. Does one of these two principals have the correct approach, or do their school organizations have something to learn from each other?

School administration encompasses the many opportunities to lead a learning organization to greatness along with the opportunities to manage people and resources effectively and efficiently. It is a field whose myriad responsibilities encompass the realm of tasks that are often associated with business CEOs. As a result, much of the literature on business leadership and management is, at the very least, somewhat pertinent to the work of school administrators at all levels. Characterizing much of this literature is the debate over the balance between leading and managing. Further compounding this debate is the recognition that many theorists and writers define these two terms differently. While some see them as two sides of the same coin, there are others who sense greater differentiation between the tasks of a manager and those of a leader.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 3 refers to the school administrator as

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

Through the actual terminology of the standard and strengthened perhaps by our own inferences, it could be concluded that Standard 3 speaks to the management side of administration. While there is some logic in that assumption, it is important to recall that the first two ISLLC standards discussed in this book were oriented more toward the leadership side of administration. Upon close examination of the appropriate theories and concepts related to them, though, it became clear that ISLLC Standards 1 and 2 referred both to leadership and management. The same, as will be illustrated, can be said of ISLLC Standard 3.

Manager Versus Leader

As mentioned, the words leader and manager conjure up very different images in the minds of some administrators. At the risk of appearing to feed the frenzy of differentiation between these two terms, this section compares and contrasts them in a way that will illuminate their similarities alongside their differences. Warren Bennis, noted author of the bestselling Leaders and On Becoming a Leader, offered in his book, Managing People is Like Herding Cats (1999), the following thoughts about management and leadership:
The manager administers; the leader innovates.  
The manager is a copy; the leader is an original.  
The manager maintains; the leader develops.  
The manager relies on control; the leader inspires trust.  
The manager has a short-range view; the leader has a long-range perspective.  
The manager asks how and when; the leader asks what and why.  
The manager has his or her eye on the bottom line; the leader has his or her eye on the horizon.  
The manager accepts the status quo; the leader challenges it.  
The manager is the classic good soldier; the leader is his or her own person.  
The manager does things right; the leader does the right thing. (p. 63)

Upon initial examination, it may appear as though the leadership side of Bennis’ statements is the preferred, more glorious side. In fact, it may be this side that has inspired many readers to consider the pursuit of school administration as a livelihood. However, if one looks carefully at the management side of these statements, particularly with ISLLC Standard 3 in mind, one will clearly see that management is essential to the efficient operation of any school.

The manager maintains—School administrators need to provide opportunities for growth and development across all programs and for all school stakeholders. They also need to understand programs and stakeholders well enough to decide which programs and/or methods should be maintained. What a terrible thought it is to imagine a new principal in a successful school who feels that all aspects of the school must be changed, developed, or reconceptualized. Greater comfort is found in thinking of a school administrator who understands what should be changed and what should be maintained. In virtually every school there are aspects of the enterprise that function well and need only maintenance. As the cliché goes, “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

The manager has a short-range view—School administrators must be visionary, always having one eye on the future and anticipating and planning for changes and improvements. They also must have one eye on short-range issues and solutions in order to keep the school and all of its stakeholders functioning. As an illustration of this idea, consider student discipline. While it is certainly accurate to expect an effective administrator to think long-range in developing policies and procedures that will minimize discipline issues, it is also fair to expect that an administrator can deal with short-range, or immediate, discipline situations. During the developmental phase of any plan, in fact, the school administrator must
possess the ability and wherewithal to deal with the short-range while creating the long-range.

♦ The manager is the classic good soldier—A school administrator must have the strength and the confidence to be his or her own person. In fact, one of the indicators of great leadership stems from the originality and courage of the leader. Having made this point, it is also true that school administrators are oftentimes called upon to be team players. The classic good soldier conjures up images of following directives and carrying out the will of the organization. While such a description taken to an extreme would likely not indicate inspirational leadership, there is clearly a place for such qualities in the personality of a school administrator. School districts have policies and are governed by a board. These policies or board directives must be adhered to just as policies and directives are adhered to by the classic good soldier.

The brief defense of the three management statements above could be done with either side of any of the ten statements. Thus it is important to realize that these statements were not designed necessarily to be evaluative. They were offered by Bennis in the context that many organizations are overmanaged and underled. This is certainly evident in our schools as well. However, we do not want to sacrifice good management at the altar of leadership. We need to use both management and leadership, and perhaps more importantly, we need to know which situations require which behaviors.

**Knowledge of Organizational Structure**

Perhaps even before using management and/or leadership skills, it is incumbent upon the school administrator to understand how he or she fits in with the organizational structure of the school or district. Whether the structure is strongly bureaucratic or heavily reliant on participatory management to a large extent determines how much management and how much leadership the school administrator should be expected to perform.

Before distinguishing between the two ends of a long continuum—bureaucracy and participatory management—let us examine some elements of organizational structure inherent to some degree in all models.

♦ Centralization—The extent to which centralization is part of an organizational structure is directly determined by the amount of power and decision-making authority retained by the administrators. In a school, if all decision-making power rests with the principal, then the organizational structure is said to be centralized. Conversely, if the principal delegates authority and responsibility for decision making to teachers and staff, then the structure is decentralized. In short, the extent to which authority is delegated to lower levels of
the organization determines where on the continuum between centralized and decentralized the organizational structure falls.

♦ *Span of Management*—Organizations vary in the depth and breadth of a manager’s responsibility. In some organizations, a large number of employees report to a single supervisor, whereas in others the number of subordinates reporting to one person is relatively small. Span of management refers to the number of subordinates reporting directly to a given supervisor. At higher levels of an organization, it is often thought that it is best to have fewer individuals reporting directly to one supervisor. At lower levels, where work tasks may be more routine, this is not as important.

♦ *Authority*—An individual who has the right to make decisions and to direct other people’s work is said to have authority. There are two distinct types of authority that we see in most organizations. Line authority is present when there is a direct link in the chain of command. When a superior has direct supervision responsibilities over a subordinate, then a line authority relationship is present. Staff authority, on the other hand, is advisory in nature. A person with staff authority over a subordinate seeks advice and counsel from that subordinate without directly telling the subordinate what to do. In most school districts there are elements of both line authority (assistant superintendent–principal) and staff authority (superintendent–assistant to the superintendent).

♦ *Chain of Command*—An organization’s chain of command refers to its defined flow of authority and responsibility from top to bottom. A clearly defined chain of command leaves no room for ambiguity. That is, it is crystal clear to all employees who reports to whom and under what conditions. When the chain of command is less-clearly defined, then subordinates may report to more than one supervisor. Unity of command, one aspect of chain of command, means that a subordinate receives direction from and is accountable to only one person.

♦ *Job Specialization*—Job specialization refers to the division of labor into distinct units based on specific job tasks. In schools, students are divided by grade level, classes are divided by subject matter, and there is great distinction between administrative tasks and teaching responsibilities. In examining the licensure requirements in various states, the notion of job specialization becomes even more apparent. That separate licenses are required for so many different professional education jobs indicates that these jobs are highly specialized and require different skills and competencies from other jobs.
It should be noted that each of these elements can be plotted on a continuum. In other words, virtually all organizations exhibit characteristics of centralization, span of management, authority, chain of command, and job specialization. The extent to which each organizational concept is present determines, to a large extent, how much leadership and/or management can be exercised by the administrators.

**Bureaucracy**

German sociologist Max Weber is considered the father of bureaucracy, having developed the concept after an extensive study of organizations that existed at the dawn of the twentieth century. Since then a negative connotation of bureaucracy has ruled, with people crediting bureaucrats with the development of meaningless paperwork, inflexible rules, and miles of red tape. Calling somebody a bureaucrat today is considered insulting, although in Weber’s time it was a term of admiration, as a bureaucratic structure was the answer to an organization considered to be largely irrational.

According to Weber, there are five characteristics of an ideal bureaucracy:

1. *Division of Labor*—Everybody in the organization has a job to do and the authority to do it.
2. *Impersonality*—Treat people as objects so as to avoid favoritism or prejudice. This ensures objectivity.
3. *Rules*—There is a rule or policy for virtually everything so as to ensure uniformity.
4. *Competence*—All employment decisions are based on employee performance.
5. *Hierarchy of Authority*—There is a clearly defined chain of command from top to bottom.

These characteristics are present in many organizations today. Most large businesses, universities, healthcare corporations, and the U.S. military operate under a bureaucratic system. However, it also must be acknowledged that there are degrees to which the aforementioned organizations adhere to these bureaucratic characteristics. This leads to an important caveat in determining whether or not bureaucracies are effective and useful models for schools to follow.

In the minds of many people and reflected in much of the literature about organizational structure are misconceptions regarding bureaucracy as a viable organizational structure. Most people, as alluded to earlier, see “bureaucracy” and “bureaucrat” as dirty words. Perhaps if the characteristics were played out in organizations to the extent envisioned by Weber, such accounts would be accurate. The truth is that even though there are few pure bureaucracies as envisioned by Weber, there are elements of bureaucracy to some degree in the structure of almost every organization. The question is not so much if an organization is a
bureaucracy. Instead the question is, “To what extent are bureaucratic elements present in the organizational structure?”

Although these elements are present in most organizations, there are reasons why a bureaucracy in its purest form would be troubling to many people. First, if a system of rules is too rigid and there is a rule or policy in place for everything, then inertia can result. Rules, played out to such extremes, can become ends in themselves instead of means to ends.

Second, consider what we learned from Herzberg regarding the motivating factor of challenging work. If a system relied so heavily on dividing labor, then work would be less challenging and far more specialized. In such instances, the lack of challenge could have a negative impact on employee motivation.

Third, if the hierarchy of authority is too clear and too deep, then communication can suffer. Organizations that are characterized by excessive steps in the chain of command make it very inefficient for information to travel from a lower level to a higher level.

Fourth, there is great criticism of organizations that are too impersonal. In fact, much contemporary literature focuses on the call for organizations to be more friendly to people and their needs. The rigid impersonality in a bureaucracy opens it up to a great deal of criticism.

Finally, the elements of a bureaucracy, taken to extremes, contradict much of what the ISLLC Standards identify as good leadership. If one reflects only on the three standards discussed thus far, one can see great emphasis on human relations and on increasing communication and involvement of stakeholders. The next three standards refer to such communication and human relations skills to an even greater extent. The climate in which school administrators are now called upon to lead, simply requires a set of skills and behaviors not allowed for under a strictly bureaucratic model.

**Participatory Management**

At the other end of a long continuum sits an organizational model that is participatory in nature. Such a model is void of the impersonality and rigidity that characterizes a pure bureaucracy. Participatory Management grew out of the notion that an organization that satisfies employees’ personal needs will be characterized by improved worker performance. The focus in a participatory management environment, therefore, is on job satisfaction, employee morale, and structuring the work environment to enhance the personal fulfillment of workers.

An organization that relies on participatory management to an extreme extent involves stakeholders in the formation of all rules, contains no obvious chain of command, is flexible, and is concerned with people and their needs before being concerned with the needs of an efficient organization. It is the very antithesis of a pure bureaucracy and so is placed on the opposite end of the continuum that is organizational structure.
In actuality, it is highly unlikely that any organization would be so participatory, just as it is highly unlikely that an organization would be purely bureaucratic. The fact is that most organizations fall somewhere along the continuum between bureaucracy and participatory management. Where the organizational structure is along this continuum determines, in large part, how the administrator will view the management/leadership debate that was introduced at the beginning of this chapter.

Schools, in fact, are considered to be examples of participatory environments much more than they are viewed as bureaucracies. However, upon closer examination, many bureaucratic elements are alive and well in schools all across America. Consider school board policy manuals as illustrations of this point. In some school districts, these policy manuals are contained in multiple volumes. Such volumes are evidence of the many rules and regulations inherent in schools as organizations. On the other hand, these rules, regulations, and policies are regularly revisited and opened for examination by stakeholders from all different perspectives. Because of this stakeholder involvement in setting and revising policies, schools also have a side that is well grounded in participatory management. Again, schools as organizations must be viewed as being somewhere along the continuum of purely bureaucratic or purely participatory.

The Immaturity–Maturity Continuum

Chris Argyris, a behavioral scientist, thought that the impersonal, rigid structure of a bureaucracy prevented people from realizing their full potential. This conflict between organizational needs and personal needs stems from the incompatibility between individuals’ innate desires to grow and develop their maturing personalities and the repressive qualities inherent in formal organizations.

Essentially, Argyris believes that all people progress from a very immature, dependent personality to a mature, independent one. This is somewhat congruous with Maslow’s Need Hierarchy. According to Argyris (1993), many organizations prevent their employees from reaching these desired states of a mature, independent personality through their overreliance on rules, procedures, and immature management principles. In other words, an individual’s innate desire to become mature and independent is squelched by management principles which seek to keep employees in a dependent state.

Argyris views the maturational process in stages that transform immature infants into mature adults. As individuals mature, they have increasing needs to be more active, desires to move from subordinate positions to superordinate ones, needs to develop many new and different ways for behaving, and deeper interests than they did when they were in a more immature state. The work organization, and this is true in many schools, prevents this natural growth by keeping people in a more narrowly focused, subordinate state.
Reflecting back on Deming’s fourteen points, discussed in Chapter 5, it is apparent that the leadership skills that are congruent with creating positive, productive cultures are also congruent with assisting in the developing, mature personality referred to by Argyris. The inherent conflict between organizational goals and individual development illustrated through the immaturity–maturity continuum is avoided when management principles are balanced with people-centered leadership skills.

**Schools as Social Systems**

Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba (1957) have been influential for half a century in assisting administrators’ understanding of their work within the framework of a social system. The term social system is descriptive of any organization in which group members interact and participate for a common purpose. As such, schools can clearly be classified as social systems.

According to the Getzels-Guba model, there are two distinct dimensions of a social system. On the one hand, we have the nomothetic dimension, which encompasses the needs and goals of the institution, or the normative dimension. On the other hand, we have the idiographic dimension, which encompasses the personalities and individual needs of people in the organization, or the personal dimension. The observed behavior of individuals within the organization can be understood by the model depicted in Figure 6.2 (page 124).

The model depicted in Figure 6.2 illustrates that the observed behavior in a social system is a function of the institution, the roles, and the expectations; and the individual, the individual’s personality, and the individual’s need-dispositions. More simply put, the behaviors that we can observe when studying a social system are a function of the interactions between what the organization requires and what the individual brings to the relationship.

---

**Figure 6.1 Maturity-Maturity Continuum**

**Characteristics of People**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immaturity</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>Relative independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behave in a few ways</td>
<td>Behave in many ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erratic, shallow interests</td>
<td>Deeper interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short time perspective</td>
<td>Long time perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate position</td>
<td>Equal or superior position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness of self</td>
<td>Awareness and self-control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Figure 6.2 Getzels-Guba Model of Behavior in Social Systems

needs (institution, role, role expectations) and what the individual needs (individual, personality, need-dispositions). In some organizations, the nomothetic dimension is given greater weight, whereas in other organizations, the idiographic dimension is stressed. Consider the military as a social system in which emphasis is given to the nomothetic dimension. That is to say that the role one assumes in the military influences the individual’s behavior far more than does the individual’s personality. Conversely, a fashion designer’s behavior is probably determined more by the individual’s personality than by the individual’s role. This is an example in which greater emphasis is given to the idiographic dimension.

Shortly after developing this model, Getzels worked with Herbert Thelen to describe the school classroom as a unique social system (Getzels & Thelen, 1960). This was done in recognition of the fact that an individual’s role within a social system and the individual’s personality did not explain all of the observed behavior in classrooms. Instead, classrooms have cultural factors that mediate the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. The relationships that form in classrooms, combined with the developmental needs of the students present, create an environment that is too complex to describe through an analysis of nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. This notion provides a reminder of the im-
portance of a positive school and classroom culture, as the cultural elements of a classroom are at the root of what Getzels and Thelen were referring to.

**Awareness of Best Practices**

In fulfilling the goals of ISLLC Standard 3, school administrators are compelled to avail themselves of the latest research and literature on what constitutes best practices within our schools. This can be accomplished through dialogue with other effective school administrators, participation in staff development, and reading research reports and anecdotal stories of administrators’ successes. Being part of a professional organization for school administrators, reading their publications, and attending their conferences and development opportunities can also be an important first step in the ongoing development of school administrators who seek awareness of best practices.

There are many organizations at the state, national, and international level that are dedicated to improving schools and providing educators with the best opportunities to stay abreast of current research and thinking about the best school practices for maximizing the achievement of all students. Below are brief statements of the missions and/or beliefs of three of the most prominent organizations for administrators. Their inclusion here is not an endorsement of their work over the work of any other organization.

**The American Association of School Administrators Belief Statements**

- **Public Education**
  Public education is the foundation of American democracy and is the primary vehicle for preparing each generation of adult citizens to become contributing members of a democratic society.

- **Diversity**
  School leaders have a responsibility to create school cultures that recognize and value diversity.

- **Conditions Under Which Children Learn**
  Environments conducive to learning require that all variables that influence a student’s ability to succeed should be addressed.

- **Student Achievement**
  All public schools must provide a quality education for each student, which requires meeting high standards.

- **Accountability**
  A system of accountability which clearly demonstrates the level of progress attained by schools or school districts is essential to fulfilling our mission of increasing student achievement.
Leadership
The leadership provided by superintendents is critical to the success of the public school systems.

Partnerships and Linkage
Building partnerships among the many stakeholders contributes to the education and well being of our children and therefore is the responsibility of the entire community.

Governance
Boards of education and superintendents are the governing team responsible for building and maintaining a strong partnership focused on continuously increasing achievement for all students.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals

The mission of the National Association of Elementary School Principals is to lead in the advocacy and support for elementary and middle-level principals and other education leaders in their commitment to all children.

In carrying out that mission, we are mindful of two particularly striking findings of research: First, that children’s early years in school are the most crucial to their future, not only in the classroom but indeed, in life. And second, that the key figure in assuring a top-quality school is the principal.

We accept the profound challenges inherent in those findings, and we emphasize that the school’s first and foremost concern must be the progress and welfare of its students. Each of them must be helped to achieve their full potential.

We recognize an obligation to make continuing contributions toward strengthening the principalship and the profession—through cooperation with the institutions that prepare school administrators; through counsel and constructive relationships with governmental bodies at all levels; and through a wide range of NAESP training programs, publications, conferences, and professional meetings aimed at helping aspiring principals reach their goal and practicing principals hone their skills.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals believes that the child is the focal point of the educational program and that education in our society must assist each child to realize his or her potential as a functioning and contributing member of that society. The Association believes that each child should have an equal opportunity to attain self-realization.
NAESP further believes that the elementary and middle-level school is the foundation of all educational efforts on behalf of the child, and that the primary responsibility for the development of an effective program in each elementary and middle-level school is vested in the principal.

Therefore, the National Association of Elementary School Principals dedicates itself to achieving the recognition of the principal as the authority in the supervision and administration of the elementary and middle-level school.

**The National Association of Secondary School Principals**

The mission of NASSP is to promote excellence in school leadership. Through our award winning publications, professional development opportunities, ready access to relevant research, and persistence in advocating on behalf of school leaders, we help to advance middle level and high school education by:

- Promoting high professional standards
- Focusing attention on school leaders’ challenges
- Providing a “national voice” for school leaders
- Building public confidence in education
- Strengthening the role of the principal as instructional leader
- Publicizing the issues and interests of our members in the news media.

**School Administrators as Role Models**

In Chapter 5, the leadership behaviors associated with creating, fostering, and sustaining a positive school culture were explained. Among those was the notion of school administrators as role models. In research conducted and replicated in various settings and under various situations (Marks, 2002; Fiore, 1999; Whitaker, 1997), it was clear that the school principal was seen by many as a role model. Furthermore, these studies indicated that the most effective principals appreciate being seen in this way and work hard to ensure that they are modeling appropriate behaviors for all stakeholders.

Inherent in any discussion about school administrators’ management responsibilities is mention of the administrators’ responsibility to model effective communication and conflict resolution skills. As Chapter 7 illustrates, the school administrator is responsible for ensuring a safe, orderly, and productive learning environment. With increased attention focused on security in every facet of American life, the responsibility to make students safe and secure at school is paramount. There are implications here for facility design and upkeep and for
policies that try to prevent disruptions to the learning environment and resolve them if they do occur.

Ensuring management of a safe and secure learning environment is more than just policies and procedures like those discussed in Chapter 7. For the purposes of this section, it is important to recall that a principal’s visibility, as illustrated in Chapter 5, gives students and staff a sense of security. When that visibility is combined with strong, confident communication and a pleasant demeanor, it is even more calming and soothing to stakeholders. Figure 6.3 provides contrasting examples of the value of demeanor in communication.

**Figure 6.3 The Value of Demeanor**

- *The Calming Effect of a Pleasant Demeanor*—Imagine an irate parent appearing unexpectedly at the principal’s office loudly protesting a decision that had been made to expel his child from school. This parent is yelling loudly and using language that borders on being threatening. The school administrator correctly chooses not to raise her voice, but instead speaks soothingly, yet confidently about the situation. While maintaining eye contact and showing concern for the parent’s feelings, the administrator encourages him to sit down and repeats the message about why expulsion was warranted in a calm, soothing voice. Although not guaranteed, there is a good chance that this administrator’s communication style will lead to decreased anger from the parent, as it is difficult to stay angry or to threaten somebody who is showing concern and compassion.

- *Inflammation Caused by an Unpleasant Demeanor*—Imagine this same irate parent appearing unexpectedly at the principal’s office loudly protesting the decision that had been made to expel his child from school. Like before, the parent is yelling loudly and using language that borders on being threatening. The school administrator, not wanting to appear intimidated, chooses to raise her voice back at the parent in an attempt to match his volume and demeanor. While staring the angry parent in the eye, the administrator loudly tells him to sit down and repeats the message about why expulsion was warranted in a strong, confident voice. Again, although not guaranteed, there is a good chance that this administrator’s communication style will lead to increased anger from the parent, as telling an angry person what to do or trying to match the person’s anger is rarely an effective technique.

School administrators are well served to understand how important their communication skills, both verbal and nonverbal, are to observers’ feelings that the environment is safe and secure. Developing and enhancing conflict resolution skills can assist administrators in maintaining a more even temper and calming potentially volatile situations. Although great attention is paid to communication skills in the context of ISLLC Standards 4 and 5, it is wise to begin recognizing the power conflict resolution skills have as part of an administra-
tor’s communications repertoire. Several resources are available that can assist administrators in this regard, but rather than list them, it is more relevant to recognize that books, articles, conferences, and administrator organizations, like those previously mentioned, are excellent resources for amassing this knowledge.

Summary

ISLLC Standard 3 explains about knowledge, dispositions, and performances that can assist school administrators in understanding their management responsibilities within their schools. Additionally, this standard provides administrators with the knowledge necessary to balance the requirements of leadership with those of management. Whether one sees these terms as separate entities or as two sides of the same coin, it is clear that all six ISLLC Standards describe school administrators who can manage as well as lead.

In preparing to manage a school, an administrator ought to understand the organizational structure of that school. This chapter described two distinct ways of structuring organizations, as a bureaucracy or through a high level of participatory management. Instead of perpetuating the popular cultural myth that bureaucracy is necessarily bad, we should note that elements of a bureaucratic organization have proven helpful in maintaining a sense of order in schools. In fact, there are many examples of bureaucracy in schools that were presented in this chapter.

In reality, all school’s organizations can be placed somewhere along the continuum between pure bureaucracy and pure participatory management. The structure of a bureaucracy, in conjunction with the high morale and sense of ownership characteristic of an organization with high employee participation, creates an organizational structure typical of most American schools today. The important factor in the success of any organization, however it is structured, is that the administrator understands the structure and manages it appropriately and in a manner consistent with its expectations.

In considering schools as social systems, it is important to recall the conflict that can sometimes arise between the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions of the work environment. Getzels and Guba developed a clear model for illustrating that the behavior observed within a social system is the result of the interaction between these two dimensions. This relates well to the work that Chris Argyris completed, as he advanced the notion that individuals seek an avenue for their emerging maturity at work, while the management structure of the workplace often resists and fosters immaturity. Through all of this work, it is clear that school administrators must pay careful attention to how the needs of their school organization work in concert or conflict with the needs of the individuals who work there.

As ISLLC Standard 3 illuminates the need for school administrators to stay abreast of current thinking and knowledgeable of best practices for contemporary schools, it behooves all administrators to become part of organizations that
Professional meetings, staff development opportunities, and relevant reading can all assist administrators in understanding emerging trends in education. Finally, it is imperative that school leaders exhibit strong communication and conflict resolutions skills so as to create feelings of safety and security among school stakeholders. By staying mindful of the ten behaviors for enhancing a positive school culture explained in Chapter 5, school administrators can position themselves to create atmospheres supportive of safety and order. This, in turn, will invariably lead to the creation of a well-managed school.

Point

Schools and school systems are perfect examples of bureaucracies. In schools, there typically is a very clear chain of command. The principal takes direction from an administrator in the central office. The teachers take direction from the principal. The students take direction from the teachers. Schools are also bureaucratic in how they organize and specialize. Grade levels and/or subject areas divide the academic units, and students are placed in the unit deemed appropriate for them by school officials. To say that education is not a bureaucratic industry is quite misleading.

Counterpoint

There is far more participatory governance in schools than in most other organizations. Most schools have parent–teacher associations in which decisions are made by stakeholders from various perspectives. Teachers typically work in teams, and there is rarely only one teacher in charge of a student’s learning. School leaders are trained in a far more participatory management paradigm than they ever used to be. Calling education a bureaucratic industry is quite misleading.

Questions

♦ To what extent is your school and/or district a bureaucracy? How many examples of bureaucratic structure can you find in your school/district?
♦ Should schools be structured in more of a participatory manner than presently is the case? How much participation is enough? How do you know?
Chapter Highlights

♦ School administration encompasses the many opportunities to lead a learning organization to greatness along with the opportunities to manage people and resources effectively and efficiently. ISLLC Standard 3 underscores that management is essential to the efficient operation of any school.

♦ It is incumbent upon all school administrators to understand how they fit in with the organizational structure of their school or district.

♦ Virtually all organizations exhibit characteristics of centralization, span of management, authority, chain of command, and job specialization. The extent to which each organizational concept is present determines, to a large extent, how much leadership and/or management can be exercised by the administrators.

♦ German sociologist Max Weber envisioned a bureaucratic structure as the answer to organizations that were considered to be largely irrational.

♦ At the opposite end of a long continuum sits an organizational model characterized by participatory management. The opposite of bureaucracy, this model relies on the involvement of people in setting rules and making decisions.

♦ Chris Argyris acknowledged that organizations are fraught with a conflict between the needs of people and the needs of the organization. As people strive toward maturity, Argyris posits that management structures strive to keep them in an immature state.

♦ Understanding schools as social systems helps us to recognize that the needs of individual people augmented with organizational needs result in the behaviors that we witness. Administrators must assist employees in balancing their personality with their roles within the organization. Professional organizations can be a great source for school administrators as they strive to stay current in their understanding of what constitutes the most effective school practices.

Application Questions

1. In your present position at work, how do you balance leadership responsibilities with management responsibilities? Are there examples in other parts of your life (i.e. family relationships, volunteer activity, civic duties) where you also strike a similar balance? Which role is more natural for you, management or leadership?

2. Consider the system of rules and regulations governing student behavior in your classroom or school? Is there evidence of bureau-
cracy’s influence in these rules? Would your classroom or school benefit from more of a bureaucratic structure, less of one, or is the balance about right in your estimation?

3. Respond to Argyris’s assertion that there is an inherent conflict between the individual and the organization. Do you see evidence of this conflict in your work environment? Are there some practices at your school that may have been designed to reduce this conflict?

**Field Activity**

Speak with as many administrators as you can about their involvement or lack of involvement in professional educational organizations. Try to get your hands on as many recent publications from these organizations as you possibly can. If the school administrators that you have access to are not members of professional organizations, then go to your local public or higher education library and look there for publications.

Upon scanning the contents of these publications, see if you can identify issues that have any ramifications for the work that is done in your school. Do you think administrators and other educators would benefit from the material that is presented in these articles?

Prepare a brief synopsis of two to three articles that you think are pertinent and place them in a scrapbook. Throughout your course of study in school administration, add to this scrapbook so that you will begin developing a good resource for your own career as a school administrator. If opportunities for sharing this scrapbook with other administrators present themselves, seize them as outstanding contributions to your overall development.

**Have You Thought About It?**

In thinking about Ms. Brown and Mr. Staub, it is apparent that both of these leaders have admirable qualities. Is it possible to combine their positive qualities and diminish their negative qualities? The answer is “yes” if we think of management and leadership as existing on a continuum. Every effective school administrator is both a skilled manager and an inspiring leader. Also, every effective school administrator is a bureaucrat to some degree. The key lies in understanding to what degree bureaucracy is helpful to an organization.

What do you think?
Managing Human Resources for a Safe, Effective Environment

Think About It

Dr. Cynthia Marshall, superintendent of Carytown Schools, believes that hiring teachers is the most important duty of an effective principal. Dr. Marshall has long believed that if principals hire and retain high-quality teachers, a school can practically run itself. Failure to perform as well in hiring can result in too much work for the principal and a lower level of performance among students. This is why she feels that it is so important to sit down and talk with new principal Seymour Merkman. There are several faculty openings at Crenshaw Elementary, and Dr. Marshall wants to ensure that the best hiring decisions are made by Mr. Merkman.

Dr. Marshall begins her conversation with Mr. Merkman by describing the elements of effective teaching. She bases this discussion on the most recent research she can find. From there, she proceeds to tell Mr. Merkman that there are ways to see if prospective teachers understand those elements. Furthermore, she explains, hiring decisions must be based on more than just an interview with the principal. Candidates for
teaching positions should talk with other respected teachers, and their backgrounds and references should be thoroughly examined. Finally, Dr. Marshall states that all efforts should be made to keep our best teachers happy in their work environment, even if it means that our worst teachers may resent the necessary actions.

This chapter is devoted to the roles of school administrators in hiring teachers and focusing on their continuous growth and development. As you read through the chapter, consider the beliefs of Dr. Marshall. Think about how congruent her beliefs and her conversation with Mr. Merkman are with what research and best practices say about hiring and retaining quality teachers.

Whereas Chapter 6 focused on the behaviors of school administrators that distinguish themselves as management oriented or leadership oriented, this chapter examines the administrator’s role in managing resources. The result, therefore, is an examination of the school administrator’s ability to mobilize others so that student learning can be maximized. Taken with Chapter 6, it is apparent that school administrators must exhibit both leadership and management behaviors themselves, while also making choices that will lead others to create the kinds of learning environments our students deserve and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards demand.

An obvious place to begin this examination is by looking at school administrators’ roles in human resource functions. It is in the human resource capacity that school administrators have the greatest influence over the behaviors of other school professionals. School administrators with superior skills in this regard often wind up with the most dedicated school staffs and have the fewest problems with teacher attrition. Although other factors also affect the retention/attrition of teachers, some of which will be identified later in this chapter, the ability to manage human resources is certainly a key component.

School Administrators as Human Resource Managers

Managing the human resources of a school entails a multitude of roles and responsibilities, far more than this chapter can address. However, this section does address some of the major responsibilities that school administrators have in the area of human resources. Specific attention is paid to those roles alluded to by the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 3.

Recruiting Quality Teachers

If our careers have thus far been spent in high-quality, high-performing schools, it is easy to forget that recruitment is a very important part of compiling a staff that will ensure student success. If, however, we have had experiences working in school districts with lower-than-average salaries or adverse working conditions, then the concept of recruitment is not a foreign one. Although many
school districts, particularly larger ones, have central office administrators and staff who are responsible for recruitment, school administrators at the building level should recognize their important role in this process. School administrators must possess two significant skills in order to be great recruiters. First, they must understand what effective teaching is. Second, they must be adept communicators who consistently inform the external public that their school is a place where effective teachers want to work. As a high percentage of those teachers recruited for our schools are beginners, let us examine some principles of effective beginning teachers of which school administrators should be aware.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), developers of the ISLLC Standards, also created a list of model standards for beginning teachers. As was the case with ISLLC, the beginning teacher standards were developed by a broad base of constituents with expert knowledge in the field. The result of this development was the formation of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), representing experts in the teaching profession along with personnel from seventeen state education agencies. This group worked at developing standards to be compatible with the advanced certification standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching. While the standards are accompanied by indicators of knowledge, dispositions, and performances, just as the ISLLC Standards are, Figure 7.1 shows only the wording of the actual standards themselves.

**Figure 7.1 INTASC Principles for Beginning Teachers**

- **Principle #1:** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
- **Principle #2:** The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.
- **Principle #3:** The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.
- **Principle #4:** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students’ development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.
- **Principle #5:** The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
- **Principle #6:** The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
- **Principle #7:** The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.
Principle #8: The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Principle #9: The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Principle #10: The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students’ learning and well-being.

Although understanding these principles is prerequisite to a school administrator’s abilities at recognizing their presence, an important part of the recruitment process at the building level is to create the impression that the administrator’s school is the right place for quality teachers to work. Building such credibility is not a one-time task. It is not a role. Instead, building credibility is an attitude that must permeate all communications that school administrators have with their publics. Externally, the message from the school administrator must always be that the administrator’s particular school is an outstanding place to work. Equally important, the school administrator also must create such a belief within the internal community. A staff that believes their school is outstanding is often the best recruitment tool an administrator can have. Again, the ISLLC Standards form a framework for creating these feelings among staff members. Adhering to the Standards and possessing the knowledge, skills, and performance of ISLLC will lead school administrators to creating, fostering, and sustaining such feelings among constituents.

Hiring Quality Teachers

Although the ability to excel in recruiting quality teachers is important, this ability can be undermined by the lack of ability in hiring the best possible people to fill vacant positions. Factors such as the age of the teaching force and retention rates within the school district will impact the extent to which school administrators are positioned to make hiring decisions, but these decisions remain among the most important ones administrators are involved in. As a result, school administrators should be knowledgeable of interviewing techniques, and they should also possess strong skills in decision making. These skills are explored in greater detail in Chapter 9.

It is imperative that school administrators be well versed in legal issues that can arise when interviewing candidates for vacant positions. Although specific laws vary somewhat from state to state, there are certain issues that cannot be raised and particular questions that cannot be asked without potentially violating the rights of the candidate being interviewed. ELT-Specialists in Ethics and Legal Compliance Training (http://www.elt-inc.com/) offer the following guidelines for conducting legal interviews:
Address/Residence

You May Ask
♦ “Can you be reached at this address? If not, would you care to leave another?”
♦ “Can you be reached at these telephone numbers? If not, would you care to leave another?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ “Do you own your home or rent?”
♦ “Do you live with your spouse?”
♦ “With whom do you live?”

Age

You May Ask
♦ Only questions that verify nonminor status; e.g., “Are you over 18?” “If hired can you show proof of age?” “If under 18, can you after employment, submit a work permit?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ How old are you?”
♦ “What is your date of birth?”
♦ “What is your age?”
♦ “When were you born?”
♦ Dates of attendance or completion of elementary or high school.
♦ Any questions which imply a preference for persons under forty years of age.

AIDS/HIV

You May Ask
♦ “Are you able to perform the essential functions of the job applied for?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ Any questions to inquire whether an applicant (or current employee) has AIDS/HIV.
Arrests and Convictions
(see also Court Records below)

You May Ask
♦ Employers may ask applicants about arrests, but must include inquiries concerning whether charges are still pending, have been dismissed, or led to conviction of a crime involving behavior which would adversely affect job performance, and whether the arrest occurred within the last ten years. Law enforcement and certain state agencies, school districts, businesses and other organizations that have a direct responsibility of the supervision, care, or treatment of children, mentally ill or disabled persons, or other vulnerable adults, may have more latitude to ask questions regarding arrests. Employers should check state law with respect to any questions concerning arrest records. Generally, it is safer just to ask about criminal convictions.

You Should Not Ask
♦ Any questions about arrests that did not occur in the last ten years.

Citizenship/ Birthplace

You May Ask
♦ “Are you authorized to work in the United States?”
♦ “Can you, after employment, submit verification of your legal right to work in the United States?” (Or a statement that such proof may be required after employment.)
♦ But do not ask only foreign-looking or foreign-sounding applicants.

You Should Not Ask
♦ “Are you a United States citizen?”
♦ “Where were you born?”
♦ Or any questions regarding birthplace or citizenship status of applicant, applicant’s spouse, or other relatives.

Color or Race

You May Ask
♦ Statement that photograph may be required after employment.

You Should Not Ask
♦ Any questions concerning race or color of skin, eyes, hair, etc.
♦ Should not require applicant to affix a photograph to application nor should applicant be given the option of attaching a photograph.
Court Records

You May Ask
- “Have you ever been convicted of any crime?” (In California, exclude marijuana violations more than 2 years old.)
- “Has a court, jury, or government agency ever made a finding you committed unlawful harassment or discrimination?”

You Should Not Ask
- “Have you ever had a bankruptcy?”
- “Have you ever sued or filed claims or complaints against your employer?”
- “Have you ever been a plaintiff in a lawsuit?”

Disability

You May Ask
- “Can you, with or without reasonable accommodation, perform the essential duties of the job(s) for which you are applying (see attached job description)?”
- “Are you currently able to perform the essential duties of the job(s) for which you are applying?”
- If the disability is obvious, or disclosed, you may ask about accommodations.

You Should Not Ask
- “Are you disabled?”
- An employer may not make any medical inquiry or conduct any medical examination prior to making a conditional offer of employment.
- “Have you ever filed for or received workers’ compensation?”
- What medical problems the applicant may have.
- The amount of sick time or medical leave taken at last job.

Drug Use

You May Ask
- Current use of illegal drugs.
- Recent use of illegal drugs.

You Should Not Ask
- Questions about past addictions.
- Use of lawful drugs.
- Frequency of alcohol use.
Education

You May Ask
♦ “Are you presently enrolled or do you intend to enroll in school?”
♦ “What subjects did you excel in at school?”
♦ “Did you participate in extracurricular activities?”
♦ “What did you select as your major?”
♦ “Did you work an outside job while attending school? Doing what? What did you like/dislike about your part-time job during school?”
♦ “Did your education prepare you for the job you are seeking with us? In what ways?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ “Did you graduate from high school or college?” (unless the employer can demonstrate that successful performance on this job requires a specific level of education).
♦ “Who paid for your educational expenses while you were in school?”
♦ “Did you go to school on a scholarship?”
♦ “Do you still owe on student loans taken out during school?”

Experience, Skills, & Activities

You May Ask
♦ “Do you have any special skills or knowledge?”
♦ “Are your skills recent?”
♦ “When did you last use a calculator (or any other machine or skill)?”
♦ “Do you enjoy being active in community affairs?”
♦ “Are there any activities that have provided you with experience, training, or skills that you feel would be helpful to a position with us?”
♦ “How will your involvement in [activity] affect your work here?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ “Does your physical condition make you less skilled?”

Family

You May Ask
♦ “Do you have any commitments which would prevent you from working regular hours?”
♦ “Can you work overtime, if needed?”
“Are you now or do you expect to be engaged in any other business or employment? If 'yes,' what kind of business or employment is it? How much time does it require?”

You Should Not Ask

- “How many children do you have?”
- “Who takes care of your children while you are working?”
- “Do your children go to daycare?”
- “What does your husband think about your working outside the home?”
- “What does your husband (or wife) do?”
- “What is your husband’s (or wife’s) salary?”
- Name(s) of applicant’s spouse or children.

Marital Status

You May Ask

- “Please state the name(s) of any relatives already employed by this company or a competitor.”
- “Whom should we contact in case of an emergency?”

You Should Not Ask

- “Is it Mrs. or Miss?”
- “What is your maiden name?”
- Identity of applicant’s spouse.

Military Service

You May Ask

- “Have you served in the U.S. military?”
- “Did your military service and training provide you with skills you could put to use in this job?”
- “How did you feel about your stay in the Army (Navy, etc.)?”

You Should Not Ask

- “Have you served in the army of a foreign country?”
- “What type of discharge did you receive from the U.S. military service?”
- “Can you provide discharge papers?”
Name

You May Ask
♦ “Have you ever used another name?” or, “Is any additional information relative to change of name, use of an assumed name, or nickname necessary to enable a check on your work and educational record? If yes, please explain.”

You Should Not Ask
♦ “What is your maiden name?”

National Origin

You May Ask
To comply with the Federal Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, you can ask:
♦ “Are you prevented from being employed in the United States because of your visa or immigration status?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ “What is your national origin?”
♦ “Where were you born?”
♦ “What is the origin of your name?”
♦ “What is your native language?”
♦ “What country do your ancestors come from?”
♦ “Do you read, write, or speak Korean (or another foreign language, unless based on job requirements)?”
♦ How applicant acquired the ability to read, write, or speak a foreign language.
♦ Any other questions as to nationality, lineage, ancestry, national origin, descent, or parentage of applicant or applicant’s parents or spouse.

Notice in Case of Emergency

You May Ask
♦ Name and address of person to be notified in case of accident or emergency.

You Should Not Ask
♦ Name and address of relative to be notified in case of accident or emergency.
Organizations

You May Ask
♦ About any organization memberships, excluding any organization of which the name or character indicates the race, color, creed, sex, marital status, religion, national origin, or ancestry of its members.
♦ “Do you enjoy being active in community affairs?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ For a list of all organizations, clubs, societies, and lodges to which the applicant belongs.

Photographs

You May Ask
♦ For a photograph after hiring for identification purposes.

You Should Not Ask
♦ Any applicant to submit a photograph whether mandatory or optional before hiring.

Physical or Mental Condition, Disability

You May Ask
♦ Statement by employer that offer may be made contingent on applicant’s passing a job-related physical examination.

You Should Not Ask
♦ “Do you have any physical disabilities or handicaps?”
♦ Questions regarding applicant’s general medical condition, state of health, or illnesses.
♦ Questions regarding receipt of workers’ compensation.

Pregnancy

You May Ask
♦ “How long do you plan to stay on the job?”
♦ “Are you currently able to perform the essential duties of the job(s) for which you are applying?”

You Should Not Ask
♦ “Are you pregnant?”
♦ “When was your most recent pregnancy terminated?”
♦ “Do you plan to become pregnant?”
♦ Any questions about medical history concerning pregnancy and related matters.
Prior Employment

You May Ask

♦ “How did you overcome problems you faced there?”
♦ “Which problems frustrated you the most?”
♦ “Of the jobs indicated on your application, which did you enjoy the most, and why?”
♦ “What were your reasons for leaving your last job?”
♦ “Have you ever been discharged from any position? If so, for what reason?”
♦ “Can you meet the attendance requirements of the job?”

You Should Not Ask

♦ “How many sick days did you take at your old job?”
♦ “Did you file any claims against your former employer?”
♦ “Have you sustained any work-related injury?”

References

You May Ask

♦ “By whom were you referred for a position here?”
♦ Names of persons willing to provide professional and/or character references for applicant.

You Should Not Ask

♦ Questions put to applicant’s former employers or acquaintances that elicit information specifying the applicant’s race, color, religion, national origin, disability, age, or sex.

Religion or Creed

You May Ask

♦ Statement by employer of regular days, hours or shifts to be worked.
♦ “Are you available to work on weekends?” (if this is a legitimate question).

You Should Not Ask

♦ “What is your religion?”
♦ “What church do you go to?”
♦ “What are your religious holidays?”
♦ “Does your religion prevent you from working weekends or holidays?”
Sexual Orientation or Preference

You Should Not Ask
♦ “Are you a homosexual?”
♦ “What is your view regarding same-sex partner benefits.”

There are a variety of different interview prototypes that school administrators should be knowledgeable of. Although the specific interview protocol may be spelled out and required by the central office, school-building administrators may have options regarding which techniques they use to conduct interviews. Understanding the assets and liabilities of different techniques is, therefore, extremely helpful. Some of the techniques described below may allow for variance in the questions asked of individual applicants, but for the most part, what follows are structured or standardized interview techniques.

♦ The Screening Interview—Only in rare and extreme circumstances, such as during a time crunch or in the absence of a qualified candidate pool, are fewer than two interviews conducted for a teaching position. In some cases, there may even be three or more interviews required of the best, most seriously considered candidates. Typically, the first interview conducted is a screening interview. Screening interviews are conducted with the job application and the applicant’s resume or vita as guides. The purpose is to eliminate those candidates who do not meet the minimum job requirements, as evidenced by their application, resume, and/or vita. A structured set of questions is usually used for screening interviews.

♦ The Selection Interview—As the name implies, selection interviews are used to determine whether or not an applicant should actually be selected for a position. As such, selection interviews are longer and much more intense than screening interviews. Questions asked during selection interviews tend to probe more deeply than questions asked during screening interviews. Whereas the screening interview seeks to determine whether or not an applicant meets minimum job requirements, the selection interview seeks to ascertain the depth of the applicant’s skills and experiences along with a sense of whether or not the applicant is a “fit” for the particular school.

Because deeper probing occurs during selection interviews than it does during screening interviews, the questions asked are not always structured. In many cases, a set of structured questions is used as the starting point for a selection interview, but the responses given by the applicant often lead to probing questions that are crafted on the spot by the interviewer. The ability to probe appropriately is an important skill for school administrators to develop. Some examples of
probing questions and statements, crafted for human resource managers in all fields, are:

“I’d like to hear more about your thinking on that subject.”
“Why do you feel that way?”
“Could you elaborate?”
“Would you describe that in greater detail?”
[Please] “Tell me more.” (Moffatt, 1979)

Probing questions like the general ones above can be used as followups to a wide range of responses. However, school administrators should possess the necessary communication skills to craft even more specific probing questions when the situation warrants such action. Strong listening skills are very helpful in this regard, as the interviewer who is truly and actively listening will find it easier to ask for the additional information they desire.

♦ **The Perceiver Interview**—A perceiver interview is a special type of structured interview in which identical questions are asked of all applicants (Seyfarth, 2007). Most notable among this type of interview is the Teacher Perceiver Instrument developed by the Gallup Organization. This instrument seeks to identify the presence of themes in an applicant’s life, which are known to correlate with successful teaching. After extensive studying of the talents of successful teachers, there emerged a common set of life themes that explain their success. These themes are briefly explained in Figure 7.2.

### Figure 7.2 Teacher Perceiver Themes

♦ **Mission**—Mission is what takes some individuals and groups out of society’s mainstream in order to assure the quality and purposiveness of that mainstream. Mission is a deep underlying belief that students can grow and attain self-actualization. A teacher with mission has a goal to make a significant contribution to other people.

♦ **Empathy**—Empathy is the apprehension and acceptance of the state of mind of another person. Practically, we say we put ourselves into the other person’s place. Empathy is the phenomenon that provides the teacher feedback about the individual student’s feelings and thoughts.

♦ **Rapport Drive**—The rapport drive is evidenced by the teacher’s ability to have an approving and mutually favorable relationship with each student. The teacher likes students and expects them to reciprocate. Rapport is seen by the teacher as a favorable and necessary condition of learning.

♦ **Individualized Perception**—Individualized perception means that the teacher spontaneously thinks about the interests and needs of each student and makes every effort to personalize each student’s program.
♦ **Listening**—The Listening theme is evident when a person spontaneously listens to others with responsiveness and acceptance. Listening is viewed as beneficial to the speaker.

♦ **Investment**—The Investment theme is indicated by the teacher’s capacity to receive a satisfaction from the growth of the students. This is in contrast to the person who must personally perform to achieve satisfaction.

♦ **Input Drive**—Input drive is evidenced by the teacher who is continuously searching for ideas, materials and experiences to use in helping other people, especially students.

♦ **Activation**—Activation indicates that the teacher is capable of stimulating students to think, to respond, to feel—to learn.

♦ **Innovation**—The Innovation theme is indicated when a teacher tries new ideas and techniques. A certain amount of determination is observed in this theme because the idea has to be implemented. At a higher level of innovation is creativity where the teacher has the capability of putting information and experience together into new configurations.

♦ **Gestalt**—The Gestalt theme indicates the teacher has a drive toward completeness. The teacher sees in patterns—is uneasy until work is finished. When gestalt is high, the teacher tends toward perfectionism. Even though form and structure are important, the individual student is considered first. The teacher works from individual to structure.

♦ **Objectivity**—Objectivity is indicated when a teacher responds to the total situation. This teacher gets facts and understands first as compared to making an impulsive reaction.

♦ **Focus**—Focus is indicated when a person has models and goals. The person’s life is moving in a planned direction. The teacher knows what the goals are and selects activities in terms of these goals. (http://education.gallup.com/hrd/select/content.asp?i=255)

The Teacher Perceiver Interview can only be conducted by a trained Teacher Perceiver Specialist, as determined by the Gallup Organization. This guideline contributes to the reliability and validity of the instrument. Also, to ensure accuracy in evaluating interviewee responses, three rules apply to the process. First, all questions are asked of all applicants in *exactly* the same way. Second, there are particular “listen fors,” or comments that applicants must make in order to be considered as having the particular life theme being evaluated present in their lives. Third, because the interviews are recorded and because the interviewer has a sheet on which the interviewer marks the absence or presence of “listen fors,” the interviewer can conduct the interview with the applicant and evaluate or understand it at a different time. This is significant, because it is quite challenging to ask questions, listen to responses, and evaluate them or see if they lead to an understanding of the individual all at the same time. The structure of the Gallup Teacher Perceiver Interview allows the communication process.
of the interview and the scoring, or understanding, process to be two separate occurrences.

Retaining Quality Teachers

With estimates that we will need more than two million new teachers by 2010, it is clear that the teaching profession will be characterized by an open job market. That is, all teachers who are considered average or better will have choices about which teaching job they will choose to accept. While recent history has been characterized by a very competitive teaching job market, the growing American population and the aging of America’s teaching workforce will lead to potentially more job openings than candidates with which to fill them. Because of this, school administrators will be faced with a great challenge to retain the quality teachers they have so as to avoid seeing their best teachers lured away to other schools. Accomplishing such a task, while not solely the responsibility of the school administrator, requires an understanding of what it is that leads some teachers to stay employed within the school (retention) while causing others to seek employment elsewhere or to abandon teaching altogether (attrition).

First, let us consider some actual, sobering statistics. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 1998) predicted that by 2008 approximately 2.4 million teachers will be needed in this country, at a rate of over 200,000 per year (Latham, Gitomer, & Ziomek, 1999). Early indications are that this number was an underestimate. Several different factors led the NCES to this prediction. First, because of increased birth rates and immigration (Darling-Hammond, 1999), student enrollment was projected to surpass 54 million by 2008 (Merrow, 1999; NCES, 1998). In 1996, public school enrollment actually exceeded 55 million. Second, more than one-third of the current teaching force is age fifty years or older (Recruiting New Teachers, 1998) and likely to retire within the next decade (Merrow, 1999). Third, current recommendations to reduce the number of students in each classroom mean that more teachers will be needed for these smaller classes (Merrow, 1999; National Association of State Boards of Education [NASBE], 1998) if these recommendations are ever adhered to.

According to Ingersoll (1998), it is a mistake for anybody to assume that hiring difficulties result from teacher shortages in the conventional sense of the availability of candidates willing to enter the profession. Instead, the demand for new teachers comes about primarily because teachers choose to leave their jobs at far higher rates than do professionals in many other occupations (NCES, 1998). The difficulty, therefore, is not in recruiting new teachers; the problem is the retention of teachers.

The National Center for Education Statistics (1997) reported that 9.3 percent of public school teachers leave before they ever complete their first year in the classroom, and more than twenty percent of public school teachers leave their positions within their first three years of teaching. Also, nearly one-third of teachers leave the teaching profession within five years of entry, with even
higher attrition rates existing in more disadvantaged schools (Delgado, 1999; Darling-Hammond, 1999).

With data such as this facing schools all across the country, it is imperative that school administrators understand what they can do to influence the retention decisions of their teachers. Although many teachers leave because of factors outside of the school administrator’s control, there are still many who cite poor leadership and a lack of administrative support for their reasons to leave (Betancourt-Smith, Inman, & Marlow, 1994; Billingsley, 1993). Adhering to the ISLLC Standards and exhibiting human relations skills will assist administrators in ensuring that they do not create environments in which support is not adequate.

Furthermore, as school administrators recognize the needs that teachers have to interact positively with colleagues, they will work to create a school culture in which such positive interactions are fostered. Recalling Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory and the other associated motivational theories, which were presented in the discussion of ISLLC Standard 2, can assist school administrators in creating cultures that are supportive of such interactions. In the meantime, as the teaching population ages and as more new teachers enter the profession, school administrators should recognize that first-year teachers often suffer the most from a lack of support. Many first-year teachers report that they experience overwhelming isolation as they leave the support of student teaching cohorts, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. Leaving the support to which they were accustomed during their preservice training may shatter the goals, diminish the spirits, and destroy the self-confidence of first year teachers (Delgado, 1999). In fact, studies have shown that collegial support and interaction influence satisfaction and retention among teachers (Popkewitz & Myrdal, 1991; Theobald, 1989; Bloland & Shelby, 1980).

Weiss (1999) specifically investigated teachers’ plans for remaining in the teaching profession. The findings of this study revealed that a school culture that includes strong collaboration and teacher decision making most strongly correlates to high morale, stronger commitment to teaching, and intentions to remain in teaching. This study indicates that the higher the school culture is rated, the higher the level of planned retention. Essentially, the most important finding of Weiss’ study is described as follows:

First-year teachers’ perceptions of school leadership and culture and teacher autonomy and discretion shape the extent of their willingness to do their best work, to commit to teaching as a career choice again, and to plan to stay in teaching. (p. 869)

Once again illustrating the spiraling nature of the ISLLC Standards, it is evident that an understanding of how to create, foster, and sustain a positive school culture is arguably the best tool a school administrator has for increasing the retention of teachers. Specific guidance regarding how school administrators create positive cultures was presented in Chapter 5.
Providing Meaningful Professional Development

John Seyfarth (2007) defined professional development as “any activity or process intended to maintain or improve skills, attitudes, understandings, or performances of professional and support personnel in present or future roles” (p. 122). While this definition encompasses the professional development responsibilities of people holding a wide range of administrative titles, it is a strong definition in that it illustrates the need for focusing on more than just skills. School administrators perform a vital human resource function when they purposefully and consistently work to improve people’s attitudes and understandings, as well as their skills and performances. Doing so in a half-day workshop rarely leads to the desired outcomes, however. Instead, school administrators need to recognize what research says about effective professional development, so as to avoid presenting staff members with disconnected pieces of information around which they are expected to improve their performance.

Perhaps the first thing school administrators should realize is that research shows that brief workshops focused only on skill development are among the least-effective ways in which to develop teachers. Far more effective are intensive approaches that deal directly with teachers’ knowledge, experiences, and beliefs (Lieberman, 1999). Furthermore, these intensive sessions are more productive when they are revisited some time after the original presentation date. In many schools, professional development consists of isolated sessions, each one dealing with a completely different topic. Focusing development on one topic and then revisiting that topic at a later professional development session is much more effective and tends to produce more lasting change.

Also, there has been some research that suggests teachers must be active participants in order for professional development to have any real meaning for them. Listening to somebody present on a topic does not allow for the kind of engagement that leads to greater development among teachers. It has been suggested that professional development programs ought to provide opportunities for teachers to converse with their professional colleagues about problems and successes encountered in their teaching (Morocco & Solomon, 1999). By doing so, teachers feel more a part of the professional development and are more likely to report getting something meaningful out of the session.

It is important to note that, in many school districts, administrators from central office plan the professional development program. While this is good in that it allows for consistency between schools and can lead to a districtwide focus on particular goals, there is a greater chance that individual teachers will feel too far removed from the professional development activities than would be the case if they had a hand in designing them. Because of this, many school districts design professional development plans with committees, often consisting of teachers, staff, parents, and administrators.

School districts that incorporate site-based management into their organizational structure delegate the bulk of responsibility regarding the professional development program to the individual schools. In these cases, it is imperative
that the school administrators have the skills necessary to design a professional development program that meets the needs of the school and its employees. This is best accomplished by involving those affected by professional development in the design of the professional development activities. Doing so leads to higher levels of interest and commitment and increases the collaboration among and between teachers and principals (Howey & Vaughn, 1983).

The four specific roles mentioned in the above section certainly do not represent all of the human resource functions of school administrators. They are, however, the four most implicated roles in the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of the ISLLC Standards. In many ways, much of this textbook’s content has referred to some of the other roles relative to human resource management. Focusing on creating a positive school culture, on motivating employees, on communicating effectively, on providing instructional leadership, and on making sound decisions also leads school administrators to the performance of human resource functions. The very nature of schooling, namely it being such a “human” business, illustrates the importance of the school administrator as manager of human resources.

In considering the importance of the work environment, the Hawthorne Studies deserve mention here. Although certainly closely related to ISLLC Standard 3, the results of the Hawthorne Studies also can be tied to the other ISLLC Standards. They are among the most powerful studies conducted regarding the interpersonal environment of the workplace.

The Hawthorne Studies

The Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric Works near Chicago, Illinois, was the site of a significant series of studies that essentially gave birth to the human relations approach to administration and cemented key terms and concepts regarding organizational behavior onto the minds of all who study administration. The Hawthorne Studies are truly groundbreaking in that they led to an understanding of human interaction and group behavior that underlie much of what we understand about people in the workplace today. Through a series of experiments, which failed to produce the results that experimenter and Harvard Business School Professor Elton Mayo expected, the term “Hawthorne Effect” was coined. Today this term simply indicates that the mere act of showing people that you are concerned about them usually spurs them to better job performance. Administrators reap many rewards when they pay attention to people. This truth is a pillar of the human relations aspect of all six ISLLC Standards.

There are two separate sets of experiments worth noting in our discussion of the Hawthorne Studies. The first, the illumination experiments, tried to determine whether or not better lighting would lead to increased productivity. To determine this, a control group and an experimental group were formed. In the control group lighting levels remained the same, while the experimental group experienced great variance in the degree of lighting in their environment. Although the control group was expected to perform better because of the consis-
tency in lighting, both the control group and the experimental group of female employees produced more, whether the lights were turned up or down. It was discovered that this increased productivity was a result of the attention received by the group and had nothing to do with the actual lighting levels. In fact, in the experimental group, productivity remained high until the lighting level was reduced to the level of moonlight. Researchers were surprised at these results, as they had failed to realize the power in simply paying attention to people. Even negative attention led to increased productivity, thereby indicating that attention and recognition are positive motivational tools.

The second set of experiments focused on the effectiveness of the piece-rate system in increasing the output of groups of workers. Essentially, the workers were told that their rates of pay would increase as their productivity increased. In effect, the group would earn more money if the group members increased their levels of productivity by assembling more products. The experimenters believed that such a system would lead to a marked increase in productivity because faster workers would put pressure on slower workers to increase their outputs. However, the level of output remained constant, no matter what “standard” rates management set. This was a result of the fact that over time the group developed a “norm” or acceptable level of output. Those individuals who produced too much were referred to as “rate-busters” and those who produced too little were deemed to be “slackers.” In both cases, overachievers and underachievers were pressured by the group to produce at the “normal” level of output.

The Hawthorne Study researchers concluded that human factors were responsible for the results of the two experiments. In the piece-rate experiments, each group of workers informally set the acceptable rate of output for the group. To gain the social acceptance of the group, each worker had to produce at that rate. Slower or faster workers were pressured to maintain the group’s pace. In the lighting experiments, the mere fact that employees were recognized and received attention led to increases in their productivity, despite working conditions. The Hawthorne Studies essentially demonstrated that human factors are at least as important as pay rates are to motivation.

The results of these studies are duplicated consistently in our schools. Many readers can attest to the fact that student groups often determine an acceptable level of performance for themselves. Children who either overachieve or underachieve in schools are often ostracized by the majority population because they do not fit in. The same behavior can be witnessed in adult members of the school community. In some schools, particularly those that experience a more negative culture, optimistic teachers censure their optimism when they are socializing in the teacher’s lounge. Particularly new teachers often complain that they arrive at their first teaching position full of optimism and a belief that all children can learn, only to find that such a belief is considered naïve and is ridiculed by their more experienced colleagues. While such behavior is not exhibited in schools with more positive cultures, school administrators must watch for it, and they must protect their best teachers from it.
School Administrators and Crisis Planning

Over the past few decades, it appears to most people that there has been an increase in the number and severity of school crimes throughout the United States. The result is that school administrators, although always charged with the responsibility of ensuring student safety, became increasingly concerned with both strengthening the safety of their schools and of assuring the public that they had done so. The term crisis planning gradually worked its way into the job responsibilities of school administrators and the roles and duties of administrators continued to change. While many of these changes have been great for education and have led to even safer schools than those our students entered previously, it is questionable whether school crimes really had increased or if public awareness of them was all that precipitated the new-found attention to school crimes. In taking a brief look at this issue, it becomes apparent that the seeming rise in school crimes actually represents a false picture of school safety across America.

According to the United States Justice Department’s Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics, victimization in American schools has actually decreased since 1992. Their report, Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 2006, states that between 2003 and 2004, violent victimization rates at schools declined from seventy-three crimes per 1,000 students ages twelve through eighteen years to fifty-five per 1,000 students. In 2004, students ages twelve to eighteen years were victims of about 1.4 million nonfatal crimes at school, including about 863,000 thefts and 583,000 violent crimes—107,000 of which were serious violent crimes (rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault). This shows an overall decline. For example, in 2003, there were seventy-three victimizations per 1,000 students at school, compared with fifty-five victimizations in 2004. Theft victimization at school declined from forty-five victimizations per 1,000 students in 2003 to thirty-three victimizations of students in 2004. In comparison, in 2003, there were sixty victimizations per 1,000 students away from school, compared with forty-eight victimizations in 2004. Violent victimization declined from thirty-two victimizations per 1,000 students in 2003 to twenty-one victimizations in 2004. Furthermore, between 2003 and 2005, the percentage of students reporting victimization declined (from five to four percent), as did the percentage reporting theft (from four to three percent); there were no measurable declines in the percentages reporting violent and serious violent crime during the same period.

Fighting and bullying seem to have taken the place of much violent crime at school. In 2005, thirty-six percent of students in grades nine to twelve reported they had been in a fight anywhere, and fourteen percent said they had been in a fight on school property during the previous twelve months. In the same year, forty-three percent of males said they had been in a fight anywhere, compared with twenty-eight percent of females, and eighteen percent of males said they had been in a fight on school property, compared with nine percent of females. In 2005, twenty-eight percent of students ages twelve to eighteen years reported
having been bullied at school during the last six months. Of these students, fifty-eight percent said that the bullying had happened once or twice during that period, twenty-five percent had experienced bullying once or twice a month, eleven percent reported having been bullied once or twice a week, and eight percent said they had been bullied almost daily.

Interestingly, while there is an apparent reduction in school crime, students also report being more afraid at school than they previously were. Whether this is related to the increased media coverage of school violence or to some other phenomena is unclear. The U.S. Department of Education’s Annual Report on School Safety 2005 states:

In 2003, 6 percent of students ages 12–18 reported that they had been afraid of attack at school or on the way to and from school, and 5 percent reported that they had been afraid of attack away from school. In 1999 and 2001, students were more likely to report they were afraid of being attacked at school or on the way to and from school than away from school; however, in 2003, no such difference was. The percentage of students who reported that they were afraid of being attacked at school or on the way to and from school decreased from 12 percent in 1995 to 6 percent in 2003; however, no difference was detected in the percentage of students who feared such an attack between the most recent survey years, 2001 and 2003. (http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2005/Indicators.asp?PubPageNumber=17)

Although school crises involve much more than crimes committed on school grounds, it is the crimes that receive the most attention. Later in this section, attention is paid to other types of school crises that administrators must prepare for, but the fact that school crimes have received so much media attention in recent years prompts further examination first. Even though actual crimes in schools have decreased, as evidenced by the reports cited earlier, there are other disturbing trends that may contribute to the level of fear being felt by students. Among them are the following:

♦ Ten percent of high school students said that in the past thirty days they had carried a weapon (e.g., gun, knife, or club) on school property.
♦ Juvenile arrestees are more likely than adult arrestees to have used a gun in committing a crime. One-third of students who carried a weapon took it to school.
♦ By age seventeen, thirty-three percent of all youth said they had been suspended from school at least once, eighteen percent had run away from home (i.e., had at least once left home and stayed away overnight without a parent’s prior knowledge or permission), and eight percent had belonged to a gang.
♦ By age seventeen, a greater proportion of juveniles reported that they had committed an assault with the intent of seriously hurting
the person than reported ever having run away from home, sold drugs, carried a handgun, stolen something worth more than fifty dollars, or belonged to a gang.

♦ Nationally, five percent of students said they missed at least one day of school in the past month because they had felt unsafe at school or when traveling to or from school, up from four percent in 1993.

♦ According to the 2003 Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Survey, three in ten high school students said that in the past month they rode in a vehicle with a driver who had been drinking. The proportion varied across states, ranging from eighteen percent to forty-three percent.

♦ Although today’s violent juveniles do not commit more violent acts than their predecessors of fifteen years ago, a larger proportion of the juvenile population are committing violent acts.

♦ Nearly eight in ten cities with populations of 50,000 or more reported gang problems. Thus, most Americans still live in or near areas that have problems with youth gangs.

♦ More than half of high school seniors have used an illicit drug at least once—more have used alcohol. (The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; Sickmund, Snyder, & Poe-Yamagata 2006)

These realities must be accepted by school administrators, as students who are fearful of attending school cannot be as productive as those who lack such feelings of fear. While school crime may not be an issue in any given school or school community, the fact remains that national statistics such as those shared above, do scare many students. The foundation of effective school administration, as evidenced by the opening phrase of each ISLLC Standard is that “a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students....” It is far more difficult to promote student success when the student body is frightened than it is when they are not.

School administrators must, therefore, plan for potential crises and make students aware that such plans exist. Not only does a crisis plan make a school safer, but knowledge that such a plan exists makes many stakeholders, including students, feel as though the school is a safer place than it would be if no plan existed. This feeling, in many cases, is as important as the crisis plan itself. Furthermore, the crisis plan must be clearly articulated so that all stakeholders understand their role in any potential crisis situation.

Figure 7.3 illustrates the most important components of any crisis management plan. In considering the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 3, these elements are critical. Following Figure 7.3 is a brief explanation of each of the eight elements that ought to be considered in designing a crisis management plan. These explanations are adapted from Fiore, School–Community Relations, 2nd edition (2006).
Figure 7.3 Designing a Crisis Management Plan

A comprehensive crisis management plan should do the following:
1. Select individuals to serve on crisis response and aftercare teams.
2. Establish a headquarters for the crisis response and aftercare teams.
3. Select an individual to be the official spokesperson during a crisis.
4. Establish a procedure for activating community support services.
5. Establish a procedure for developing channels of communication.
6. Establish a procedure for controlling rumors.
7. Establish a procedure for assessing the crisis management system.
8. Establish a procedure for bringing closure to the crisis.

All of these components are general enough to be applied to virtually all crisis situations that could arise in schools. However, the components are also specific enough to create a structured plan that will greatly assist the school staff in dealing with the situations in an effective and efficient manner.

1. Select individuals to serve on crisis response and aftercare teams.
   While potentially all members of the school community are affected by a crisis situation, it is both impractical and illogical for each person to play a role in responding to the crisis. Instead, the school administrator should select members for the crisis response and aftercare teams based on his or her knowledge of each person’s strengths. Although school counselors and social workers may make excellent members of the aftercare team, a team that requires counseling and human relations skills, there are likely additional members of the school community with some of those skills. Likewise, although the school secretary may be a logical person to assign to the crisis response team, as making telephone contacts and announcements are skills necessary for this team, there are doubtless other members of the school community who would be excellent choices to carry out these duties as well.

   It is important that individuals selected for these teams are aware and approve of their selection. Above all else, crisis response and aftercare teams need individuals with a desire to serve on them and an understanding of their importance. Finally, individuals selected for these teams ought to be people who are regularly in the school or, at least, have very quick access to the school. A half-time teacher, living some 30 miles from the campus, is not a good choice for this particular assignment.

2. Establish a headquarters for the crisis response and aftercare teams.
   Chaos is probable if the crisis response or aftercare teams have no place to go in a crisis situation. In situations like the 1999 Colum-
bine incident, those who are on the response and aftercare teams need a place to do their work. There must be a specific room in the building where the team meets, formulates strategy, responds to the press, and makes decisions. This must be decided upon before the crisis takes place. It would be very damaging to a school’s public image, not to mention their ability to assure safety during a crisis, if members of these teams were running around bumping into each other as they searched for a place to meet. Whether it is the school media center, the cafeteria, the teachers’ lounge, or someplace else, the crisis response and aftercare teams must have an established place to meet. They are also wise to have a backup place in the event that access to their normal meeting place is blocked.

3. Select an individual to be the official spokesperson during a crisis.

Although a high-ranking school administrator is typically chosen for this role, this does not necessarily have to be so. Not all administrators have the calmness and rationality to act as spokesperson during times of crisis. This does not make them bad administrators. It does, however, make them lousy spokespersons during a crisis situation. The person selected for this role must understand much of what is expressed in the dispositions of the ISLLC Standards. They must be aware of their nonverbal communication idiosyncrasies, they must have a pleasant demeanor, and they must be able to respond calmly, rationally, and assuredly during emergency situations.

Some larger school districts have hired public relations personnel to deal with issues such as these. If your school does not have access to such personnel, then it is critical that a person be selected who has the appropriate qualities. As always, this person must agree to the assignment and must understand the significance of the role he or she is agreeing to.

4. Establish a procedure for activating community support services.

The more serious the crisis, the more important it will be that community support services are made available to the school community. In virtually all of the school tragedies experienced during the last decade, community support services have played a major role in assisting students with issues such as grief management, guilt, depression, fear, or even suicidal feelings. It is not only the students who benefit from these services, however. School staff members and parents often have tremendous difficulty coping with tragic events taking place in schools that they assumed were too safe for such things to happen.

As is the case with each of these components, lack of planning can really be as devastating as the crisis situation itself. Therefore, it
is imperative that the plan specifies who will contact community support services, how they will be contacted, and when the contact will take place. Failure to address these concerns will increase the risk that community support services will be lost as an oversight. It is also important that the list of support services and their contact information be kept in a secure and reliable place. The individual in charge of this list, often the school administrator, must regularly update it to ensure that contact information is as accurate as it possibly can be.

5. Establish a procedure for developing channels of communication. Who contacts the superintendent and the school board? Are they contacted immediately? Who contacts police and other emergency personnel? Are the press responded to as they arrive, or are press conferences held? If there are press conferences, where are they held? How are parents notified? Who notifies them? Who tells the staff? Are students informed of the crisis in a large assembly, or is it handled individually in classrooms?

These are just some of the questions that point to the significance of developing channels for communication. It is so easy during a crisis to overlook informing somebody who really ought not be overlooked. It is equally easy to incorrectly inform individuals or to release information out of sequence or to the wrong party. Establishing channels of communication ahead of time avoids these problems. In many schools, telephone trees have been established for this very purpose. While they tend to be more prevalent in areas that may be affected by severe weather closing school unexpectedly, telephone trees are a very traditional, simple way to keep people informed.

Obviously, not all of the questions above are appropriate in all crisis situations. For example, if a gunman opens fire in a crowded cafeteria, all students are likely to know about it quickly. If a staff member is killed in an accident on the way to school, however, the issue of informing students becomes a bit more delicate.

6. Establish a procedure for controlling rumors. Whenever a crisis develops in a community as large and as diverse as a school, there is always a risk of rumors being developed and disseminated. As the facts of a crisis may be delicate enough to deal with, there is no need to be forced to deal with rumors as well. Therefore, there must be a plan for keeping rumors controlled. Part of this plan should involve the assurance of honest communication. People often start rumors, not out of cruelty, but because of a lack of correct information. Thus keeping people appropriately informed will help squelch some rumors from circulating.
school administrator should take the lead in requiring all staff to put an end to rumors early on. Students who may be having difficulty dealing with the crisis situation may spread rumors as a defense mechanism or as a way of suppressing the truth that they do not understand how to deal with. Staff members need to be sensitive to these possible defense mechanisms and should seek out the assistance of counselors, social workers, or community service agencies when dealing with these students.

7. Establish a procedure for assessing the crisis management plan.
   As is the case with virtually all that we do in education, there must be methods in place for assessing our crisis management plan. This includes an assessment of the personnel in key roles and the comprehensiveness of the plan itself. As a crisis management plan is designed, there is no real concrete way for determining the extent to which it has been appropriately created. This lack of a concrete method is why if misfortune strikes and a crisis does occur, school leaders must seize the opportunity for evaluating the plan’s effectiveness.

   In assessing the system, it is important that administrators ask the difficult questions. Were people properly informed? Did our plan have the necessary structure? Were grieving school community members appropriately assisted? Were key personnel able to perform their duties as we had imagined they would? Did we use space appropriately? These are just a sample of the questions that ought to be a part of your assessment system. A good piece of advice is to develop assessment questions before the plan must be implemented. This is no different than the effective teacher who often develops assessment tools before he/she completes the teaching of an instructional unit.

8. Establish a procedure for bringing closure to the crisis.
   Among the greatest lessons school administrators have learned from school tragedies that have taken place before is this one. Just as in all other personal tragedies human beings may endure, closure must ultimately be brought if healing is to successfully occur. While this does not mean that the school administrator arbitrarily chooses a date at which he/she declares the crisis and its aftermath to have ended, it does mean that at some point the school must ceremoniously end the crisis. It is important to remember that different people with differing relationships to the crisis victims will heal at dramatically different rates. School administrators must be sensitive to this and should ensure that services are available for as long as members of the school community need them.
However, in respect to these individual needs, the school administrator must ensure that the crisis is brought to closure for the entire school community. This may mean that a memorial service is held and school is cancelled for a period of time. It may mean that a monument of some sort is erected in memory of victims. It may mean, in the case of a less-tragic crisis, little more than a newsletter summing up how things have been handled. The school administrator must work with the crisis management team to develop a plan for bringing closure to the crisis in a way that respects individual needs, honors what people endured during and after the crisis, but reminds everybody involved that the purpose of schooling must endure.

Although there are other issues that must be considered in designing a crisis management plan, such as the delicate nature in which information must be communicated, the preceding information includes the most pertinent steps for school administrators to remain cognizant of. Failure to plan for crises often makes them bigger crises if and when they do occur. And again, if the school community has knowledge that the school is prepared for potential crises, there is a much greater chance that stakeholders will feel more safe and secure.

A final point to be made is that not every crisis involves a crime or serious threat on the part of an individual who plans to do harm. While tragedies such as school shootings grab national headlines and often become ways to define school crises, as the data at the beginning of this section verified, they are not at all common. A more exhaustive list of examples of school crises include those mentioned in Figure 7.4.

Balancing Management Tasks with ISLLC Standard 3

Chapter 6 and this chapter have each taken a piece of the school administrator’s management responsibilities in ensuring a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. Together these chapters have dispelled the myth that management and leadership must be compared, contrasted, and analyzed in a manner that leads us to choosing one over the other. Through these chapters, and in viewing them in light of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 3, it is clear that management and leadership are both sides of the same coin we call school administration.

Chapter 6, in particular, was concerned with the differences between management and leadership. Paying attention to the organizational structure that governs the behavior of administrators provided assistance in seeing the balance that is oftentimes necessary to strike. This chapter further looked at best practices of school administrators, as identified by leading educational administration organizations.
Figure 7.4 Occurrences That Can be Classified as School Crises

1. Natural disasters such as:
   ♦ Blizzards
   ♦ Tornadoes
   ♦ Hurricanes
   ♦ Floods
   ♦ Earthquakes
2. Employee problems such as
   ♦ Strikes
   ♦ Work Stoppages
3. Student problems such as severe disruptions
4. Physical plant problems such as:
   ♦ Power outages
   ♦ Heating/cooling breakage
   ♦ Water leaking
   ♦ Water contamination
5. Criminal acts or serious threats such as:
   ♦ Shootings
   ♦ Knifings
   ♦ Bombings
   ♦ Bomb Threats
   ♦ Arson
   ♦ Kidnapping
   ♦ Rape

In this chapter, the school administrator as human resource manager was a focal point. In considering ISLLC Standard 3 and its relationship to the other five Standards, it is clear that school administrators must understand and deal effectively with people if they are to meet their charge of promoting the success of all students. This chapter also considered the vital role school administrators play in preparing for potential crisis situations. Although we hope they never will occur, crises are a reality and the most effective school administrators do all they can to ensure that their school community is prepared for anything.

In taking another look at ISLLC Standard 3, it is important to reflect on these two chapters and to see if the theories, concepts, and practical work of school administration are reflected. An analysis of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 3 will remind us all of how important it is for school administrators to understand what is contained within the pages of Chapter 6 and this chapter.
Standard 3

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

Knowledge

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
- theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development
- operational procedures at the school and district level
- principles and issues relating to school safety and security
- human resources management and development
- principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management
- principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space
- legal issues impacting school operations
- current technologies that support management functions

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
- making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching
- taking risks to improve schools
- trusting people and their judgments
- accepting responsibility
- high-quality standards, expectations, and performances
- involving stakeholders in management processes
- a safe environment

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
- knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions
- operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning
- emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate
- operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place
- collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed
the school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively
- time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals
- potential problems and opportunities are identified
- problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner
- financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of schools
- the school acts entrepreneurially to support continuous improvement
- organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed
- stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools
- responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability
- effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used
- effective conflict resolution skills are used
- effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used
- effective communication skills are used
- a safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained
- human resource functions support the attainment of school goals
- confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained

Summary

While human resource management as a function of the school administrator’s responsibilities is a topic deserving further, more in-depth study, for the purposes of introducing the topic in relation to ISLLC Standard 3 there are four essential functions worth noting.

First, school administrators must concern themselves with recruiting the best possible teachers to staff their classrooms. With estimates of a national teacher shortage leading to some 2.4 million vacancies (Latham, Gitomer, & Ziomek, 1999), this may be considered one of the most important responsibilities facing contemporary school leaders. Such recruitment must be preceded by an understanding of what it means to be an effective teacher. A simple truth is that school administrators cannot possibly recruit the best and brightest teachers if they do not recognize what great teaching is themselves. The standards developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) provide a strong framework for such an understanding.

Second, school administrators must possess expertise in the hiring process so that they can bring these recruited teachers officially on board. There are several different types of interview techniques that can be very helpful in this process. Screening Interviews, Selection Interviews, and Perceiver Interviews offer differing perspectives from one another and are useful at various points in the hiring process. It is critical that school administrators combine knowledge of the
interviewing and hiring processes with strong communication skills in order to effectively hire the best possible staff for their school.

School administrators also need skills in retaining the quality teachers that they have. This is perhaps the area most relevant to strong human relations skills. School administrators who understand people in many of the ways already expressed in this textbook and who exhibit the skills necessary to help subordinates feel valued and motivated have the easiest time in retaining their

164 ♦ Introduction to Educational Administration, Second Edition
best teachers. While there are aspects of teacher attrition that cannot be helped, such as when teachers leave their jobs for personal, family reasons, a positive school culture and a strong, respected leader are key components in the choices that many teachers make regarding retention/attrition. Paying careful attention to the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of all six ISLLC Standards will compel school administrators to create conditions and behave in manners consistent with teachers’ desires to remain in the profession. The book, Creating Connections for Better Schools: How Leaders Enhance School Culture provides helpful assistance for school leaders desiring to modify their behaviors in a way that will improve their school’s culture.

Recognizing what the Hawthorne Studies indicate about people’s inherent need for attention and recognition, school administrators should design professional development opportunities that give teachers essential and useful information. The goal of professional development should be to truly help teachers become even better at what they do. An obvious prerequisite of such a goal is to already recognize what people do well so that their strengths can be built upon.

The final focus of this chapter was on the school administrator’s significant roles in crisis planning and crisis management. Although crises can be defined as including many of the extreme difficulties befalling some schools, it is worth noting that school crises still are rare occurrences. Nevertheless, because a crisis can strike any school at any time, school administrators must be prepared. The knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 3 each specifically cite the importance of a safe school. School administrators are well served to develop specific plans that can be put into motion quickly should a crisis situation ever arise on their campus or in their school community. Such plans include information about which employee is responsible for what action, who communicates information to whom, how rumors are to be controlled, and how to ultimately bring closure to the crisis situation. The focus, to be consistent with the dictates of ISLLC Standard 3, must be on the administrator’s ability to plan for these situations and to keep all stakeholders informed of the plan so that it can be carried out with maximum efficiency should such a need arise.

**Chapter Highlights**

- Managing the human resources of a school entails a multitude of roles and responsibilities, including recruiting quality teachers, hiring quality teachers, retaining quality teachers, and providing meaningful professional development.

- There are three distinct types of interviews of which school administrators should be aware: screening interviews; selection interviews; and perceiver interviews.

- Certain reasons teachers give for attrition are beyond the control of the school administrator and should not, therefore, be areas of concern. Other reasons, namely lack of administrative support and
lack of collegiality are well within the control of the school administrator and represent important human resource functions.

♦ School administrators perform a vital human resource function when they purposefully and consistently work to improve people’s attitudes and understandings, as well as their skills and performances.

♦ The Hawthorne Studies were groundbreaking in their discovery of the power of group norms on employee productivity. Furthermore, these studies indicated that employee performance will improve when there are feelings of recognition and acknowledgement present in the work environment.

♦ According to the United States Justice Department’s Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics, victimization in American schools has actually decreased since 1992.

♦ Nevertheless, school administrators must plan for potential crises and make students aware that such plans exist.

Application Questions

1. Consider the means by which teachers are presently hired in your school/district. Is there evidence of recruitment efforts prior to actual hiring? Regarding the hiring process, are different types of interviews conducted? Critique what your school/district currently does in this regard in comparison with the information presented in this chapter.

2. Examine the professional development program used in your school/district. Who is involved in choosing topics for professional development? Do teachers generally feel that the topics are worthwhile?

3. Give at least two examples of the power of group norms in your present school environment. These examples can be in relation to any stakeholder groups (i.e., students, staff, parents). Do group norms affect your work environment in a way similar to the findings of the Hawthorne Studies?

Field Activity

Ask to see a copy of either your school’s crisis management plan or that of your school district. Carefully review the plan in light of the eight design elements listed in Figure 7.3 (page 156). How many of the eight elements are present in your plan? Which ones are not? Review the findings with a school/district administrator. If any elements are absent from the plan, discover whether or not...
there are sound reasons for their absence. Also, discover if there are any other important elements present in the plan that have not been included in Figure 7.3.

Ask how often the plan is reviewed with employees. Is there evidence that employees are aware of the plan and would know what to do in the unfortunate event of a school crisis? If not, meet with a school/district administrator and discuss steps that might lead to greater employee awareness of the crisis management plan.

Finally, consider taking the lead and making any necessary modifications in the school’s/district’s crisis management plan. See if you can get the superintendent’s and the school board’s approval of your modifications so that they can become permanent parts of your crisis management plan.

**Have You Thought About It?**

Dr. Marshall strikes me as a highly effective leader in terms of her beliefs about the hiring process. She recognizes that hard work on the front end of the hiring process can save potential problems from happening years later. Superintendents like Dr. Marshall are aware that hiring quality teachers is very different from just hiring teachers. Determining quality is challenging, but it is more possible to accomplish with a thorough screening, interview, and selection process in place.

What do you think?
Standard Four

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

As Chapters 8 and 9 illustrate, school administrators must take the leadership initiative to involve all stakeholders in the educational process. This involves, as Chapter 9 exemplifies, collaborations with parents, business and civic organizations, and the media. Furthermore, as is the focal point of Chapter 8, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 4 underscores the need for school administrators to possess decision-making skills and to appropriately involve others in decisions that will affect them. In demonstrating an understanding and recognition of the language in ISLLC Standard 4, educational administrators recognize the importance of appreciating diverse viewpoints and mobilizing stakeholders for the common purpose of creating the very best educational opportunities for students. This again brings up the crucial role of the educational administrator as instructional leader and expert communicator.

The wording of ISLLC Standard 4 and the knowledge, dispositions, and performances inherent in an understanding of the Standard, compel school administrators to appreciate the diversity of their communities and to work hard at establishing collaborative relationships with them. Standard 4 is critical in that it proactively leads school administrators to forming these relationships and partnerships before problems occur within the school.

Before going further, readers ought to examine the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of ISLLC Standard 4. Revisiting this list while reading Chapters 8 and 9 will provide opportunities for deeper understanding of the standard. This same table of knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators is revisited at the conclusion of Chapter 9.
Standard 4

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

Knowledge

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
♦ emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community
♦ the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community
♦ community resources
♦ community relations and marketing strategies and processes
♦ successful models of school, family, business, community, government, and higher education partnerships

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
♦ schools operating as an integral part of the larger community
♦ collaboration and communication with families
♦ involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes
♦ the proposition that diversity enriches the school
♦ families as partners in the education of their children
♦ the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind
♦ resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students
♦ an informed public

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
♦ high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority
♦ relationships with community leaders are identified and nurtured
♦ information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly
♦ there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations
♦ credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict
♦ the school and community serve one another as resources
available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals
partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups
to strengthen programs and support school goals
community youth family services are integrated with school programs
community stakeholders are treated equitably
diversity is recognized and valued
effective media relations are developed and maintained
a comprehensive program of community relations is established
public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely
community collaboration is modeled for staff
opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided

Chapter 8 compares and contrasts individual decision-making techniques with group decision-making techniques. While examining the classical decision-making model, wherein an individual reaches the best decisions the individual can given the existing constraints, Chapter 8 focuses to a lesser degree on the knowledge, dispositions, and performances than the model does as it examines the processes of group decision making. It is in that discussion where tremendous linkages are drawn between effective administrative behaviors and the language of ISLLC Standard 4. Additionally, Chapter 8 presents the benefits and potential pitfalls of involving stakeholders in decisions.

Chapter 9 deals with the importance of partnerships in promoting student achievement within the school. Emphasis is placed on the role of parents in the process, and specific techniques for working cooperatively with parents are explored. Also given substantial attention, are the important roles businesses, civic groups, and other members of the external community play in school success. Specific ways that school administrators can demonstrate the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 4 are included. Finally, this chapter examines the important role of the media in creating lasting school partnerships. Particular attention is paid to the ways in which various media outlets can serve as school partners.

The knowledge, skills, and dispositions inherent in ISLLC standard 4 are really a culmination of the work that school administrators do in relation to the previous three standards. It is through ISLLC Standard 4, that school administrators use their vision and understanding of the community’s culture to form partnerships that ultimately improve student learning.
Think About It

The faculty and staff of Morton Middle School are divided over whether or not it’s a good idea to include two student representatives on the PTA (or PTSA) board. Their opinions are sought by Assistant Principal Hester Wochik on behalf of the school’s principal. It’s not so much that faculty members are undecided about whether or not involving students is a good idea. Rather, they cannot figure out which students to involve, and they really don’t know how to go about determining an answer to this dilemma.

Mrs. Wochik decides to consult some of her old school administration textbooks, in the hopes that some clues about how to reach a decision will be presented. What she finds is a lot of information comparing and contrasting individual and group decision-making processes. What she needs is information about how to determine when to involve people, and then some methods for determining who ought to be involved.

The dilemma facing Mrs. Wochik is not uncommon in education. Often-times, educators are forced to choose who should represent a group, be it on an educational committee, or even in some classroom situations.
As you read through this chapter, consider how common Mrs. Wochik’s predicament is. Pay close attention to information that helps leaders determine who should be involved in a decision. Finally, think about some of the obstacles inherent whenever groups try to make a decision or reach consensus. How can these obstacles be overcome?

Simply put, decision making pervades all other functions and practices of educational administration. When school administrators plan and implement communication activities, when they communicate with various stakeholders, when they attempt to improve morale and staff motivation, and when they examine curriculum, instruction, and assessment issues within their schools, they engage in decision making. Furthermore, as school administrators make big decisions, they arrive at those decisions through a process that often involves hundreds or even thousands of other small decisions along the way. Decision making, an important part of daily life, is manifested in virtually everything a school administrator does. And because school administrators’ actions are under the scrutiny of many different stakeholders, their skills in making good decisions are of paramount importance.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 4 acknowledges the need for school administrators to collaborate with families and community members in order to ensure student success. This requires school administrators to understand how group decision-making models work and how to discern which situations call for the involvement of which constituents. Before discussing this further, let us examine the classical decision-making model that most individuals use in reaching decisions. This will enable greater differentiation and understanding when we consider the benefits and potential pitfalls of group decision-making processes. Although ISLLC Standard 4 illustrates the need for consensus building and the involvement of constituents in reaching decisions, there is also a need for administrators to recognize when the involvement of others in the decision-making process is most beneficial.

The Classical Decision-Making Model

Referred to as classical because of its timeless quality and its common usage, the classical decision-making model essentially describes the manner in which most of us reach the individual decisions that are necessary in our daily lives. The model, really a synthesis of many models using similar terminology, assumes, at its foundation, that decision making is a purely rational process. That is, the success of the classical decision-making model hinges on the extent to which we are rational beings, capable of considering all possible alternatives and able to correctly evaluate the benefits and consequences of them.

Although there are several versions of the classical decision-making model, the one presented here has five distinct steps. After a brief explanation of the five steps, there are two examples that can be used for breaking down the process and labeling each step. The five steps of the classical decision-making process are:
1. **Recognizing the problem**—The problem, or the discrepancy between what we want and what we are presented with, begins the decision-making process. Although it may seem obvious, this first step is critical. If there is no problem or discrepancy, then no decision needs to be made. Oftentimes, when there is a problem, the decision maker has difficulty recognizing exactly what the problem is. The decision maker knows something is wrong, but is not exactly sure what is wrong. Recognizing the problem and identifying it clearly are, therefore, very significant in the decision-making process.

2. **Brainstorming alternatives**—Typically, after recognizing the problem, individuals begin a process of brainstorming possible resolutions. At this point the resolutions, or alternatives, are not evaluated, but are simply developed. In simple decisions, this brainstorming of alternatives happens rapidly. Oftentimes, however, we are presented with a problem that is so complex or unlike any that we had previously faced, that brainstorming alternatives takes quite a bit longer.

3. **Evaluating alternatives**—At this stage of the decision-making process, the individual begins assessing the benefits and pitfalls of each solution previously brainstormed. Again, the underlying assumption here is one of rationality. That is, the ability to correctly evaluate alternatives is determined by the decision maker’s level of rationality. This step can be taken quite rapidly, or in more complex decisions, evaluating alternatives independently can be a time-consuming task.

4. **Making the decision**—Once alternatives have been generated and evaluated, the decision maker is in a position to make the decision. This decision is based on the assumption that the alternatives generated have all been evaluated accurately and that the one chosen will best solve the problem recognized in the first place.

5. **Taking action**—Making a decision and acting on the decision are two completely different things. Again, assuming complete rationality, the decision maker concludes the process by acting on the decision he or she has made. This action is an attempt at resolving the problem that was originally identified. Worth noting is that the action required to implement a decision may involve other people.

An important observation to make here is that this last step does not always end the decision-making process. Instead, there are often new problems that emerge as a result of the decision that has been implemented. This is largely because we are not rational or knowledgeable enough to always generate all alternatives, correctly evaluate them, and implement the best possible decision. This is explained in further depth in the section entitled Bounded Rationality.

Consider examples 1 and 2 as illustrative of the classical decision-making model. In both cases, look for all of the places at which the process can go awry.
Example 1

As principal of a large, suburban high school, you receive a telephone call from a parent that you have not yet met. This parent, Ms. Hapscott, tells you that she sees students throwing garbage out of the school bus window every day when the bus drives past her house. She goes on to explain that she has asked her son to identify the students throwing the garbage, as he is just exiting the bus when this happens. Possibly out of fear, she explains, her son refuses to cooperate and give her any additional information. Because she is fed up with picking up garbage every day after the bus drives by, she demands that you resolve the problem immediately. To further “inspire you to act,” as she puts it, she informs you that she will be calling the superintendent as soon as she hangs up with you. Now, let’s examine this situation in light of the classical decision-making model.

- **Recognizing the problem**—Several problems are interrelated in this example. One, you have an upset parent to deal with. Two, your superintendent is going to be brought into a situation that you have not even had a chance to resolve yet. Three, as Ms. Hapscott’s son refuses to speak with her about whom the perpetrators are, you are unsure about whether or not you should try to speak with him. Although there are likely other problems embedded in this situation, let’s just consider these three for now.

- **Brainstorming alternatives**—There are literally dozens of possible solutions or alternatives that can be brainstormed as a result of this situation. Among them, you could call the superintendent before she hears from Ms. Hapscott; assure the parent that this will not happen again and call for Ms. Hapscott’s son so the two of you can discuss this; ignore the situation and hope it goes away. While one or more of these may not seem to be good alternatives, we have not evaluated them yet. At this point, all possible solutions are considered.

- **Evaluating alternatives**—Each alternative presented has positive and negative outcomes associated with it. For example, if you assure Ms. Hapscott that garbage will no longer get thrown out of bus windows, the positive side is that you may make her very happy. The negative side is that this is a promise you may not have the ability to keep. Promising her something that you cannot deliver would only make the situation worse. Likewise, you can ignore the situation. The positive side is that you will be free to move on to other tasks. The negative is that it will likely remain unresolved which, in turn, will cause several people to question your leadership.
From this point on, you will make a decision and then take action. Your ability to clearly recognize the problem, generate and evaluate the alternatives, and tactfully act on what you decide all will contribute to the possibility of a new problem surfacing. Furthermore, we need to remember that situations like this one tend to occur while we are already in the throes of several other decisions that may require immediate action.

Now, let’s consider another example. No analysis is provided for this example. Read it and see what problem(s) you identify, how many alternatives you can brainstorm, and how well you evaluate each alternative.

Example 2

As principal of an elementary school, you recently enrolled a student who exhibits some serious behavior disorders. During the week in which this student has been enrolled, two different veteran teachers have complained of her behavior and have claimed that her actions are unlike those of any student they had ever worked with before. Now, you’ve just been called and told to immediately go to the cafeteria. From what you have been told, this student is racing through the cafeteria stabbing other children with a fork.

Again, there are many variables in this situation that must be addressed. While ensuring the safety of other students by immediately stopping this student’s rampage is an obvious initial part of resolving this problem, there are many other issues that are related and must be considered as you go about securing a long-term solution to this problem.

Bounded Rationality

As mentioned earlier, the classical decision-making model is based on the assumption of rationality. That is to say, the extent to which the model can yield good decisions is directly related to the rationality of the decision maker. Does the decision maker clearly understand the problem? Has the decision maker generated all possible solutions to the problem? In assessing the pros and cons of each proposed solution, has the individual clearly understood the consequences? Did the decision maker make the right choice in terms of all the data generated? Has the decision been carried out, or acted upon, correctly? Responses to these questions help to determine how rational the decision maker is.

Herbert Simon, who was awarded the Nobel Prize as a decision theorist, coined the term bounded rationality (1997) to explain why decision makers often settle for less-than-optimal decisions despite their desire to make the best decisions possible. As bounded rationality indicates, it is virtually impossible for a decision maker to be (a) aware of all possible solutions to a problem, (b) aware of all possible consequences of each alternative generated, (c) able to accurately evaluate all of the consequences, (d) able to rank the alternatives in the order in which they are most likely to solve the problem, and (e) choose the alternative that best solves the problem. Consequently, because our rationality is bounded,
or limited, we settle for less-than-optimal solutions. If it were possible to be truly rational, then the classical decision-making model would be far more successful at reaching optimal solutions. But because we are limited in our understanding of problems, consequences, and possible solutions, our rationality is bounded and we are unable to always make the best decisions on our own.

In Decision Making: Alternatives to Rational Choice Models (1992), Mary Zey makes some observations about decision making that point to the bounded rationality that we all face.

♦ All decisions are based on an incomplete comprehension of the true nature of the problem we face.
♦ It is virtually impossible for decision makers to generate all possible solutions to a problem.
♦ It is virtually impossible to predict all consequences associated with each alternative.
♦ It is impossible to ever determine which alternative will lead to an optimal solution so all decisions must be based on something less than optimization.

What decision makers often do because of bounded rationality is called satisficing. Essentially, satisficing means that the decision maker chooses the first alternative the decision maker thinks of that satisfies minimal standards. That is, the individual does not reach the best decision but settles for one that is good enough. Minimal standards become the end that falls far short of the goal of finding the best solution to our problems. Education simply will not benefit from leaders who make decisions that are good enough. Our students deserve much more than such a standard.

Site-Based Decision Making

Thus far the focus of this chapter has been on the process and potential pitfalls of making decisions as an individual. In recognition of the fact that such a process is necessary and that the work of school administrators requires skills in reaching quick, effective decisions by oneself, the focus now shifts to the process and skills of involving others in the decision making process.

ISLLC Standard 4 states that “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.” It is apparent, therefore, that effective school leaders must be adept at collaborating with stakeholders. This next section details some of the principles of site-based decision making, while also examining the shortfalls of such a process. Finally, it concludes with some logical considerations as school administrators grapple with who should be involved in which decisions.
Site-based decision making, a buzzword term in the 1980s and 1990s, is a concept that has taken root in our educational environment. Referring to the idea that decisions should be made at the level at which they are to be implemented is logical and characteristic of the tribute that educational leaders wish to pay to all of those people who work with children in our schools. The issue of bounded rationality and the realization that school administrators work in a hectic and fast-paced environment necessitate that many school decisions must be the result of stakeholder collaboration. School administrators, just like school faculty members, spend a great deal of time working with committees in order to reach the best possible decisions with the highest probability that stakeholders will accept the results. Examples of such committees abound, but include the following:

♦ Textbook adoption is usually done by a committee comprised largely of teaching faculty.
♦ Superintendents are generally hired by a board of education committee, representing the larger community.
♦ Student special education placement decisions and reviews are usually made by a committee including teachers, administrators, and parents.
♦ In collective bargaining states, educator contracts are negotiated by committees representing the administration and teacher association.
♦ Principals are generally hired by committees consisting of faculty representatives, central office representatives, and community representatives.

In such instances, the onus is on the school administrator to see to it that committee decisions produce better results than do individual decisions. Therefore, not only must school administrators be adept at making individual decisions, but they must also develop strong group decision-making skills. Specifically, the school administrator must transform a committee from a collection of individuals searching for the best decision to meet their individual needs into a collective decision-making unit.

**Benefits of Shared Decision Making**

As there are a multitude of variables that enter into any decision-making process, it is dangerous to assume that any one model is always preferred over others. Nevertheless, there are some generalizations about shared decision-making that bear repeating because they illustrate the benefits that most people agree exist when using a collaborative decision-making model. Later in this chapter are explanations about how to choose appropriate individuals to participate in a decision. For now, the assumption is that benefits do exist that make shared decision-making a desirable approach.
decision making an excellent option for arriving at the best decisions. Among the benefits are the following:

1. **Greater sum of knowledge**—When groups of people collaborate on a decision, there is a high probability that they will be able to generate more ideas and a greater knowledge base than would individuals acting alone.

2. **Higher degree of acceptance**—One of the strongest benefits of group decision making is that those who participate in the decision are more likely to accept the results than they would be had they not been involved. Simply put, involvement increases the likelihood of acceptance.

3. **Increased motivation**—Owens (2001) states that individuals who are involved in group decision making are motivated because they find an outlet for expressing their creativity and initiative.

4. **Greater understanding**—When individuals act alone, there is often the risk that others will not understand the decision that they have made. Group participation increases understanding as group members have been involved in the process and have a good understanding of the issues surrounding the final decision.

5. **More accurate decisions**—Because groups of people tend to evaluate each other’s thinking, major errors in judgment rarely get past the group. This results in more accurate decisions being made than would be the case if an individual acted alone.

Whether using the terms site-based decision making, shared decision making, or group decision making, the conclusions of most scholars and researchers are that groups of people tend to more thoroughly examine issues, offer more varied perspectives, and arrive at better decisions than do individuals who make decisions on their own. The debate over site-based decision making and its use in our schools during the latter part of the last century led to strong endorsements from The American Association of School Administrators and from the National Education Association (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Although potential pitfalls exist, the benefits of having various school stakeholders participate in schoolwide decisions have been believed by many to far outweigh any negative outcomes. In fact, as ISLLC Standard 4 states, “a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.” Involving individuals in decisions that are likely to affect them is one of the surest ways to accomplish the collaboration envisioned by these standards.
Techniques for Shared Decision Making

Knowledge that effectively uses groups of people in making decisions does not, by itself, ensure that good decisions will result from the group’s actions. To accomplish what ISLLC Standard 4 suggests, school administrators should understand some basic techniques for using groups in the decision-making process. What follows is a brief description of some of the more popular techniques for shared decision making.

**Brainstorming**

Brainstorming is a technique that generates a large number of ideas in a short period of time. It works best when group members know each other well and have some degree of trust between and among themselves. The most important thing to remember about brainstorming is that it is intended to generate ideas—not judge ideas.

In a brainstorming session it is a good idea to encourage everybody to give at least one idea. A brainstorming session should end while people are participating enthusiastically, rather than being forced to think of “just one more idea.” Usually, brainstorming is not the ultimate decision-making activity. The results of a brainstorming session are probably best used in other decision-making processes such as the nominal group technique or paired-weighting, which is discussed later.

A few rules to remember in designing a brainstorming session are the following:

- Criticism of ideas is not allowed;
- Emphasis is on building ideas;
- Any and all ideas are permitted; and
- The objective is to generate as many ideas as possible.

**Nominal Grouping**

The nominal group process (NGP) is a technique used for complex problems or to focus action on an issue that affects many people. NGP is most useful in situations where individual judgments need to be considered and combined with others to arrive at a decision that cannot be made by one person. It is a method of pooling knowledge and judgment for the group’s benefit. NGP consists of five steps that may take several hours to complete, depending upon the number of people involved.

The basic steps of NGP are as follows:

- Group members are introduced to the topic. This introduction is provided by the leader or the group member with the most knowledge of the problem.
♦ Each member writes down any ideas they might have. This phase takes place silently and lasts anywhere from five to ten minutes.
♦ All of the ideas are recorded on a flip chart. During the recording of ideas, there is no discussion and ideas are not evaluated.
♦ When all ideas have been presented, group members are permitted to seek clarification of ideas.
♦ The group members rank the available alternatives. After some discussion of the rankings, a vote is taken and the best alternative is chosen.

**Delphi Technique**

The Delphi Technique was developed in the 1960s by researchers at the Rand Corporation. One of its initial purposes was to overcome some of the interpersonal conflict and strife that can emerge in groups. Unlike with brainstorming and nominal grouping, participants in the Delphi Technique do not engage in face-to-face interaction with other group members. Instead, participants give their input through some other form of communication, usually the mail or email.

The steps in the Delphi Technique are as follows:

♦ A detailed questionnaire is completed by each of the group members independently.
♦ The responses are tabulated and a summary is distributed to each of the group members.
♦ A central location compiles, transcribes, and reproduces group members’ comments.
♦ With the benefit of others’ responses, each group member completes the questionnaire again.
♦ The results are tabulated and distributed again, and the process continues until a consensus emerges.

**Problems Arising From Shared Decision Making**

Although the benefits far outweigh the problems, shared decision making is not always the most effective method for reaching effective decisions. In fact, when any of the three problems outlined in this section are present, the resulting decisions will most certainly not be as good as the decisions an individual would have reached alone. The three problems discussed in this section are escalation of commitment, groupthink, and risky shift.
Escalation of Commitment

The first, and perhaps the simplest, potential problem inherent in a group decision is escalation of commitment. Although escalation of commitment can also plague individual decisions, it is a more common problem associated with group decisions. It arises out of the tendency groups have for increasing their commitment to a particular course of action in order to justify their decisions. Essentially, escalation of commitment occurs because of the time and energy that a group has put into the decision-making process. Because effort has been used to arrive at a decision, the group becomes even more committed to the decision so as not to render its efforts meaningless. In many ways, this phenomenon is similar to retrospective rationality. Because deliberate steps have been taken to reach the best possible decision, it is understandable that groups would become even more committed to their decisions.

An example of escalation of commitment occurs in almost all collective bargaining negotiations. Invariably, a group on one side of the bargaining table will advance a position to be negotiated that represents the interests of those they represent. Although evidence may be introduced as negotiations proceed which makes the position taken appear to need adjustment, the group will hold onto its original demand as a consequence of escalation of commitment. Once everybody in the group is “onboard” with the decision and their position has been presented to the other side, even information that should cause a change in opinion is often ignored as the group retrospectively escalates its commitment to the position.

Groupthink

Groupthink is the result of group pressures and tends to occur in cohesive groups (Janis, 1982). When group members know each other well, there is a greater chance that they will begin thinking as one cohesive unit rather than as a collection of individuals. This negates, in many ways, the advantages of shared decision making. The benefits that come from multiple viewpoints are lost when a group is so familiar and cohesive that its members begin thinking as one unit. This phenomenon has serious implications when groups are assembled to make decisions that have the potential of impacting significant educational issues. There have been speculations that groupthink is partly responsible for some major international events such as the Challenger disaster, the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor during World War II, and the escalation of the Korean War conflict. In each of these cases, there is mounting evidence that one or more of the potential problems of groupthink, as depicted in Figure 8.1, took place. Similarly, the invasion of the Bay of Pigs in 1961 served as the impetus of Irving Janis’s work in identifying groupthink. As was the case with the events mentioned above, the Bay of Pigs fiasco resulted from top military and government leaders reaching a decision together. Based on these poor decisions, Janis concluded that the members of these groups experienced groupthink, a distorted style of thinking that renders group members incapable of making a rational decision. According
to Janis (1982, p. 9), groupthink is “a mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a cohesive in-group, when the members’ strivings for unanimity override their motivation to realistically appraise alternative courses of action.” To Janis, groupthink is a disease that infects healthy groups, rendering them inefficient and unproductive.

**Figure 8.1 Characteristics of Groupthink**

Groupthink occurs when a group of people think as a unit rather than as a collection of individuals. It has the potential of creating three types of errors.

Type I—The group overestimates its power and morality.
- There is a belief that the group is invulnerable, which causes extreme risks.
- There is an unquestioned belief in the group’s morality, which causes them to ignore the ethics of their actions.

Type II—The group becomes closed-minded.
- The group collectively rationalizes away anything that might make it reconsider its decision.
- The group stereotypes the views of the opposition as too evil, weak, or stupid to possibly defeat the group.

Type III—There is great pressure toward conformity.
- Each group member censors his or her doubts, which creates apparent group consensus.
- A shared illusion of unanimity exists because of this censorship.
- Deviants in the group receive strong pressure from other group members to conform.
- Somebody protects the group from information that might shatter the group’s complacency.

**Causes of Groupthink**

While it is difficult to ascertain precisely what causes groupthink in all instances, four of the most common causes are the following:

1. **Cohesiveness**—Cohesive groups have many advantages over groups that lack such unity. People enjoy group membership much more when the group is cohesive, they are less likely to quit or otherwise abandon the group, and they work harder in pursuit of the group’s goals. While this is so, extreme cohesiveness can be dangerous. As cohesiveness intensifies, group members become more likely to accept the decisions of the group without question. Pressure to conform also rises as group members become reluctant to say or do anything that goes against the feelings of the group, and the number of internal disagreements decreases. Janis (1982, p. 176)
acknowledges that groups that are not cohesive can also make terrible decisions, “especially if the members are engaging in internal warfare.” However, in a cohesive group, members refrain from speaking out against decisions, they avoid arguing, and they strive to maintain friendly, cordial relations with one another at all costs.

2. **Isolation**—Some groups avoid leaks by maintaining strict confidentiality and working only with people who are members of their group. Again, recalling the Bay of Pigs, the president’s advisers who planned the invasion believed that only a surprise attack would succeed, so they isolated themselves from any outside contacts. Unfortunately, their isolation limited the amount of information that was available to them and prevented any type of consultation with independent experts. Military analysts could have provided fresh insights and useful criticisms of the plan, but their input was not sought. The group’s isolation from important sources of information resulted in a poor plan that was never rigorously scrutinized.

3. **Biased leadership**—Leaders can also contribute to the growth of groupthink. A biased leader who exerts too much authority over group members can increase pressures to conform. Many groups follow a rigid protocol that gives the leader considerable control over the group discussion. A biased leader can discourage dissension by expressing his or her own views at the very outset, and by urging the group to strive for agreement rather than critical discussion.

4. **Decisional stress**—Most people experience great stress when they are forced to make an important decision. Important decisions, such as which house to buy, which college to attend, which vehicle to purchase, which job offer to accept, and whom to marry are made reluctantly, and only after we have suffered through long days and nights of worry, anxiety, and uncertainty.

**Avoiding Groupthink**

Although it is difficult to avoid groupthink altogether, the following are some suggestions for helping to reduce the likelihood that groupthink will occur:

- At all group meetings, one member should be assigned the role of devil’s advocate. This person should express as many objections to the group’s decisions as possible.
- Each group member should be responsible for discussing the group’s deliberations with colleagues outside of the group. These colleagues’ reactions should be reported back to the group at its next meeting.
At various points throughout the group’s tenure, it should temporarily split into subgroups. These subgroups should meet separately and then report back to the group as a whole.

Qualified colleagues, who are not members of the group, should periodically be invited to group meetings so they can listen and give their objections in the group’s presence.

There are reasons and occasions in which each of these suggestions will fail. However, they must all be examined for inclusion in the group’s processes in order to reduce the odds of groupthink occurring. The only alternative is to intentionally fail to build cohesive groups. While such a tactic would reduce the likelihood of groupthink, the organization would fail to benefit from the advantages inherent in having a group examine a critical issue and reach an important decision.

**Risky Shift**

In 1968, James A. Stoner published findings from an extensive research study he conducted about risk factors in group decision making. Stoner originally hypothesized that group decisions would be more cautious than would individual decisions. Contrary to this prediction, Stoner discovered that group decisions were considerably riskier than were individual decisions. This finding is now referred to as the *risky shift* in group decision making. Although there have been some findings that are inconsistent with risky shift and that have pointed to the cautious decisions reached by some groups, risky shift is still considered by many to be descriptive of the behaviors of some groups charged with shared decision making.

There are several reasons that have been proposed to explain why risky shift takes place in some groups:

1. **Diffusion of responsibility**—Because individuals are not held accountable for poor decisions when they have worked in groups, the group often takes greater risks. As individuals cannot be blamed for poor group decisions, they share the blame with others or, in the worst cases, they shift the blame entirely to other members of the group.

2. **Leaders are great risk takers**—In every group, a leader emerges. Oftentimes, this leader, because of their inherent penchant for risk taking, encourages other members of the group to take greater risks than they ordinarily would have on their own.

3. **Groups are familiar with the problem**—When decisions are made in groups, more ideas and data are generated on the problem, resulting in increased familiarity with the issues. This, in turn, tends to make groups less afraid to take risks in their decisions.

4. **Risk taking is socially desirable**—Whereas an individual may not take risks because of fear of the consequences, our society does encour-
age risks. As nobody likes to be labeled a “scaredy-cat,” members of groups often yield to perceived pressure to take risks.

Anybody who has raised teenagers or who can recall their own teen years can attest to the power of risky shift. Nevertheless, risky shift is far from being an adolescent issue. The news media is full of reports of otherwise intelligent, rational adults who make poor decisions because of the reasons listed above. In most cases, these poor decisions are the direct result of acquiescing to outside pressures or opinions that never would have occurred if the individual was left to his or her own devices in the decision-making process.

Overcoming Obstacles in Shared Decision Making

While it is virtually impossible to ensure that decisions made by groups will be superior to those made individually, there are some important considerations when designing or creating groups or committees for the purpose of making important decisions. These considerations, if implemented properly, will reduce the likelihood that groups fall prey to groupthink or risky shift.

For the purpose of placing individuals in groups or on committees that will be charged with decisions-making responsibilities, examine your potential list of participants and classify them into one of the following four types:

♦ **Type I**—Individuals who are classified as type I meet two important criteria. First, they have a stake in the outcome of the decision and will be affected directly by its implementation. Second, type I individuals have expertise in the matter being decided upon.

♦ **Type II**—Individuals who are classified as type II do meet the criteria of having a stake in the outcome of the decision, but they do not have expertise in the matter being decided upon.

♦ **Type III**—Individuals who are classified as type III do not have a stake in the outcome of the decisions. However, these individuals do have expertise in the matter being decided upon.

♦ **Type IV**—Individuals who are classified as type IV do not meet either of the criteria. That is, they have no stake in the outcome of the decision, and they have no expertise in the matter being decided upon.

Clearly, this exercise of mentally categorizing people is not intended to relegate some to positions of less worth in the organization than others. Instead, it is to be used as an aid to ascertain the extent to which somebody would be a contributing member of a group charged with making a decision. As no individual person has a stake in everything nor expertise in all areas, we all can be classified as types I, II, III, or IV at various times and for various purposes.
After deciding how individuals in the organization are to be categorized for any given decision, it is wise for administrators to follow these guidelines in determining their degree of involvement in the decision-making process:

♦ **Type I**—These people should definitely be involved in making the decision. In fact, they will often be quite angry if they are left out of the decision. Consider a decision involving the adoption of new mathematics textbooks and support materials. The chairperson of the math department has a stake in the outcome of this decision and better have expertise in mathematics instruction, as well. As such, this person is very likely to be angry if not included in the decision.

♦ **Type II** —Type II people should be involved, but the leader must take great care to communicate with them throughout the process so they do not become frustrated. The stake that a type II person has will ordinarily lead the individual to desire involvement in the decision, but their lack of expertise can be an impediment that leads to their frustration. Continuing with the previous example of mathematics adoption, a first-year math teacher may be an example of a type II individual.

♦ **Type III**—These people often make good consultants, but you should avoid involving them too much. Overreliance on type III people can cause them to feel as if they are doing your job. As these individuals have expertise, but do not have a stake in the outcome, their knowledge can be useful, but their lack of stake will often drastically reduce their interest in assisting the decision. Again continuing with the previous example, a teacher who taught math for many years but is now involved with a different discipline is an example.

♦ **Type IV**—Rarely should a type IV individual be involved in a decision. Without any stake in the outcome and lacking in expertise, these people run the risk of compromising the group’s progress. If they must be involved, great care should be taken to ensure that they do not hold leadership status within the group or committee. Also, type IV individuals should be communicated with by the leader very often throughout the process.

In contemporary school settings, it is common for many committees to function simultaneously. Depending on such factors as faculty size and accreditation status, teachers and staff may need to serve on more committees than they would ideally like to serve on. This is why it is so important to appropriately place people on committees. The burdens that can sometimes be associated with committee work are lessened when the results of the committee’s work matter
to the individuals serving. They are lessened even further when the committee members have some knowledge or expertise in the area about which the committee is convening.

In most school settings there are some teachers who are classified as type I in multiple scenarios and others who seem to be type IV in all areas. Relating this concept to all previous ISLLC Standards, it is apparent that knowledge of the staff is a critical component of the school administrator’s success in determining these things. School leaders who take the time to really know the strengths, challenges, and interests of all staff members, are the most successful at formulating groups to arrive at the best possible decisions. While involving stakeholders in the decision-making process seems to be directly tied to ISLLC Standard 4, the implications for success in such endeavors are really rooted in all six Standards.

Summary

School administrators are faced with thousands of decisions on a daily basis. Some of these decisions are simple and occur with little or no conscious thought. Others are a bit more complex and may require the school administrator to pause, think, and reflect, so that the administrator can reach the best possible decisions for all involved. Still other decisions are much more complex and have the potential of significantly affecting various school stakeholders. These complex decisions require an even greater depth of thinking, planning, and implementing in order for the school administrator to arrive at a solution of benefit to all.

Just as there are simple decisions and a varying degree of more complex ones facing school administrators on a daily basis, there are numerous ways in which a decision can be reached. This chapter essentially compared and contrasted the classical, individual approach to decision making with various methods of group decision making. As leaders are oft-characterized partly by their ability to make decisions and implement plans with little time for reflective thinking, knowledge of the classical decision-making model is essential. Although different situations call for different methods, it is verified by ISLLC Standard 4 that the best school leaders seek to involve others in the decision-making process to the maximum extent that is practical. For this purpose, this chapter focused on the benefits and pitfalls of shared decision making.

While there are many benefits of using stakeholders in the decision-making process, such efforts do not come about without flaws. Three flaws identified in this chapter are escalation of commitment, groupthink, and risky shift. Even though there is no guarantee that any of these three potential problems will exist in a group charged with making decisions, they are all flaws that school administrators must be mindful of. School administrators should recognize the symptoms of these group disorders, and they should be knowledgeable of how to proactively reduce the chances of any of the three occurring.

One of the best opportunities for proactively approaching group dynamics occurs when the school administrator is choosing members to serve on a committee or other decision-making unit. At this vital stage, school administrators...
benefit greatly by knowing as much as they possibly can about the stakeholders with whom they work. An awareness of which members have a stake in the outcome of the decision and/or expertise in the area being decided upon will create conditions for more successful group appointments by the administrator. Such knowledge about individual stakeholder’s strengths and expertise has been referenced by virtually all six of the ISLLC Standards. It is knowledge of people that propels school administrators to making the best decisions possible,

Point

A major obstacle to educational reform is groupthink. There are few mavericks in education today because important educational decisions are being made by the masses. When an idea or a method takes hold in education, it quickly becomes the norm of the masses. Consider the example of block scheduling. For many years, secondary schools were structured nearly identically. Teaching took place in time segments of approximately forty minutes. Block scheduling began taking hold as an alternative within the past twenty years, and now one is hard-pressed to find a public high school that is not organized around a variation of block scheduling.

Counterpoint

Groupthink is rarely seen in public schools today as increasingly research has revealed the different ways in which all children learn. Teachers today need to alter their teaching style to meet the needs of an ever-growing diverse set of learners. All effective teachers are mavericks in one way or another. In such a high-stakes educational environment as we find today, a teacher couldn’t survive without originality. There may be a couple of examples of groupthink in education, but they are the exception rather than the rule.

Questions

♦ When groups of individuals arrive at the same conclusion, is it fair to call it groupthink? What’s the difference between groupthink and an effective group decision-making process?
♦ Does a discussion of groupthink have any place in the debate about year-round schooling? Why are so many localities reluctant to consider an alternative to our current scheduling structure?
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whether the decisions refer to how to motivate employees, improve instruction, enhance the curriculum, or respond to virtually any school need.

ISLLC Standard 4 says, “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.” School stakeholders, inclusive of faculty and staff, students, parents and families, neighbors, community members, and businesses, represent the community referred to in ISLLC Standard 4. To be successful and to make all stakeholders true stakeholders in the mission of the school, administrators must appropriately involve them in key decisions. Collaboration does not come about simply because some key stakeholders sit on committees with little meaning. Instead, the collaboration referenced in ISLLC Standard 4 emerges from school administrators who understand their communities and involve them in decisions for which they have a stake and some degree of expertise. Chapter 9 focuses on the roles of parents in this process.

**Chapter Highlights**

- Decision making is manifested in virtually everything a school administrator does. Because school administrators’ actions are under the scrutiny of many different stakeholders, their skills in making good decisions are of paramount importance.
- The five steps of the classical decision-making model are recognizing the problem; brainstorming alternatives; evaluating alternatives; making the decision; and taking action.
- Because people are limited in their understandings of problems, consequences, and possible solutions, their rationality is bounded and they are unable to always make the best decisions on their own.
- Satisficing means that the decision maker chooses the first alternative he/she thinks of that satisfies minimal standards. As a result, the individual does not reach the best decision but settles for one that is good enough.
- Among the benefits of shared decision making are the notions that such a process yields a greater sum of knowledge, a higher degree of acceptance, increased motivation, greater understanding, and more accurate decisions.
- Brainstorming, nominal grouping, and the Delphi Technique are three strategies that school administrators can use to help groups work through the decision-making process.
- It is important for school administrators to remain mindful of three potential problems that arise from the group decision-making process. Escalation of commitment, groupthink, and risky shift are natural outcomes that can plague many group decisions.
One of the most proactive ways for school administrators to overcome potential problems of group decision making is for them to create groups from people with both a stake in the outcome of the decision and the expertise to contribute to the decision.

Application Questions

1. Describe the steps that occur in the classical decision-making model. In your experience, at which steps do the most difficulties usually arise?
2. List the major benefits of shared decision making. What are some techniques school administrators can use to improve group decisions?
3. Give an example of a time that you witnessed or participated in a group that was plagued by escalation of commitment, groupthink, or risky shift. Was the problem overcome? If so, how?
4. Think of the school staff with which you currently work. Can you think of situations for several people in which they would be classified as type I for decision-making purposes? Can you think of examples in which they would be classified as type IV?

Field Activity

Take some time to observe the group decision making that takes place in any group(s) within your school. For this activity, you can choose any group at all. The food service staff, the custodial team, a particular grade level or subject-specific group of teachers, or even a close knit group of students can all be excellent choices for this activity. The only requirement is that the group you observe must be one that is often called upon to make group decisions.

As you observe the dynamics of your chosen group(s), see if you can find examples of escalation of commitment, groupthink, and risky shift. Document these examples, and consider sharing them with the group. Pay close attention to the steps, if any, that the group takes to combat these problems once they arise.

For the decisions that you observe the group attempting to reach, do you see examples of the different types (I, II, III, and IV) of people within the group? Do these people respond as you would have expected? For example, if a type IV individual is present, is there evidence that this person would rather not be part of the decision-making process? Are there other predictable behavior patterns observed?
Have You Thought About It?

Deciding when it is appropriate to involve others in decisions and then determining who the others should be is a daunting task and is one to which school leaders often do not pay enough attention. Mrs. Wochik is searching for answers to this dilemma without recognizing that a prerequisite is to know the strengths and weaknesses of the people with whom one works. There are ways for determining who to involve in certain decisions, and the leaders who take an interest in knowing as much as possible about their staff are the ones who struggle less.

What do you think?
Think About It

Dean of Students Sid Abraham had wanted to see his name in print ever since he was a little boy. What he wasn’t looking for, however, was his picture and a poorly attributed quote of his to appear on the front page of the local newspaper. My, how situational desires can be!

As dean, Mr. Abraham had most student discipline tasks delegated to him. Last week, he experienced one of his most bizarre cases, when a ninth grade boy choked a classmate, leading the classmate to lose consciousness. In investigating the situation, Mr. Abraham called both boys to his office, and he spoke primarily with the choker in angry, exasperated tones. At one point in the conversation, Mr. Abraham put his hands around the boys’ neck simulating choking so that the choker could better understand the seriousness of this infraction. Regretfully, Mr. Abraham
did this while students from the school’s photography class were passing by in the hallway.

Imagine Mr. Abraham’s horror when he saw his picture on the local newspaper’s front page the next morning. Underneath was a caption that read, “Now, you see how this feels.” “Did I actually say that,” Mr. Abraham wondered. “How could I be so stupid?”

Members of the media are not out to get school officials, as some may believe. Rather, most members of the media want positive partnerships with school officials. However, the forging of such partnerships is the responsibility of school leaders. Consider this fact as you read this chapter. Think about what Mr. Abraham can do in this current predicament. Think about how he could avoid situations like this in the future. Finally, consider what you will do as a school leader to foster sustaining partnerships with your external school community.

In Chapter 1, the Five Types of Power, as described by French and Raven (1968), were introduced. Some attention was given to the notion that school administrators must judiciously use power to influence the behaviors of others. As was explored in Chapter 1, the concept of power need not be one that conjures up images of tyranny or other abuses of human dignity. As French and Raven first discussed the topic in 1968, power takes different forms in different situations and simply refers to the mechanism by which leaders influence the behaviors of others. This ability to influence the behaviors of different school stakeholders becomes vitally important as school administrators work with the many publics that their school serve. This chapter is devoted to what school administrators must do in their quest to sustain partnerships with these many important stakeholder groups.

**Why Partnerships Are Important**

Joyce Epstein (1995), director of the Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships at Johns Hopkins University, states that the school, the family, and the community are “three major contexts in which students live and grow”; these “overlapping spheres of influence” are extremely important because they “directly affect children’s learning and development” (p. 702). Dr. Epstein urges schools to work together with families and the community as partners who share responsibility for the education of all children. This type of collaboration, explains Epstein (1995), contributes to improved educational outcomes for children: “Partners recognize their shared interests in and responsibilities for children, and they work together to create better programs and opportunities for students” (p. 701).

To emphasize the importance of schools sharing responsibility for student learning with families and the community, significant federal legislation has been introduced in the modern political arena. First came the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994*. This act contained three goals that were directly related to
family involvement and community partnerships. Similarly and more recently, the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* gave a strong voice to parents regarding the quality of the public schools their children attend. Specific language from the *No Child Left Behind* website states that the Act does the following for parents and children:

- Supports learning in the early years, thereby preventing many learning difficulties that may arise later;
- Provides more information for parents about their child’s progress;
- Alerts parents to important information on the performance of their child’s school;
- Gives children and parents a lifeline;
- Improves teaching and learning by providing better information to teachers and principals;
- Ensures that teacher quality is a high priority;
- Gives more resources to schools;
- Allows more flexibility; and
- Focuses on what works.

Finally the website (www.nclb.gov) states, “Because of *No Child Left Behind*: Parents will know their children’s strengths and weaknesses and how well schools are performing; they will have other options and resources for helping their children if their schools are chronically in need of improvement.”

A partnership approach gives families and community members a greater opportunity to participate in the wide range of school involvement activities, but it also gives them a voice in the school’s decision-making process as well as real roles and responsibilities in school-improvement efforts. However, partnerships such as those envisioned by Epstein and by federal legislation do not exist successfully because of mandates or research alone. School administrators must receive specific skill development that will assist them in creating, fostering, and sustaining relationships that truly enhance student learning. Appropriate power utilization is but one component of this task. While school administrators who possess referent and expert power in the eyes of stakeholders will have the best foundation formed for partnership building, such qualities alone do not render partnerships inevitable. Instead, partnerships with families and the larger community result from deliberate actions that have their basis in sound leadership practice as described by theories throughout this textbook.

**The Importance of Parents**

As time marches on, the importance of parents as partners in their children’s education becomes more and more apparent. Scores of studies and educational literature over the past 30 years (Benson, Buckley, & Elliott, 1980; Epstein, 1992; Rioux & Berla, 1993; Whitaker & Fiore, 2001; Fiore, 2002) have confirmed that as parents are welcomed as partners in the learning process, students, educa-
tors, and the parents themselves reap significant benefits. Not only is parental involvement a good idea according to educational literature, but it is an essential component of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. Contemporary school administrators are most effective when they appropriately involve parents in the educational process.

The National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education (NCPIE) lists five immediate benefits of parental involvement in education. This coalition, founded in 1980 with funding from the Ford Foundation and Union Carbide, has attracted partner organizations that represent the latest and best thinking, policy, and practice in American education since its inception. Although the list of organization partners is too long to include in this book, a partial list appears in Figure 9.1.

**Figure 9.1 Partners in NCPIE**

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)
- American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)
- American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
- American Federation of Teachers (AFT)
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
- Harvard Family Research Project
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
- National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
- National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)
- National Education Association (NEA)
- National Middle School Association (NMSA)
- Office of Civil Rights
- Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

As is apparent from this abridged list of partners, the National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education is an influential organization with a strong voice in advocating the importance of parent partnerships in education. The coalition’s website (http://www.ncpie.org/AboutNCPIE/AboutPartnerships.html) lists the following benefits of family–school partnerships:

- *Students do better in school and in life.* They are more likely to earn higher grades and test scores, graduate from high school, and go on to higher education. Low-income and minority students benefit the most.

- *Parents become empowered.* Parents develop confidence by helping their children learn at home. Many go on to further their own education and become active in the community.
Teacher morale improves. Teachers who work with families expect more from students and feel a stronger connection to and support from the community.

Schools get better. When parents are involved at home and at school, in ways that make them full partners, the performance of all children in the school tends to improve.

Communities grow stronger. Families feel more invested in the school system, and the school system becomes more responsive to parent and community needs.

Closer examination of these five benefits implicates clear behaviors of school administrators. Let us examine this list in light of what ISLLC Standard 4 says and mindful of the leadership theories that have been presented thus far in this textbook.

Students do better in school and in life—The central purpose of the work that school administrators perform is to improve student learning. If a school administrator focuses on any other goal as their central purpose, then they are focused on the wrong thing. As parent involvement has been shown to improve student learning and to impact later life through such benefits as a higher graduation rate among students with involved families, then such involvement must be fostered and sustained by school administrators. This requires, in many cases, a reconceptualization of what parent involvement means. Later in this chapter, this important issue is addressed. For now, understanding the purpose of schooling and being the torch-bearer for the mission and vision of the school is an important thrust of the ISLLC Standards.

Parents become empowered—Oftentimes, educators make the mistake of assuming that their only purpose is to directly impact students. While students are obviously the paramount reason for a career in education and must be the focal point in all educators’ efforts, tremendous gains are achieved by also improving the lives of parents. As educators, it is our job to educate entire families. This, in turn, contributes to a better life for students. Thus school administrators understand that empowering parents and recognizing their efforts as partners ultimately improves the parent’s confidence. In many cases, this has been shown to contribute directly to a better life for our students.

Teacher morale improves—Previous chapters have discussed the importance of a motivated school staff and the direct benefits to students that arise when teachers enjoy the work that they do and feel valued because of it. An important consideration is that teachers
do, in fact, raise expectations for students when they feel confident that they have the support of parents at home. Too often, in cases where parent involvement is dismal or nonexistent, teachers are found to lower expectations for students in order to avoid negative contact with uninvolved parents. School administrators, particularly those focused on increasing student achievement, recognize the need to hold very high expectations for student achievement. By encouraging and supporting teachers who appropriately involve parents in the educational process, administrators respond to the ISLLC Standards in that they make expectations clear, keep stakeholders focused on the school’s vision, and create partnerships with stakeholders.

♦ *Schools get better*—One of the loudest complaints often heard by school administrators is that the community does not recognize the outstanding opportunities for children that the school provides unless high standardized test scores are a part of the package. The good news here is twofold. First, school administrators who involve parents as partners in the educational process improve their schools in many ways. Among these ways are the renewed feelings of commitment and cooperation among all stakeholders. Second, parent involvement is linked to student achievement. By internally adopting the message of ISLLC Standard 4, school administrators enjoy increased probability that student learning and thus improved standardized test scores will be the result of their efforts.

♦ *Communities grow stronger*—The central goal of education is to improve the lives of young people; Albert Einstein once took this notion to a new level. Einstein is reported to have said, “One should guard against preaching to young people success in the customary form as the main aim in life. The most important motive for work in school and in life is pleasure in work, pleasure in its result, and the knowledge of the value of the result to the community.” As school administrators embrace the ISLLC Standards, acknowledge the expert knowledge gained from studying leadership theory, and appropriately collaborate with families, they will do more than just improve student learning. They will strengthen communities.

In addition to the benefits of parental involvement touted by the National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education, there are those expressed by the National Parent-Teacher Association (www.pta.org) and those celebrated by virtually every major educational association in America. While the words of these organizations are significant and completely in step with the intent of ISLLC Standard 4, one cannot ignore the simple truth that parent involvement just makes sense. In schools all across the country, appropriate parental involvement has been shown to improve the educational process and the educational
outcomes for students. The key is to keep the involvement appropriate. To do so, school administrators should focus on the four types of people identified in Chapter 8’s discussion of shared decision making.

**Appropriate Parent Involvement**

Recalling the four categories that individuals fall into when being considered for use in a shared decision-making model provides a simple guide for gauging the effectiveness of parent involvement in various school activities. Although school administrators must engage in strategies to learn as much about parental talents as is feasible, such engagement is worthwhile as it simplifies the process of considering parents based on the four types, repeated here:

- **Type I**—Individuals who are classified as type I meet two important criteria. First, they have a stake in the outcome of the decision and will be affected directly by its implementation. Second, type I individuals have expertise in the matter being decided upon.

- **Type II**—Individuals who are classified as type II do meet the criteria of having a stake in the outcome of the decision, but they do not have expertise in the matter being decided upon.

- **Type III**—Individuals who are classified as type III do not have a stake in the outcome of the decisions. However, these individuals do have expertise in the matter being decided upon.

- **Type IV**—Individuals who are classified as type IV do not meet either of the criteria. That is, they have no stake in the outcome of the decision, and they have no expertise in the matter being decided upon.

Broadly stated, all parents have a stake in the decisions made within a school. This does not necessarily qualify them as stakeholders in any, more focused aspect of reaching decisions. In fact, one of the challenges school administrators face in modern times is centered on this very concept. As the face of public education becomes a greater blend of all stakeholders’ faces and ceases to look solely like an educator’s face, school administrators feel pressure from parents who believe that they should be intimately involved in all school-based decisions.

Actually, although significant stakeholders in the overall quality of a school, parents are not stakeholders in all decisions that are made in a school. This is not said to diminish the significant role parents play as stakeholders. Instead, the purpose is to reassure school administrators that it is sensible and prudent to remember that every person with a stake in the school’s operations does not have equal stake in every aspect of running the operations. The ability to understand this concept and to communicate it to all stakeholders is of paramount importance. We should never diminish the role of parents, but we should sensibly balance it with other stakeholder obligations. The goal of effective school admini—
istration is to do what is in the best interests of children’s education. Confusing the decision-making process by overestimating an individual’s stake and/or expertise flies in the face of this goal.

Following are several examples of situations in which a parent would be classified as a type I member of a decision-making unit. While type I members are not the only members who should be involved, it is wise to use the expertise and stake that these people have whenever it is feasible to do so.

♦ A parent who works as a CPA would be an excellent member of a team charged with auditing a school’s financial records.
♦ A parent who works as a nutritionist or dietitian could be very helpful in designing menus for the occasions in which the school lunch program has flexibility.
♦ A parent who works in landscaping or horticulture would be an excellent consultant for designing a new courtyard or for improving other areas on the school grounds.
♦ A parent who is a member of the local Chamber of Commerce could be a wonderful source of information regarding businesses that would like to form partnerships with the school.
♦ A parent who is a nurse or a doctor could be used in decisions regarding clinic setups and/or ways in which the space in a clinic can be better used.
♦ A parent who is a decorator or artist would be very useful in designing attractive murals and in beautifying common areas in the school.

There are no hard and fast rules for appropriate parental involvement. As we should be wary of snake oil salespeople, we should likewise become skeptical at the mere mention that such rules do exist. Although ISLLC Standard 4 urges school administrators to collaborate with families, it does not do so at the expense of common sense. In close examination of the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators for ISLLC Standard 4, it is apparent that an understanding of the importance of family, use of data regarding families, and the ability to effectively communicate with and mobilize families are the necessary skills of effective school administration. This is but one more example of the inclusiveness of the ISLLC Standards. Looked at holistically, it is obvious again that effective leadership skills, a clear sense of purpose and vision, and knowledge of the stakeholders who comprise the school’s internal and external publics are keys to successful contemporary school administration.

Understanding the areas in which individual parents have a stake and/or expertise is a daunting task, particularly in large schools with historically low parental involvement. This is why such knowledge is not gained overnight, but is the result of persistent efforts to reach out to families as much as possible. There are, however, a few steps that can help facilitate this otherwise lengthy process.
♦ Become a visible member of the local community. Although this is expanded upon later, it is important to remember that visibility within the community will yield tremendous information about individuals’ interests and areas of expertise.

♦ Collect as much information from parents as you can. All schools collect emergency contact information. Include in this information a section about parental interest or talents.

♦ Host career days or similar events in which parents can come to school and share their career, vocation, or special talent.

♦ Send home surveys asking parents with particular skills to come forward. For example, if a science curriculum committee is to be formed, give parents an opportunity to describe how their knowledge or skills would be important to that committee.

♦ When meeting with parents about any issue, ask some probing questions about their interests and/or experiences. Take notes so you remember. Not only will this yield information that could be helpful at a later time, but it also makes parents feel valued and important. This is particularly useful as part of an otherwise unpleasant meeting.

### Dealing With Difficult Parents

Sometimes, despite our best efforts to appropriately involve parents and to respect and appreciate their contributions to their children’s education, parents can be difficult to deal with. The book, *Dealing with Difficult Parents: And with Parents in Difficult Situations* (Whitaker & Fiore, 2001) provides practical assistance for working with the most challenging parents in the most challenging situations. Before doing so, however, the book explains the following three mindsets, which should be part of all school administrators’ thinking as they struggle with dealing with difficult parents:

♦ Ninety percent or more of parents do an excellent job with their children.

♦ Virtually 100 percent of parents do the best job they know how to do.

♦ Part of our job, as educators is to assist the less than ten percent of parents who really need to improve.

Such thinking not only helps administrators to remain optimistic and upbeat about parents in general, but it also reminds them of their obligation to assist those parents who don’t do as good a job as they should. This assistance comes in the form of modeling appropriate behavior. Again, it is important for school administrators to remember that, consistent with the ISLLC Standards, they are to model how they want others to behave. This mindset prevents school admin-
istrators from behaving unprofessionally or in a rude manner with any school stakeholders.

Figure 9.2 highlights a few principles to keep in mind when dealing with difficult parents. These principles are further developed in the paragraphs that follow.

**Figure 9.2 Assistance in Dealing with Difficult Parents**

- Never argue, yell, use sarcasm, or behave unprofessionally with parents;
- Make positive contacts with parents before problems occur;
- Acknowledge when you have made a mistake;
- Show parents that you are on their side and have the same goals as they have;
- Illustrate for difficult parents that the situation could be worse and that you’ve really given them a good deal; and
- Focus on the future to prevent further occurrences of whatever has caused them to be upset.

(Whitaker & Fiore, 2001)

We never argue, yell, use sarcasm, or behave unprofessionally with parents for a few simple reasons. The first and most important one is because we will rarely win if we do so. Your most difficult parents have much more practice in arguing than you do. Chances are these people have already had several arguments on their way to your office. In all likelihood, a school’s most difficult parents spend much of their waking hours arguing. A second reason is that it is up to school administrators to model appropriate behaviors. Yelling at people is never an appropriate behavior. We control how many arguments we get into. Regardless of another person’s behavior, each one of us can ensure that we behave appropriately and professionally in all situations.

Many of the best schools in America have already discovered the power of positive contacts with parents. Although there is an initial investment in time to make these contacts, the time saved in the long run is documented by nearly every school that follows this suggestion. When parents see that school personnel contact them with good news as well as with bad news, a much greater sense of trust is established. Schools in which it is commonplace to send home positive notes and make positive telephone calls enjoy much greater credibility with the parents in the community. This dramatically reduces the number of negative parents that school administrators in these settings have to deal with.

Oftentimes, a false sense of pride limits a school administrator’s ability to admit to his or her mistakes. Too many administrators have had the notion of the principal as infallible leader tattooed in their minds. As a result, they feel that it is weak to admit being wrong. Nothing could be further from the truth. If we want parents to trust us, we must be honest with them. Admitting mistakes, and all schools make them, is necessary in order to establish collaborative relationships with parents.
Parents need to be reminded that they are partners with school personnel in educating children. When disagreements arise over discipline or any other school policies, school administrators ought to explain to parents how such policies lead to better lives for children. A caring attitude and a consistent message focused on what is best for children and their education can be of great assistance in explaining to parents that we are all on the same side.

Caring, committed educators routinely agonize over negative consequences with students. Oftentimes, these educators reduce consequences for student actions by rationalizing that the involved student is deserving of such treatment. A simple strategy for dealing with difficult parents is to make these “deals” known. In conversations with parents, it is helpful to use such language as, “Because this is the first time this has happened…” Or “Ordinarily this would result in a stiffer punishment…” Or “Because your son/daughter told the truth…” Such statements are then followed up by an explanation of the reduced consequence and a discussion about how the parents can assist you in ensuring that this situation does not happen again.

Focusing on the future is an additional strategy that school administrators should employ when facing a contentious parent. Oftentimes, parents choose to argue about situations that the school administrator knows very little about. In these cases, the strategy is to keep the parents focused on the future. Language like:

Hi, Mrs. Johnson. This is Bill Smith, assistant principal at Eastside Junior High. I am sorry to bother you at work but I wanted you to know that I received a bus report on Matthew for being out of his seat yesterday on the school bus. This is Matthew’s first bus report, which is a warning. However, if Matthew receives a bus report in the future then it will result in a five-day suspension from the school bus. (Whitaker & Fiore, 2001, p. 147)

Notice how this language shifts the focus of the conversation away from an issue that can be argued and toward one on which both parties agree. As the school administrator was not on the bus when the warning was issued, the parent can contend that Matthew was not even out of his seat. Too often, administrators find themselves in disagreements such as this. However, by shifting the conversation’s focus to what will happen in the future, the school administrator is now able to work cooperatively with the parent in arriving at a plan for preventing future occurrences. Each time the parent tries to bring the conversation back to the original incident, the school administrator can use language like, “Mrs. Johnson, as neither one of us was on the bus with Matthew today, let’s work together to develop a plan for the future. I know we share the goal of having school be productive and enjoyable for Matthew.”

There is no magic formula that will make all parents agreeable partners in the educational process. However, by embracing the dispositions described by ISLLC Standard 4 and by using some tried and true techniques, school administrators can sharply reduce the number of difficult parents that they deal with.
in turn, will free up time to work collaboratively with parents thereby making meaningful learning an even more natural byproduct of schooling for children.

**Creating External Partnerships**

Business partnerships, situations in which schools and businesses engaged in mutually beneficial projects used to be little more than good ideas for schools wishing to establish relationships within the larger community. Now, such partnerships have become necessities. The realization that business leaders’ opinions of our schools are critical in their decisions regarding where to search for their future workforce, coupled with the recognition that schools and businesses have a wealth of resources to offer one another that result in mutual benefit have spurred school leaders to establish relationships with businesses as a regular course of action. The language of ISLLC Standard 4, “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources,” verifies the value of collaboration.

Although the importance of forming and sustaining business partnerships continues to be recognized, scholars and educational organizations are providing some direction for school administrators who are not sure how to begin. Under the auspices of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the Council for Corporate and School Partnerships was established in March 2001. The purpose of the Council is to serve as a forum for the exchange of information, expertise, and ideas that will ensure that partnerships between businesses and schools achieve their full potential. At press, the Council is chaired by former U.S. Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander, and includes as its members former U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley, along with a number of national education association executive directors, state and local educators, and business representatives. (http://www.principals.org/s_nassp/sec.asp?TrackID=&SID=1&DID=47377&CID=12220&VID=2&RTID=O&CIDQS=&Taxonomy=$SpecialSearch=)

Building on the extensive insight gained through outreach and opinion research, the Council for Corporate and School Partnerships developed the following eight *guiding principles* for the development and implementation of school-business partnerships:

- School–business partnerships should be built on shared values and philosophies.
- Partnerships should be defined by mutually beneficial goals and objectives.
- Partnership activities should be integrated into the school and business cultures.
- Partnerships should be driven by a clear management process and structure.
- Partnerships should define specific, measurable outcomes.
Partnerships should have support at the highest level within the business and school and concurrence at all levels.

Partnerships should include detailed internal and external communications plans, which clearly illustrate expectations of all parties.

Partnerships should be developed with clear definitions of success for all partners.

For further information regarding *The Guiding Principles for Business and School Partnerships*, readers should contact the NASSP Resident Practitioner for Business at 800-253-7746.

Clearly, business partnerships must be more than schools asking businesses for donations. Instead, school administrators must take advantage of the opportunities that business partnerships create for giving to the community as well as receiving resources from the community. When school administrators engage in mutually beneficial partnerships, they experience a wonderful opportunity for enhancing their school’s public image. Many businesses and community members are unaware of the many dynamic things that go on in schools on a consistent basis. By engaging in partnerships with them, school administrators bring tremendous awareness about their schools into the community. Provided school administrators are adhering to all six ISLLC Standards, the wonderful things happening in our schools will surely be obvious to partners.

Another way in which school administrators foster partnerships is through their involvement with local civic organizations. While many school administrators join such organizations, membership in them is not necessarily implied in having a relationship with them. As civic organizations are influential in many communities, school administrators are wise to know who the leaders of these organizations are. Sharing the goals of the civic organizations and the goals of the school can lead to mutually beneficial relationships being formed. Many school administrators present information about their schools to these organizations during their regularly scheduled meetings, whether the administrator is a member of the organization or not. Figure 9.3 lists some of the more common organizations found in American communities. Although the list is not exhaustive, it does give administrators some idea of the organizations to look for. Again, partnerships with these organizations can be of great benefit to all schools.

**Figure 9.3 Common Civic and Cultural Organizations**

- AARP
- AMVETS
- American Red Cross
- American Cancer Association
- Kiwanis International
- Boy Scouts of America
- Girl Scouts
- Rotary International
Sustaining Positive Relationships with the Media

If school success is to be adequately understood in the external community, then school administrators must be able to create, foster, and sustain positive relationships with local media outlets. There is no group that is more influential in broadcasting news to a community than its local media outlets. Therefore, it is imperative that school administrators take the opportunity to develop relationships with the individuals who are responsible for media coverage within their community. While a course in school–community relations is the ideal setting for understanding the intricacies of such relationships, this section briefly explains how positive relationships with the media, an essential component of ISLLC Standard 4, are to be accomplished.

Print Media

Working with the print media in a school community requires, first and foremost, that the school administrator takes the necessary time to recognize all of the various print media outlets that exist. In some communities, this simply means that the school administrator recognizes the local newspaper. Other communities, however, are either so large or are situated in sprawling suburban or urban settings, that there may be many print media outlets that need to be recognized. Regardless, as school administrators focus on members of their schools external public with whom they ought to sustain positive relationships, members of the print media should be near the top of the list. These relationships should be formed early on in the administrator’s tenure. However, if a school administrator with a long tenure at a given school has not yet formed positive relationships with members of the print media, it is important to realize that it is never too late to start.

School administrators, consistent with the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 4, should initiate contact with members of the print media and discuss with them the preferred method for initiating future contacts. Some members of the media prefer being called on the telephone when
there is something newsworthy to report. Others prefer a quick email message. Still others are bound by regulations that may require such information to go through an editorial desk and not directly to the reporter. By contacting news reporters and asking them the best way in which to notify them of newsworthy events, school administrators are increasing the likelihood that they will get the positive news coverage they desire.

This conversation ought to focus on the school administrators’ needs, as well. Oftentimes, school administrators are annoyed when members of the news media contact them because the contact occurs at a time that the administrator finds to be inconvenient. While this cannot always be avoided, an initial conversation in which both parties express their communication preferences allows the reporter and school administrator alike to make their preferences known thereby increasing the likelihood that their preferences will be adhered to.

School administrators must also remember that reporters have a job to do. Although there are times in which a reporter’s questions can seem intrusive or otherwise troubling, it is important to note that strong human relations skills can go a long way toward bringing a school the media coverage it desires. For example, responding to a reporter’s request for information with kindness, promptness, and respect will dramatically increase the likelihood that the resulting news coverage will be positive.

In accordance with ISLLC Standard 4, effective media relationships must be formed and maintained by the school administrator. In order to maintain these relationships after they have been formed, school administrators need to continuously find ways to make it easier for members of the print media to print positive news about their school. Doing so accomplishes several key objectives. First, it enhances the relationship between the school and the reporter. Second, it increases the likelihood that the school will receive positive news coverage. Such coverage will serve to enhance the positive feelings that all members of the community have regarding the school. Third, by being done in the manner prescribed below, members of the news media will be made aware of good news happening within the school while, at the same time, members of the internal school community will be empowered to be involved in improving their school’s positive media coverage. The example below illustrates this point clearly.

Because school administrators have myriad responsibilities and cannot always be as attentive to members of the print media as they may like to be, it is important and consistent with ISLLC Standards 4, 5, and 6 for them to involve other school staff members in the process. Teachers can be involved in the process in the following way. On a monthly basis, the principal should pass out a form (see Figure 9.4) to teachers that asks them to list upcoming newsworthy events scheduled to occur in their classroom. This form should then be returned to the principal by the specified date so it can subsequently be forwarded to local newspaper contacts. Depending on the arrangements made with the newspaper reporters, the principal or the principal’s designee may need to prioritize all forms received before they are actually sent out so that the reporters will have assistance in prioritizing their coverage.
A similar form could be given to other members of the internal school community so that the excellent aspects of their work can also be acknowledged. The kitchen staff could report such events as nutrition month, special menus designed by students, or human-interest stories highlighting one of the cafeteria staff members. The custodial staff could report on maintenance upgrades or students caught doing their part to keep the school clean and attractive.

When the principal involves all members of the school community, then a great deal more information is often collected. People responsible for certain areas in the school think of newsworthy events that the school administrator may otherwise miss. Additionally, this process allows the news media to be flooded with more information than they can possibly print. As a result, they are in control of reporting on events based on their newspaper space availability. They are much more likely to fill in a small part of a page with a nice picture and a caption if you have informed them in advance of the opportunity than they would be if they needed to discover it on their own. They are likewise more likely to devote a major section of their newspaper to an event that you informed them of in advance. A key point not to be missed here is that this information should be sent to the print media at regularly scheduled intervals. Whether it is once a month or every other week is not as important as the fact that the newspaper reporters can anticipate the arrival of your information when planned. Nothing is more reassuring to the local education reporter than knowing there is a school they can count on regularly to send in newsworthy information.

**Local Radio**

Equally important to the print media in many communities are local radio stations. Although a viable source of information in some communities, public school information is rarely heard on local radio broadcasts. The primary rea-
son for this lies in the fact that many school administrators fail to understand the power and influence of this medium, and they fail to develop relationships with the members responsible for education coverage. While it is true that most people listen to the radio with a different level of awareness than they employ when they read newspapers, the fact is a vast majority of Americans tune in to radio broadcasts on a daily basis. For this reason alone, radio is a medium for communication that school administrators ought to pay careful attention to. The medium can be quite useful for broadcasting positive events about which the school administrator would like to make many people aware. Holiday concerts, schoolwide fundraisers, academic fairs, and athletic competitions are just some of the events that can be broadcast through radio. Most radio station program directors are more than willing to air announcements of these events at no cost to the school district. This is particularly true with radio stations that market themselves as being voices of the community. School administrators are wise to check with their local radio station program director regarding the particular policies for airing these announcements.

Airing public service announcements (PSAs), is another way in which local radio can be used to promote the school to the community, thereby improving communications and relationships. PSAs are essentially used for the following purposes:

- To inform the audience about a particular idea or belief of the school community.
- To conduct a campaign to generate understanding and/or support of a project requiring community support or participation.
- To advertise an event honoring educators, such as American Education Week.
- To highlight a school program or series of programs.

When writing a PSA, it is important for school administrators to remember that it ought to be written exactly the way the administrator desires it to be broadcast. Because the radio announcer most likely will be reading the PSA over the air in the precise way it was written, it is wise for the school administrator to read PSAs that they have written themselves to see how they sound. Practicing with an audience, even if it consists of one loyal advisor, is excellent advice. PSAs are rarely edited by radio station personnel before they are read over the air.

**Television Media**

A third, and final, portion of a community’s media outlets is the local television station. If this form of media exists in a given community, then school administrators are wise to initiate contacts with its representatives in much the same way as they do with print and radio media representatives. Although not routinely utilized in all communities, many school administrators have known the benefits of television for delivering messages to school stakeholders for some
time. These administrators have used the television medium for public service announcements, much like those broadcast via radio and for more personalized opportunities to be interviewed on the air. For the latter purpose, television can be a powerful communication tool, as well as one that requires careful preparation and attention. Unlike with radio and print media in which an individual’s words are all that are important, on-television appearance is significant as well. The old saying that one never gets a second chance to make a first impression is worth acknowledging here. The first impression television viewers have of a school administrator they see on the television screen will often be their lasting impression. Therefore, when asked a question, school administrators should ensure that they are able to get to the main point of their response within fifteen seconds, preferably within ten seconds. Oftentimes, that is all the time the viewer will allow before deciding that whether or not the person answering the question knows what he or she is talking about. Continuing along the lines of making a positive first impression, it is worthwhile to consider very carefully what an individual should wear for a television appearance or interview. Consider the following advice, offered by the National Association of Broadcasters:

- Wear suits or dresses of soft, medium colors. Avoid sharply contrasting patterns and colors.
- Keep jewelry simple and uncluttered.
- Men may require a little powder on a bald head, or if their skin is exceptionally oily.
- Women should avoid heavy makeup and the overuse of lipstick.
- To relax throat muscles and nerves before going on air, participants should yawn or stretch their body as they would if they were tired.
- Avoid unnecessary movements or gestures. These may attract the attention of the viewer and distract from what is being said or done.
- Move more slowly than normal—quick hand and body movements are difficult for the camera to follow.
- Also look, listen, and speak to the person conducting the interview. An exception would be if you have a key point to say directly to the viewing audience. In that case, it is appropriate to look directly at the camera.
- Resist the temptation to look at yourself on the TV monitor in the studio. This can be very distracting to the viewer.

Although it is perfectly acceptable to acquiesce a bit to current fashions, it is unwise to deviate much from what is customarily acceptable as a more conservative form of dress. Figure 9.5 summarizes key points to remember when making television appearances.
Figure 9.5 Eight Rules for Successful Television Appearances

1. Dress neatly and in soft, medium colors.
2. Sit up straight and do not squirm in the chair.
3. Enunciate clearly; do not hurry through your responses.
4. Avoid all educational jargon.
5. Speak in simple, straightforward words and sentences.
6. Look directly at the person interviewing you unless you look at the camera to make a point directly to the audience.
7. Be enthusiastic, pleasant, and positive.
8. Act naturally. Remember, you are not playing a role.

Applying ISLLC Standard 4 to Collaboration and Partnership Formation

Chapter 8 and this chapter have given practical meaning to the myriad ways in which school administrators collaborate with all school stakeholders. In Chapter 8, the focus was primarily on the decision-making process and the differences between individually generated decisions and those involving input from others. While there are clearly occasions in which school administrators must make important decisions on their own with absolutely no input from other people, it must be noted that decisions involving other people are often of a much higher quality. The knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 4 are couched in terms that accentuate the value of collaborating with stakeholders. Even though other Standards correctly acknowledge that school administrators, beginning with the end in mind, must be adept at individual decision making, ISLLC Standard 4’s intent cannot be fulfilled without a strong commitment toward collaborative decision making. This is particularly so when there are other school stakeholders with some expertise and a stake in the outcome of a decision.

Additionally, these two chapters explore specific ways in which school administrators can form lasting relationships with school stakeholders from various constituent groups. These relationships are the key to creating schools in which collaboration is genuinely seen as a way in which to promote the success of all students. A key point in this discussion involves the school administrator’s behavior when the involved stakeholders hold opinions that run contrary to those of the school administrator. The knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 4 contain language that clearly indicates the important role of the school administrator as conflict manager. For collaboration with individuals who hold diverse viewpoints to be successful, a leader with conflict resolution skills must be at the helm. Beyond this important skill, school administrators need to genuinely have respect for diverse viewpoints and opinions. It is one thing to be able to resolve disputes peacefully, but it is quite another to...
understand that diversity in thinking usually leads to even better results than would have been possible if everybody was of like mind to begin with.

In closing, let us examine the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 4. Paying particular attention to their wording, consider the relationships between the content of Chapter 8 and this chapter and the suggestions of ISLLC Standard 4.

**Standard 4**

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

**Knowledge**

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
- emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community
- the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community
- community resources
- community relations and marketing strategies and processes
- successful models of school, family, business, community, government and higher education partnerships

**Dispositions**

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
- schools operating as an integral part of the larger community
- collaboration and communication with families
- involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes
- the proposition that diversity enriches the school
- families as partners in the education of their children
- the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind
- resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students
- an informed public

**Performances**

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
- high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority
- relationships with community leaders are identified and nurtured
information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly
there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations
credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict
the school and community serve one another as resources
available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals
partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support school goals
community youth family services are integrated with school programs
community stakeholders are treated equitably
diversity is recognized and valued
effective media relations are developed and maintained
a comprehensive program of community relations is established
public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely
community collaboration is modeled for staff
opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided

Summary

It is absolutely essential for schools to have many solid partnerships within the community. These partnerships, whether with parents, businesses, community members, the media, or any other community stakeholder groups, have been consistently shown to make a big impact on the success of students. There are numerous studies cited, for example, heralding the improvements made in student achievement when parents are appropriately involved in the educational process. The kinds of partnerships described here and alluded to in ISLLC Standard 4, do not come about simply because all school administrators recognize that they should. Rather, school partnerships exist when school administrators have the skills necessary to create, foster, and sustain relationships with all stakeholder groups.

Among the stakeholder groups referred to, perhaps none is more important to the success of students than parents. Although powerful organizations and contemporary legislation consistently recognize the significant role parents play in the education of all children, on a practical level many school administrators have difficulty working with some of the more demanding and challenging parents that they encounter. Because of this reality, it is imperative that school leaders develop and regularly refine their skills in working with challenging parents. Preceding such skill development is, in many cases, a paradigm shift that recognizes parents’ value to the educational processes while understanding many of
Parent involvement is a known factor in student achievement. Studies and practice indicate that children are more successful and invested in school when their parents are involved. With the current accountability demands facing schools, educational leaders make a huge mistake if they fail to reach out to parents and seek their assistance. PTAs and PTOs are great organizations, but they don’t go far enough. Schools need other avenues for parent involvement, particularly specific ways in which parents can assist teachers as educational partners.

Studies indicating the achievement gains made when parents are involved in their child’s education typically don’t define what the involvement looks like. It’s logical to expect a correlation between student achievement and parent involvement, if for no other reason than because involved parents more typically are aware of what their child is studying in school. Educational leaders need to be leery of too much parent involvement. Having parents assist teachers directly is a recipe for disaster. There are legal ramifications of parents potentially accessing student records, and there is high potential of conflict between parents and teachers. Teachers are highly skilled, educated, and talented professionals. Teaching children should be their domain exclusively.

Questions

♦ Is it possible to strike a balance in parent involvement? Are there occasions in which parent involvement is productive, and are their occasions in which it is not? What steps do school administrators need to take as they work toward appropriate parent involvement?
♦ Which is a greater problem in schools in your district—under-involvement or over-involvement of parents? Which problem is worse? Defend your response.

the challenges and difficulties facing contemporary parents. As the dispositions of ISLLC Standard 4 state, “[t]he administrator believes in, values, and is committed to the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind.” Although school administrators may get frustrated from time to time while working with difficult parents, they must remain mindful of this reality.
It is, likewise, important for school administrators to develop partnerships within the business and/or civic community. Although an in-vogue trend several years ago that, regretfully, did not have much clear direction associated with its implementation, the formation and sustenance of meaningful business partnerships has recently been much more clearly framed and articulated. Contemporary school administrators now have cogent research to turn to in their quest for assistance in creating partnerships that will improve student learning. Consistent with ISLLC Standard 4, these partnerships should be formed and enhanced as schools pay even more attention to the needs of their communities.

Engaging in meaningful relationships with local media groups is yet another way in which school administrators exhibit the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 4. In order to stay connected to their communities, school administrators may discover no better ally than reporters from the local media. Just as some educators look askance at parents and claim that they are less than helpful, there are some who rely on the position that reporters are out to do harm. However, many of our best school leaders have discovered that in the vast majority of situations reporters like to report good news. School administrators desiring to strengthen relationships with their communities, thereby enhancing public opinion about their effectiveness, are well served to take the time necessary to form positive relationships with reporters.

Similar things can be said about relationships with other members of the local media. Depending on the community, many schools have access to local radio and television outlets. With some background knowledge about how these industries report news to the community, school administrators may find radio and television to be outstanding means by which to keep the public informed and involved in schools. Additionally, by forming relationships with local media outlets, school administrators show recognition that schools are integral parts of communities and, as such, have an obligation to keep the public informed.

ISLLC Standard 4 states “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.” In essence, this standard points to two responsibilities of school administrators. First, school administrators must believe that various stakeholders have an important role to play in the education of students. They must understand that schools are better when members of the community are involved. Second, school administrators must possess the skills necessary to illustrate to others how important it is for communities to be involved in schools. The mindset comes first, but the skills to act on those mindsets are also essential.

**Chapter Highlights**

♦ Contemporary school administrators are most effective when they appropriately involve parents in the educational process.
There is no simple formula for making parents agreeable partners in the educational process. However, by using some tried-and-true techniques, school administrators can sharply reduce the number of difficult parents that they deal with.

The Council for Corporate and School Partnerships developed eight guiding principles for the development and implementation of school–business partnerships.

Because civic organizations are influential in many communities, school administrators are wise to know who are the leaders of these organizations.

If school success is to be adequately understood in the external community, then school administrators must be able to create, foster, and sustain positive relationships with local media outlets.

When the principal involves all members of the school community in keeping the media informed of newsworthy events, then a great deal more information is usually collected.

In many communities, school administrators find radio and television to be outstanding means by which to keep the public informed and involved in schools.

Application Questions

1. Think of the most challenging parent you have had to work with as an educator. Were there some issues this parent dealt with that made the parent more difficult to deal with? How do you know this? Did you demonstrate an understanding and respect for the parent’s point of view? In hindsight, were there some things you could have done differently to get better results with that parent? Or, if you got excellent results, what did you do that led to those results?

2. Does your school make good use of opportunities to involve parents in the school? In particular, how parent-friendly is your school? If you were a parent in your school community, would you feel welcome? What are some specific things about your school that made you answer as you did? Should any of them be changed?

3. Examine the list of civic organizations in Figure 9.3 (page 207). How many of them are applicable to your community? If you were to rewrite that list, what additional organizations you would include?

4. Does your school get more positive or more negative media coverage? Why do you think this is so?
Field Activity

Meet with your school’s top-level administrator and discuss his or her plan for dealing with the media. Is there a specific plan in place, or does this administrator simply respond to the media as needs arise? Critique the effectiveness of this administrator’s efforts. Consider the following questions in your critique:

♦ Does the administrator know the names and contact information for members of the local print media?
♦ Does the administrator send positive news items to the local media on a consistent, regular basis?
♦ Is the administrator responsive to contacts that originate with local reporters?
♦ Is there evidence that the administrator understands that different types of media require different techniques and methods for successful communication?
♦ Has the administrator implemented measures to familiarize the school staff with names and contact information for members of the local media?

In addition to these questions, consider some of your own ways of discovering the strengths/weaknesses of this school administrator’s media relationship efforts. Build on your discoveries to design an actual plan that you would use if you were the school administrator.

Have You Thought About It?

Commonly, school administrators are unhappy with how they were quoted in the media. Many complain that their words were taken out of context, or that only part of what they said was presented. Oftentimes, they become gun shy about cooperating with members of the media afterwards. Mr. Abraham is at a crossroads. If he focuses on how news reports affect his relationships with internal and external publics, then he can become more cognizant of perceptions and work to improve them. If, instead, he remains angry about being caught off guard, then the likelihood of improved relationships does not look good.

What do you think?
Standard Five

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

In an effort to look holistically at the role of educational leadership in modern society, Chapter 10 begins by tracing the part that leaders at the federal government level have played in education throughout history. Understanding that the country’s focus and level of involvement in public education has changed over time provides a helpful backdrop to some reflection on the contemporary role of educational administrators in our present day environment. The study of specific tasks that school administrators at all levels undertake is explored, particularly in relation to the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 5.

Before going further, readers ought to examine the wording contained in the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of ISLLC Standard 5. Revisiting this list while reading Chapter 10 will provide opportunities for deeper understanding of the standard. This same table of knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators will be revisited at Chapter 10’s conclusion for easy reference.

**Standard 5**

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

**Knowledge**

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
* the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society
* various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics
the values of the diverse school community
professional codes of ethics
the philosophy and history of education

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
♦ the ideal of the common good
♦ the principles in the Bill of Rights
♦ the right of every student to a free, quality education
♦ bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process
♦ subordinating one’s own interest to the good of the school community
♦ accepting the consequences for upholding one’s principles and actions
♦ using the influence of one’s office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families
♦ development of a caring school community

Performances

The administrator:
♦ examines personal and professional values
♦ demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics
♦ demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance
♦ serves as a role model
♦ accepts responsibility for school operations
♦ considers the impact of one’s administrative practices on others
♦ uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain
♦ treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect
♦ protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff
♦ demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community
♦ recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others
♦ examines and considers the prevailing values of the diverse school community
♦ expects that others in the school community will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior
♦ opens the school to public scrutiny
♦ fulfills legal and contractual obligations
♦ applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately

Chapter 10 compares and contrasts the most common school administration positions, namely that of superintendent and principal at various school levels.
The purpose of that discussion is not to delineate all of the individual tasks inherent in each of those jobs, as doing so would be impossible given the great diversity characteristic of American public schools and their communities. Rather, the purpose of such a discussion is to shed light on the different ways in which school administrators must structure their thinking and their work days. In many ways, this examination allows for greater reflection on how the individual theories and concepts presented in the first nine chapters of this textbook present themselves in contemporary settings. Although an in-depth examination of these issues is too lengthy for this chapter’s purposes, its placement at a point in the text where five of the six ISLLC Standards already have been introduced is intentionally designed to assist readers in making these connections. Much of the discussions around ISLLC Standards 5 and 6 can be related to theories and concepts presented under the auspices of earlier standards.

Chapter 10 also closely examines issues of fairness and equity, particularly in relation to the work of school administrators. From an explanation of collective bargaining to some information about present inequities in school funding, this issue is presented because of its close ties to the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 5. This standard requires school administrators to make the conscious decisions to always act with integrity, fairness, and ethics. To do so and to promote the success of all students at all times, school administrators must consider the equity of all decisions in all situations.

The knowledge, skills, and dispositions inherent in ISLLC Standard 5 are closely related to the specific work that school administrators do in relation to the previous four standards. For example, although it is Standard 1 that specifically states the need for “a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community,” to do so in a way that ignores fairness, ethics, and integrity seems ridiculous at best.
At Titusville Middle School, Assistant Principal Karen Walker had learned four months ago that her principal would be retiring at the end of this current school year. Mrs. Walker was sorry to learn that her role model would be going, as she believes she has benefited greatly from the past three years, but she was also somewhat excited because she really believes that this might represent a very realistic chance for her to get the vacated principal position. As Mrs. Walker saw it, her best competition was new assistant principal, Charlie Jimenez, but he is only in his first year as an assistant principal!

Imagine Mrs. Walker’s dismay when she learns that Mr. Jimenez has just been offered the position. She sits in her office with many thoughts racing through her mind. She had thought her interviews went very well. She believed that she had the support of the school’s faculty. She was certain that the superintendent recognized that her credentials were more solid than those of Mr. Jimenez. “What could have gone wrong?,“ she wondered.

Think About It
As Mrs. Walker ponders these issues and deals with her sorrow at losing what she thought was a certain opportunity, she begins to question whether or not she really was ready to be a principal anyway. She begins to wonder if Mr. Jimenez is perhaps a better candidate because of how driven he is. She actually begins convincing herself that she was better off not getting the position that, four months ago, she really coveted.

Mrs. Walker’s behavior clearly can be explained by some noted process theories of motivation. As this chapter indicates, these theories differ from content theories of motivation in that they help us understand how people act when they are motivated, and they give us some insight into the process of motivation. As you read this chapter, consider how process theories of motivation help explain this scenario. Pay particular attention to issues of equity.

While in the broadest sense one would argue that the purpose of American public education has been constant, namely to educate the youth of America, a closer examination of the topic indicates that as governmental involvement in education has changed, so too has the expressed purpose of schooling. True, schools have always existed for the purpose of educating people. Over the last 100 years in American history, however, the emphasis on which people are educated and how that education is supported by the government has changed dramatically.

As changes in the government’s role in education have occurred, the very nature of school administration has changed along with it. This chapter examines the broad changes and shifts in focus that have characterized the government’s role in education over the last century. Additionally, the chapter examines how the role of the school administrator has needed to change to reflect contemporary school needs. Finally, this content is related to Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 5 which states that “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.”

An Historical Review of the Government’s Involvement in Education

Unlike in many other industrial nations, the United States does not have a national system of education. Instead, it can be said that the United States operates fifty different state educational systems. While this may seem like a stretch as national goals and standards increasingly influence what educators do, each state is still free to develop its own philosophies and goals for public education. To better understand this, one needs only to examine the U.S. Constitution. Although the Constitution makes no specific mention of education, the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution does indirectly address the authority for a system of education. The Tenth Amendment states “[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” This amendment created the basis for granting legal authority for public education to the states.
From the beginning, the United States of America was founded on the notion of separation of powers. Although the concept was originally intended to describe the means by which the executive, legislative, and judicial branches were to be independent and not infringe upon each other’s rights and duties, separation of powers also came to be seen as a descriptor for the relationship between the federal government and state government. Simply put, education was an established responsibility of the state and from the beginning the federal government was not going to meddle in state business. As an oversimplification, this worked quite well until the early part of the twentieth century. Although there are historical examples of federal involvement before then, up until the Great Depression public education, by and large, remained the responsibility of the states.

**Civilian Conservation Corps**

Brought on largely out of concerns for youth between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) was organized in 1933 to provide federal assistance for improving literacy and imparting vocational training to this target population. Although the CCC only lasted for ten years, more than 3 million youth were assisted by this federal appropriation, marking a turning point in the federal government’s involvement in education.

Several other federal programs, or Relief Acts, began during the Depression era as well. Rather than describing all of them, it is simply worth noting that they provided assistance for construction and repair of aging school facilities, financial aid to needy students, and unemployment assistance to targeted teachers. This aid was at a level not before seen, and it began to redefine the role of the federal government in education.

Shortly after the Great Depression, the United States found itself facing the prospects of entering World War II. This led to the next phase of federal activity with respect to education through three significant bills that were passed in a three-year period. The first one, the Lanham Act of 1941, provided funds for construction and maintenance of schools in areas where military personnel lived. The second one, the Occupational Rehabilitation Act of 1943, provided educational assistance to disabled veterans. The third, and most renowned, the Serviceman’s Re-adjustment Act of 1944, literally changed the lives of millions of people for decades. This act, more commonly known as the GI Bill, provided money for the education of veterans and was extended to conflicts which arose after World War II’s conclusion. To date, some 8 million veterans have attended institutions of higher education or specialized training schools through assistance from the GI Bill.

As the importance of a well-educated citizenry became even more apparent, the federal government continued to fund special programs designed to make the United States the most educated nation in the world. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was a prime example after the war acts that characterized the 1940s. More broadly implemented and targeting several distinct populations, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) recognized the importance of education in national defense and broadly funded programs that would thereby...
enhance the security of our nation. As our population became more diverse and as national defense began to encompass expertise in areas other than mathematics and science, NDEA programs continued to expand, providing funding in almost all subject areas.

**Elementary and Secondary Education Act**

Emphasizing equality, a new wave of federal involvement in education began in the 1960s and reached its crescendo in the 1970s. Fueled by the civil rights movement and the nation’s war on poverty, the federal government created several programs aimed at improving educational opportunities for the poor and minority populations. The most notable among these was the newly reauthorized *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA). This sweeping act, signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson in 1965, is considered a compensatory education act because of its goal of compensating for the difficulties facing disadvantaged students.

Also, during this time period, federal legislation focused on gender equality and the rights of handicapped students. Most notable in these areas were Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments to the *Civil Rights Act* and 1975’s Public Law 94-142 (the *Education for All Handicapped Children Act*). Whereas Title IX protected women from discrimination in educational programs that received federal assistance, PL 94-142 extended the right to a “free appropriate education” to all handicapped children. PL 94-142 has been rewritten several times since its introduction in 1975. In 1990, it was renamed as the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA).

Although the federal government’s involvement in education grew during an approximately fifty-year period, a dramatic shift in a different direction took place in 1980. Following newly elected President Ronald Reagan’s belief that the federal government was too involved in people’s lives through an overreliance on regulations, federal funding and federal regulations regarding educational programs were reduced.

Reduced funding from the federal government is not the only change that has taken place since 1980. Throughout the presidencies of Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, Clinton, and G.W. Bush, we have witnessed an increased focus on national standards. The standards movement essentially began with Reagan’s appointment of William Bennett as secretary of education (1985–1988). Arguably the most controversial secretary of education, Bennett followed the 1983 policy reform report, *A Nation at Risk*, with several forceful positions on national educational issues. Most notable among these were Bennett’s calls for academic standards, teacher accountability, and moral education.

The call for national standards continued and has reached a point early in this century where it has changed, in many ways, the face of American public education. Dozens of states have developed learning standards in recent years and have begun implementing them with significant consequences for schools if students do not meet the states’ standards.
The Changing Role of School Administrators

As the federal government has altered its level of involvement in education, the role of the school administrator has undergone many changes. If we look back approximately sixty years, the primary responsibility of school administrators was to manage the school. Instructional leadership was both a luxury and a rarity. This is not to imply that administrators of bygone days were inadequate. In fact, they performed their duties quite well. The point is to recognize that in the not too distant past, schools were not the great equalizers that they became in the 1960s and 1970s. Because of the nature of public education and the reduced federal role that existed in the earlier part of the last century, pressure for schools to perform well for all children was sharply reduced from what it is today. As a result, school administrators were simply required to be good managers.

The management responsibilities of school administrators have not been reduced. Instead, other roles and responsibilities have simply been added. Examine the ISLLC Standards as an indication of this point. Standard 3 is vitally important. As this textbook has illustrated, the ability of school administrators to manage the school and its resources is of paramount importance to student success. However, there are five other Standards that are equally important today. It is benchmarks, such as the ISLLC Standards provide, that enable contemporary school administrators to make sense out of complex educational changes. Struggling with the feeling that the job of the school administrator has simply become too big, the ISLLC Standards help school administrators define those aspects that are most important. They bring focus to a rapidly changing job.

As the federal government began to provide appropriations to public schools, targeting specific populations, the natural outgrowth was a demand for accountability. A simple truth exists here. Namely, accountability follows commitment of resources. Any level of government demands accountability once resources are committed. The challenge posed for school administrators was largely an issue of timing. As the federal government committed more resources to public schools, the school effectiveness research and the reform report, *A Nation at Risk*, both hit center stage. The convergence of these two streams of research, coming on the heels of unprecedented federal funding for education, created increased pressure on public schools to perform better than they had before.

Interestingly, much of the effective schools research of the 1980s identified the principal as the key to creating conditions for change in schools that would lead to increased student achievement. While there is no arguing the influence of the school principal and the power of the principal’s role as a change agent, some educational agencies interpreted this research too liberally. Instead of focusing on the role of the school principal as leader, visionary, and change agent, many state departments of education and leadership academies promoted unrealistic expectations of principals as prime movers in affecting student achievement.

As the standards movement has picked up speed and the public has become more adamant about success for all students, those who view the principal as the prime player in improving student achievement have raised the stakes
even higher for school administrators. Again, the answer to these high stakes and often unrealistic expectations lies in an understanding and acceptance of the six ISLLC Standards. Principals who study the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of these standards clearly see the value in embracing them. The ISLLC Standards appropriately balance the need for vision, leadership, management, communication, and ethics in a way that provides the necessary skills for successfully administering public schools today.

**Administrative Job Functions**

Although the specific job functions of administrators vary greatly from school district to school district, there are some commonalities, which will be explored here. The purpose is to develop an understanding of the complexity of administration in contemporary educational settings. Before examining specific administrative roles and the duties they contain, a distinction must be made between school-based administrators and central office administrators. Again, although there is variance in how these terms are defined, school-based administration generally refers to administrative assignments that take place primarily at an individual school. Conversely, central office administration generally refers to administrative assignments that primarily consist of districtwide responsibilities. The scope of these responsibilities is determined somewhat by the number of administrative positions that are staffed in each setting. For example, the duties of a superintendent who is the sole central office administrator are considerably different from those of a superintendent in a large school district with several other central office administrators. Although there are many other administrative positions and titles, this section describes the typical duties of superintendent, high school principal, middle school/junior high school principal, elementary school principal, and assistant principal.

**Superintendent**

As the chief school district administrator, the superintendent holds a job similar in some ways to that of a chief executive officer in a private company. While the particular skill set required for success from school district to school district may vary somewhat, the superintendent always must be adept at managing large operations and must possess excellent communication skills. Essentially, the superintendent is both the administrative head of the school district and the executive officer of the school board to which the superintendent reports. The superintendent of schools typically has responsibility for the general supervision and management of all aspects of school district operations. The superintendent may delegate responsibility for administering various segments of school district operations but is ultimately responsible to the school board for the results produced. The depth and breadth of the central office administrative staff determines, in large part, the specific duties that superintendents carry out as part of their daily charge. However, the following list of responsibilities is a typical representation of the scope of a superintendent’s work. Additionally, the
language used represents a compilation of job descriptions found throughout the United States.

♦ Serve as the administrative and executive officer of the school board.
♦ Recommend to the school board such policies and procedures that in his or her judgment are necessary for the efficient conduct of the schools and carrying into effect with the aid of his or her staff such policies and procedures as are authorized by the board.
♦ Ensure that the laws and regulations of the state board of education and the district are faithfully executed.
♦ With the approval of the school board, prescribe such regulations for the government of the school system and its employees necessary to secure efficiency and promote the best interests of the school system.
♦ Prepare the annual budget and present it to the school board for consideration and approval at times determined by the school board.
♦ Determine appropriate consequences for policy violations.
♦ Make recommendations for hiring, nonrenewing, or dismissing staff and bringing resignations of staff to the school board.
♦ Assign, transfer, promote, and discipline staff.
♦ Assume responsibility for the expenditures of funds approved in the annual budget.
♦ Keep, or cause to be kept, records, books, and papers pertaining to the business of the district, and preserve statistical records and reports pertaining to the status of each phase of school operations.
♦ Have control over all buildings, equipment and supplies belonging to the district, and keep an up-to-date inventory of all items.
♦ Study the educational and financial conditions and needs of the district, and recommend to the school board plans and policies for improvement.
♦ Maintain relationships beneficial to the district with local and state public leaders.
♦ Interpret policies and actions of the school board to the staff.
♦ Provide educational leadership to the school board, the schools, and the community.
♦ Promote good public relations between the school and the community by school activities, press, radio and TV releases, PTA activities, personal participation in community activities, bulletins and reports; encourage each employee of the district through performance of duty, community activities, and personal conduct to be an ambassador for good public relations.
♦ Submit to the school board each year a detailed report of information, facts, and statistics that illustrate the state and progress of all schools in the district.

♦ Develop and implement short- and long-range planning.

♦ Provide for an inservice educational program for certificated and classified personnel.

♦ Delegate duties and responsibilities to officers or employees employed by the district except where policy or regulations of the school board prohibit such delegation of authority.

♦ Perform such other duties and exercise such other authority as may be required of or conferred upon him by law or by the school board.

Although these 21 superintendent duties represent a sampling of responsibilities inherent in the job, the list is not intended to characterize the work of all superintendents. Rather, the purpose is to encourage reflection on the typical responsibilities and an awareness of how they differ in scope and magnitude from those of administrators at the school-building level. An attempt to describe the duties of deputy/assistant superintendents would be fruitless as such duties are contingent upon the specific duties assigned to the superintendent of schools. Suffice it to say that the size of a school district and the number of functions it deals with (i.e., business, special services, transportation, governmental relations) determines, in large part, the number of deputy/assistant superintendent positions available to that district. Then, the specific responsibilities of the people in those positions are likewise determined by such issues as size of the district and depth of the administrative staff.

**The High School Principal**

Largely because high school enrollment tends to be larger than enrollment in middle schools or elementary schools, the high school principal typically supervises a large staff and student body. Also, because high schools distinguish themselves from middle schools and elementary schools by the number of curricular and extracurricular offerings they provide, the scope of a high school principal’s work tends to be larger than that of middle school and elementary school counterparts. This is not to say that the job of a high school principal is necessarily more difficult than that of other school administrators, but it does acknowledge the great variance in responsibilities that high school principals experience. High school principals supervise extensive and diverse curricular offerings, and they also assume responsibility for an extracurricular program that often includes multiple sports, arts, and technical modules.

This extensive availability of extracurricular opportunities leads the high school principal into a very visible role in most communities. While all school principals need strong communication and public relations skills, the high school principal is ordinarily more visible to the public than are principals at other levels. It is important to recognize this, as the ability to demonstrate strong,
committed leadership to the public is an important component of a high school principal’s success.

Typically, high school principals are called upon to work very long hours. It is not uncommon to find high school principals arriving at school early each day. Considering that in many districts high schools begin operation earlier in the day than do middle or elementary schools, this work day can begin as early as 6:00 or 6:30 a.m. Also, the extracurricular offerings at the high school keep high school principals at work supervising two or three evenings a week. All in all, the hours that high school principals work are among the longest in public school administrative posts.

These long hours and diverse responsibilities are not without rewards, however. In examining administrative salaries, it is apparent that high school principals do receive more compensation for their work than do middle school or elementary school principals. According to data supplied by the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, average salaries paid to principals during the 2006–2007 school year were:

- High school principal: $92,965
- Middle school principal: $87,866
- Elementary school principal: $82,414

The Middle/Junior High School Principal

Although the specific philosophies of junior high schools and middle schools differ, they are included together in this section as an acknowledgement that some localities use a junior high school structure whereas others favor a middle school structure. The distinction is important, as the development of middle schools occurred in response to what many educators deemed to be the shortcomings of junior high schools. In particular, Wood, Nicholson, and Findley (1985) state “[t]here is a growing belief that the junior high school is no longer serving its original purpose and is taking on more and more characteristics of a senior high school” (p. 6). While grade span is one distinguishing factor separating junior high schools from middle schools, it is certainly not the only distinguishing factor. Philosophies about grouping and teaching practices more conducive to early adolescents are believed to be more associated with the middle school concept than with the traditional junior high school concept.

The role of middle school principals, therefore, is a pivotal one. While prior to the emergence of middle schools junior high school principals almost always came from the ranks of high school teachers, this is no longer the case. Now many middle school administrators come from elementary school backgrounds. As middle schools attempt to address both the academic and social needs of
students, they are seen as transitions between the self-contained environment of elementary schools and the departmentalized environment of high schools.

The result of serving such a transitional role is that middle schools often champion instructional teaming and other grouping processes. This is done to avoid the shock that would occur if students were rapidly transitioned from a self-contained environment to a typical high school environment. The grouping characteristic of many middle schools provides early adolescent students with the right blend of containment and flexibility to ease their transition.

This requires middle school principals to be expert at collaboration. Although all levels of administration demand collaboration skills, the nature of middle schools perhaps demands this even more. Students in middle schools are asked to collaborate with others more often than they had before, and teaching faculty in middle schools must collaborate with one another. The interpersonal conflicts and/or student discipline issues that can arise in such an environment are best dealt with by a school principal who collaborates with others and possesses strong conflict resolution skills.

Also, middle school principals must be familiar with varied curricular issues and must support an ever growing extracurricular program. Although the requirement for attending extracurricular programs after school is reduced from that of a high school principal, it nevertheless exists. Fewer extracurricular offerings than there are at typical high schools means fewer evenings at work for middle school principals, but the expectation that one to two late afternoons are spent at such offerings is part of the typical middle school principal’s responsibility.

**The Elementary School Principal**

The role expectations of elementary school principals have perhaps changed more than have any other educational administration roles. Increased accountability demands and a growing societal interest in providing school services to children prior to kindergarten age are two of the areas prompting these changes. While elementary schools of old employed “head” teachers to oversee the managerial aspects of the school, growing demands led to the emergence of full-time principals some years later. Today, it is not uncommon to see elementary school administrations growing as many elementary schools now employ assistant principals as well.

The typical elementary school administrator must be very knowledgeable of instructional methodologies and child development. As the years that a child spends in elementary school set the foundation for later school success, elementary school principals must be skilled at motivating students and at making school rewarding. Providing instructional support to teachers in these formative years is a critical task for the successful elementary school principal.

Additionally, elementary school principals, although generally not as visible in the community as middle school or high school principals, must be adept at working cooperatively with parents. Although parental involvement in education is important at all school levels, elementary schools typically enjoy a more
involved organization of parents than do other schools. Along with this organi-
zational involvement, individual parent concerns are very prevalent in elemen-
tary schools as parents recognize the significance of children feeling successful
during the elementary years.

Most elementary schools are characterized by far fewer extracurricular of-
ferings than are characteristic of middle schools and certainly of high schools.
This is a result of the recognition that young children need time for rest and un-
coordinated social interaction. As a result, the time drain on elementary school
principals, often reflected in salaries, is somewhat less demanding than it is with
secondary school principals. Nevertheless, the work of an effective elementary
school principal is both demanding and challenging.

The Assistant Principal

As the first administrative role most educators assume, the assistant principal’s job is an important one to understand. However, as the job with the most varied definitions, it is perhaps the most difficult one to characterize. This is largely because the specific roles assistant principals assume often come directly from the responsibilities passed on to them by their principals.

In its purest sense, the term assistant principal refers to an individual who assists the principal. Many studies of administrative roles and responsibilities have concluded that the extent to which an assistant principal assists or supports the principal determines, in large part, their effectiveness as determined by the principal (Hartzell, 1993; West, 1993). As principals have their own strengths and their own aspects of administration that they feel most adept in, their selection of which responsibilities will rest with the assistant principal vary considerably.

Nevertheless, the assistant principal can usually expect to be involved in student discipline to a great extent. As discipline issues can be time-consuming and laborious, particularly in large schools, a focus on them can stand in the way of instructional leadership issues that are necessary for contemporary school principals. As our culture continues to emphasize the role of the principal as instructional leader, more and more principals work to free up their time to assume this role (Hoy & Hoy, 2003; Portin, Shen, & Williams, 1998). Delegating discipline issues to an assistant principal is one way to ensure that time is available for instructional leadership.

Another obvious difference characterizing the work life of many assistant principals is the size and level of the school. A simple truth is that assistant principals in one kind of school perform far different tasks than do assistant principals in different settings. In many elementary schools, for example, assistant principals are employed as half-time teachers and half-time administrators. In these cases, the work performed as assistant principal tends to be more curricular in nature. As somebody who teaches the curriculum half-time, these individuals are well positioned to assume leadership in the implementation of the curriculum.
In larger secondary schools, there is more than one assistant principal. This represents an ideal opportunity for the principal to divide leadership responsibilities among assistant principals on the basis of each individual’s strengths and/or areas of expertise. Or, particular tasks such as student discipline can be shared by multiple administrators, freeing each one up to pursue other administrative functions.

It was once true that assistant principals were people who ultimately aspired to the principalship and beyond. This is no longer necessarily the case (Kowalski, 2003). Nowadays, as the scope of responsibilities has changed, many educators see employment as an assistant principal to be the end of their career path and goals.

**The Good Old Days**

Much attention has been paid to the roles and responsibilities of school administrators in contemporary schools. It is important to remember as you reflect on these roles and responsibilities that changing times continue to produce changes in what we expect of school administrators. The nation’s public schools cannot continue to improve if administrators and other educators refuse to do their work differently.

Having said this, it is equally important that all educators remember that change for change’s sake is never warranted. The ISLLC Standards have been created to keep school administrators focused on those aspects of their professionalism that lead to student success. Student success, therefore, is always the focal point of a school administrator’s work. While this truth is inescapable, we cannot allow it to be misrepresented by those who believe that our schools must go backwards to a time that they recall as having been better for our students. The truth is students have never been more successful at any earlier point in American educational history. There may have been a privileged few who felt that they were better off, but public schools have never before been asked to educate as diverse a population as they are asked to educate today. Contemporary school administrators are leading schools whose results are unparalleled in America’s history. Consider the following facts as evidence that the good old days were not as good as some remember them to have been:

- In 1889, 335 of 400 colleges found the background of entering freshmen to be so deficient that they needed to set up special preparatory departments to compensate.
- In 1941, the Naval Officers’ Training Corps reported that sixty-two percent of the 4,200 college freshmen tested failed a test of basic mathematics.
- In 1945, only four of ten Americans who entered school completed four years of high school. Forty years later, this number had climbed to almost nine of ten.
In 1954, sixty-two percent of American colleges found it necessary to teach high school algebra to freshmen. (Schlechty, 1997, p. 4)

It is important to recall that these problems, with all due respect to past educational leaders, existed at a time when the population to be educated was smaller and more homogeneous than it is today. School administrators are well served to remember these facts and to consider them in light of much of the unwarranted criticism they face today.

**Collective Bargaining and Negotiations**

Recalling that there is not a federal system of education in the United States, the means by which administrative teams determine compensation, benefits, and working conditions of their employees vary greatly. In some states and localities, these issues are determined by and at the sole discretion of the local school board. Employees in such school districts are offered a package including compensation and expectations that they can freely approve or reject at their individual discretion. In some ways, this mirrors the personnel processes of many other industries. An individual applies for a job, is offered the position, discusses the compensation, benefits, and expectations, and then determines whether or not they are acceptable. If most prospective employees feel that the compensation and benefits are too small for the work required, then the hiring board, at its discretion, can modify the package to attract more candidates.

In other states and localities, public school educators are part of a union and, consequently, they have tremendous input into the expectations regarding compensation, benefits, and working conditions. Although the hiring process in these school districts may appear, on the surface, to be similar to the process in school districts described earlier, the decisions that lead to the determination of compensation, benefits, and working conditions are made collectively by management and employees.

In defining key terms, a union may be considered to be a formal organization of employees that was formed for the sole purpose of influencing management’s decisions regarding the conditions of employment. The means by which unions and management interact in determining conditions of employment is referred to as collective bargaining. More specifically, collective bargaining is the process of negotiating and then administering the contract between a union and management. The term contains the word “collective” because representatives are selected from within the organization to work as a unit in representing the concerns of their members.

Collective bargaining agreements, or the contracts that result from the collective bargaining process, are generally lengthier and more complex than are contracts that have not been collectively bargained. While there is no standard length associated with collective bargaining agreements, in many localities the page numbers exceed 100. In many states, statute determines the issues that are to be included in collective bargaining agreements. Although collective bargain-
ing agreements are legal and binding on both parties, there remain some issues, varying from locality to locality that are not negotiable.

The collective bargaining process consists of a series of meetings between two teams of negotiators. The teachers, often the largest bargaining unit in a school district, select their members, and the administrative team selects its team members. While the superintendent is often a member of the negotiations team in smaller school districts, this is not always the case. As the chief administrative officer, many superintendents consider it unwise for them to sit at the bargaining table. Oftentimes, a different senior-level school administrator, or a board member, acts as chief negotiator for management. It is common practice for one to three principals to sit on the team, as they can represent management and they have an understanding of how the contract impacts daily school operations. Finally, some school districts include an attorney or labor relations specialist on their negotiations team.

The collective bargaining process involves these two teams sharing proposals and/or counterproposals relative to the contract items that each party would like to see changed. This process may take several long meetings to work through, as some issues are difficult to reach an agreement on. Generally, a new contract is agreed upon, but sometimes the two sides find themselves at an impasse and need to go through mediation and arbitration to settle the contract. While collective bargaining routinely is a smooth process in many school districts, there are other times in which the process leads to bitter feelings between teachers and administrators. These bitter feelings, if left unchecked, can severely damage a school district.

Although an essential human resource function of school administrators, collective bargaining and the negotiations process are discussed in light of ISLLC Standard 5 because of the inherent need for ethics, integrity, and fairness in the process. Though negotiation sessions in the collective bargaining process may contain bitter disagreements with both sides of the table holding fast to particular issues, school administrators must remember that the intended outcome of this process is to enhance the education of children and to ensure the success of all students. ISLLC Standard 5 says “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.” While the negotiations process can be trying, regardless of whether the contract is bargained collectively or simply approved by the school board, it is easy for school administrators to lose sight of what is really important. Budget crises, for example, can often lead to an exaggerated focus on the bottom line. As long as the school administrator possesses the knowledge and dispositions and engages in the performances of ISLLC Standard 5, then ethics, fairness, and integrity will prevail in the decision-making process.

**Process Theories of Motivation**

Earlier in this textbook, an understanding of content theories of motivation was developed. It was explained that these content theories, most notably those
of Maslow, Herzberg, and Alderfer, helped explain what it is that motivates people. Conversely, process theories of motivation, the subject of this section, explain how individuals are motivated. As the name implies, process theories concern themselves with the process of motivation. While it is vitally important that school administrators truly understand the wisdom that comes from content theories of motivation, knowledge of the two process theories presented here will help all administrators to act with fairness, integrity, and in an ethical manner. In the context of ISLLC Standard 5, this is the calling of all school leaders.

**Equity Theory**

Though other theorists, like Herzberg, have concerned themselves with the role of equity in motivation, Stacy Adams developed the most relevant, detailed equity theory of all. The application of Adams’ Equity Theory to the behaviors of school personnel are obvious and easy to recognize. Many school administrators have reported that an understanding of Equity Theory has provided great assistance to them in motivating teachers and staff.

Essentially, Equity Theory holds that employees pay close attention to the outcomes they receive from their work environment, and they weigh these outcomes, consciously or subconsciously, against the inputs that they put into their work to achieve these outcomes. The expectation of employees, according to Equity Theory, is that the ratio of their outcomes to their inputs will be equitable. Already, the relevance to ISLLC Standard 5 ought to be apparent.

Additionally, Equity Theory asserts that employees judge the equity or fairness of the above mentioned ratio through a comparison with a peer or colleague, known as the “comparison other.” The comparison other may be an individual colleague, or it may be manifested as some sort of group average based on the outcomes of several colleagues. The important concept to understand is that the employee will judge the outcomes he/she receives from his/her inputs against those received by the comparison other. If the comparison other receives greater outcomes for the same or lesser inputs, or even the same outcomes for lesser inputs, then an inequity will be perceived. Inequity, the theory holds, leads to job dissatisfaction, while an equitable or fair situation contributes to job satisfaction.

An obvious goal school leaders ought to have, based on this theory, is to restore equity whenever inequity is perceived. If equitable situations lead to job satisfaction, then it stands to reason that a motivated faculty would be one in which people are treated equitably. The difficulty in achieving this goal, however, lies in the fact that it is the perception of the individual workers that is important; not the perception of the school administrator. An administrator may believe that he/she treats all employees fairly and equitably, but if this is not the perception of each individual employee, then motivation may still suffer. Perception, in this case, really is reality. As long as a worker perceives an inequity, then there is a much greater chance of job dissatisfaction.

Incumbent upon school administrators, therefore, is the need to recognize when an employee feels that a significant inequity is present in the work envi-
ronment. What follows are six typical responses that employees have to inequitable situations. Though different employees in different circumstances may exhibit any of the six responses described, recognizing these as the typical responses to inequitable situations is of great assistance to school administrators. Only if the school administrator understands that an employee perceives an inequity can he/she have any hope of restoring equity and improving motivation and satisfaction.

**Figure 10.1. Ways Employees Restore Equity**

1. **Change Their Comparison Other**—If an employee believes that his/her comparison other is receiving greater outcomes for the same or lesser inputs, he/she may choose to compare himself/herself to a different comparison other. Oftentimes, by comparing oneself to a known individual who receives lesser outcomes than we do can help us to restore equity in our minds.

2. **Quit the Organization**—Sometimes, the only way an employee feels that equity can be restored is to simply quit or leave the organization altogether.

3. **Change Their Inputs**—If an employee believes that an inequity exists, then he/she may simply reduce the amount or quality of the work performed. If, for example, an employee feels underpaid, then he/she may spend less time on the job or do work of poorer quality than before in order to restore equity.

4. **Change Their Outcomes**—Though employees rarely have the opportunity to choose this option, sometimes workers can alter what they receive without increasing their workload at all. This is often the draw of large professional organizations and unions. Recalling the collective bargaining discussion from earlier in this chapter, a union can attract members by pledging to improve employee working conditions and salaries without requiring any additional work to be performed.

5. **Cognitively Distort Their Inputs or Outcomes**—A somewhat common coping mechanism people engage in is to cognitively distort that which causes them discomfort. Oftentimes, if an employee perceives an inequity at work, by cognitively distorting the situation, he/she makes himself/herself feel better. For example, if a colleague receives a promotion that another employee really wanted, then the employee who was not promoted may rationalize the situation by convincing himself/herself that the colleague had more knowledge, greater experience, or was simply more deserving for any number of other reasons. Similarly, if an employee feels that he/she is receiving inadequate recognition, then he/she may rationalize this discomfort away by convincing himself/herself that their best effort was not put forward.
6. Change the Inputs or Outcomes of the Comparison Other—It is also possible that an individual seeking equity may attempt to change the quality of the work done by the comparison other through some means of interference, or may even interfere in the rewards that the comparison other receives. This may be done by putting pressure on the comparison other, reminiscent of the pressure put on rate busters in the Hawthorne Studies.

School administrators, therefore, particularly in keeping with the intent of ISLLC Standard 5, are well served to be on the lookout for signs that employees feel there are inequitable situations in the workplace. Upon discovering these feelings, school administrators ought to assist employees in appropriately restoring equity. This does not mean that school administrators are charged with needing to actually restore equity in all cases. Rather, it is important for the administrator to work on the perceptions of inequity expressed by their employees. Sometimes, when employees complain of an inequity, their perception may be accurate. In these instances, school administrators should work hard to immediately restore equity. On other occasions, however, employees perceive inequities that are not entirely accurate. Workers may be jealous of the rewards given to colleagues simply because they do not have all of the facts surrounding the administration of those rewards. Rookie teachers may feel that veteran teachers get better treatment, more cooperative parents, more able students, and higher salaries while putting forth less effort. School administrators, knowing that these perceived inequities are not entirely accurate, must still deal with them. Sitting down with the jealous employee and helping the individual to see things differently is a necessary step for any administrator desirous of removing inequitable situations. Drawing on the six common behaviors described in Figure 10.1, oftentimes school administrators need to help school staff members choose different comparison others to restore equity. As it is rarely helpful to have a disgruntled employee do less work or quit the organization, astutely leading the employee to a different comparison other is often the most helpful solution.

As has been mentioned many times throughout this textbook, knowledge of the people who make up the school organization is vital. If school administrators wish to keep employees motivated and satisfied at work, then knowledge of Equity Theory may be helpful. It is the knowledge of people and the ability to discover when they may perceive inequity that must supersede the theoretical knowledge.

**Expectancy Theory**

Expectancy Theory, oft-associated with names like Victor Vroom, Lyman Porter, and Edward Lawler, has received great attention over the last four decades and has been modified and tweaked to the point where some claim it is too complex. While it may be true that some expectancy models have become quite detailed and are thus difficult to measure, the basic expectancy model has
tremendous credibility and can be used to accurately predict the motivation of individuals in the workplace.

There are four basic assumptions of Expectancy Theory. First, Expectancy Theory assumes that people join organizations with expectations about their needs and wants. Second, there is an assumption that the needs and wants people have are individual and varied. Third, Expectancy Theory holds that an individual’s behavior is the result of conscious choice. Finally, the fourth assumption is that people will make choices at work that will lead to optimal situations for themselves.

The four assumptions mentioned above lead to four key elements of Expectancy Theory, as described by Vroom. These four elements are described in Figure 10.2.

**Figure 10.2. Four Elements of Expectancy Theory**

1. **Outcomes**—First-level outcomes describe the performance that results from expending some effort on a task. Second-level outcomes refer to the consequences of first-level outcomes. For example, if a teacher performs her teaching duties well (first-level outcome), then she may be rewarded with a salary increase (second-level outcome).

2. **Expectancy**—The belief that effort will result in the desired performance (first-level outcome) is called expectancy. Expectancy can be plotted along a range of 0 to 1. If somebody sees absolutely no chance that effort will lead to the desired performance, then the expectancy is 0. If, on the other hand, somebody is absolutely certain that their effort will lead to the desired performance, then the expectancy is 1. Typically, workers’ beliefs of expectancy lie somewhere between the two extremes of 0 and 1.

3. **Instrumentality**—The relationship between first-level outcomes and second-level outcomes is referred to as instrumentality. Again, instrumentality is based on probabilities and ranges from 0 to 1. If, for example, a teacher is absolutely convinced that good teaching performance (first-level outcome) will lead to a salary increase (second-level outcome), then the instrumentality has a value of 1. Conversely, if the teacher sees absolutely no relationship between good teaching and a salary increase, then the instrumentality is 0.

4. **Valence**—Simply stated, valence is the strength of the individual’s desire for a particular outcome or reward. When valence is high and the individual desires the outcome, we expect to see a different level of effort than we do if the valence is low and the individual has no desire for the reward or outcome. While expectancy theory is a process theory of motivation, valence provides the link to content theories, as valence speaks to the content of what an individual actually wants.
In summary, while attempting to simplify Expectancy Theory, it is evident that the motivation of an individual at work is a function of (1) the expectancy that a certain level of performance will result from the expended effort and (2) the instrumentality that rewards will result from certain levels of performance. Both of these variables are moderated by the valences, or strength, attached to these outcomes by the individual. Strongest motivation occurs when there is high expectancy, high instrumentality, and high positive valence. The lowest motivation, conversely occurs when there is low expectancy, low instrumentality, and low or weak valence. Moderate motivation can occur if one or two of the three elements are low while the remaining element(s) is high.

The two process theories of motivation presented here can be very useful to school administrators desiring to exhibit the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 5. An administrator who cares enough to really get to know the people being led will typically understand a great deal about how people feel while in the workplace. Understanding the feelings, attitudes, and desires of teachers and staff helps position a school principal to be able to effectively apply both Equity Theory and Expectancy Theory. The application of these theories, coupled with knowledge of the content theories of motivation presented earlier, will propel school leaders into positions of equity, fairness, ethics, and integrity.

Equality and Equity in Education

ISLLC Standard 5 states that a school administrator acts with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. This standard is so important, particularly in a time that finds many people questioning the equality and equity of opportunities that exist for students in our schools. But what is really meant by equity? How does it differ from equality? Finally, can appreciation for the two terms lead administrators toward behavior that can be described as occurring with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner?

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (www.m-w.com) defines equity as “justice according to natural law or right; specifically: freedom from bias or favoritism” and equality as “the quality or state of being equal.” Although many people confuse these two terms, it is clear that their meanings are quite different. In schools, administrators clearly should concern themselves with equity. There will always be situations in which an individual student, or perhaps even a group of students, will require differentiated treatment. This should not occur because of favoritism or because of any bias in favor of or against any individual or group. It should occur, and it does occur, however, because educators have long recognized that much of what they do must be individualized. Different situations with different students do often require differentiated treatment. While it is always wise and fair to try and treat people the same and govern them by the same rules and standards, education is not a business in which inanimate products are manufactured. Instead, education is an endeavor that is humane. As such, differing situations do require differentiated treatment.
What is important for school administrators to remember is that individual treatment must be given because of an overwhelming desire to act fairly and with integrity. Such is the precise demand of ISLLC Standard 5: “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.” This simply means that school administrators behave with integrity, fairness, and ethics because such behavior will promote the success of all students. Holding everybody to the exact same standard in all situations will promote the success of some students or of most students. This is obviously not the intent.

Jonathan Kozol, winner of the National Book Award for his 1967 book *Death at an Early Age*, and the Robert F. Kennedy Award for his 1988 book *Rachel and Her Children*, has done more to help contemporary educators understand issues of equity and equality than perhaps anyone else. Kozol, whose books have been considered to be foundations of the American conscience, particularly for those Americans who profess deep concern about our public schools, has written moving, descriptive words about some of the inequities that face public schools across the country. In his 1991 book *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*, Kozol tackles issues of funding for public schools, and he criticizes the “arcane system by which we finance public education” (p. 54). Kozol’s belief is that American public education has ceased being the great equalizer. Our educational system is not fulfilling the goal of treating people equitably. There is no justice when America’s schools, as a whole, are examined.

When looking at the inequalities and inequities in American public education, Kozol focuses much attention on the use of property tax as a major determinant of school funding. In fact, although it varies from state to state, the percentage of overall funding that any given public school receives from the collection of property taxes, hovers at around fifty percent. This creates obvious inequities, as significantly more property tax money is collected in affluent suburbs than is the case in poorer communities. While landmark court cases, such as *McInnis v. Shapiro* in Illinois and *Burruss v. Wilkerson* in Virginia, have focused attention on how schools are funded, local tax on property remains the major determinant of educational funding. In a 1993 interview published in Educational Leadership, Jonathan Kozol said,

East St. Louis, like many poor cities in America, taxes itself at a very high rate. It's one of the most heavily taxed school districts in Illinois. In New Jersey, its counterpart is Camden. Camden has almost the highest property tax rate in New Jersey. But in both cases, because the property is virtually worthless, even with a high property tax, they cannot provide adequate revenues for their schools.

What we ought to do ultimately is get rid of the property tax completely as the primary means of funding public education, because it is inherently unjust. To use the local property tax as even a portion of school funding is unjust because it will always benefit the children of the most privileged people. The present system guarantees that those who can
buy a $1 million home in an affluent suburb will also be able to provide their children with superior schools. That is a persistent betrayal of the whole idea of equal opportunity in America. It’s a betrayal of democracy.

We ought to finance the education of every child in America equitably, with adjustments made only for the greater or lesser needs of certain children. And that funding should all come from the collective wealth of our society, mainly from a steeply graduated progressive income tax. (http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/edlead/9212/scherer.html)

Whether or not Kozol is correct in advocating a progressive income tax, although good fodder for debate, is not the most relevant issue for an explanation of ISLLC Standard 5. What is relevant is an understanding that the present system does not treat all children in America fairly. While the intent here is not to advocate policy that would improve school funding formulas, it is critical that school leaders and those aspiring to such positions understand the importance of working for fair, ethical means of ensuring the progress of all students. The ISLLC Standards, particularly Standards 5 and 6, focus our attention on school administrators’ obligations to ensure that fairness prevails. Furthermore, these two Standards, in particular, remind school administrators that their work is performed in a political, social, and cultural context. School administrators simply cannot sit back and focus only on the treatment that students in their particular school receive. Instead, to be true leaders, school administrators must concern themselves with the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context in which their work takes place. In short, school administrators, are called to be leaders for all schoolchildren, not just those who attend their own particular schools.

The manner in which our schools are funded is, by no means, the only topic in which issues of equality and equity in education surface. The myriad changes that have taken place over the last 50 or so years have caused all leaders in all public arenas to consider special needs and special circumstances that individuals and/or groups find themselves in. The knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 5 serve as a gauge for school leaders wishing to measure their own values and behaviors. In the final analysis, it is imperative that school administrators “promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.”

**Relating the Integrity of School Administrators to ISLLC Standard 5**

In some ways, possessing the knowledge and dispositions of ISLLC Standard 5 is a gift that individuals are born with. As there is much debate regarding the extent to which leadership characteristics and behaviors are teachable or are aspects of one’s individual constitution that they are born with, much of what is required by ISLLC Standard 5 is fitting for such debates. Although it is true that
certain aspects of ISLLC Standard 5’s knowledge and dispositions can be taught, this standard is somewhat reliant on personal values and beliefs. Examining the performance indicators of ISLLC Standard 5 drives this point home even harder. Much of what is suggested by the performance indicators of ISLLC Standard 5 is based on deeply held assumptions about that which is fair, just, and honorable.

In many ways, ISLLC Standard 5 points more to the interpersonal and intrapersonal qualities of school administrators than it does to specific theories or concepts that govern school leadership behaviors. The indicators of this standard are applicable to leadership in its broadest sense and are not confined to the educational environment. Reexamine the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of this standard, and compare what they indicate with the underlying beliefs and resulting behaviors of the best school leaders with whom you have worked. Chances are there will be a strong connection between these behaviors and ISLLC Standard 5.

**Standard 5**

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

**Knowledge**

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

♦ the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society
♦ various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics
♦ the values of the diverse school community
♦ professional codes of ethics
♦ the philosophy and history of education

**Dispositions**

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

♦ the ideal of the common good
♦ the principles in the Bill of Rights
♦ the right of every student to a free, quality education
♦ bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process
♦ subordinating one’s own interest to the good of the school community
♦ accepting the consequences for upholding one’s principles and actions
♦ using the influence of one’s office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families
♦ development of a caring school community
Performances

The administrator:
♦ examines personal and professional values
♦ demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics
♦ demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance
♦ serves as a role model
♦ accepts responsibility for school operations
♦ considers the impact of one's administrative practices on others
♦ uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain
♦ treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect
♦ protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff
♦ demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community
♦ recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others
♦ examines and considers the prevailing values of the diverse school community
♦ expects that others in the school community will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior
♦ opens the school to public scrutiny
♦ fulfills legal and contractual obligations
♦ applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately

The particular roles of school administrators at all levels, including the central office, were examined in this chapter so that readers could visualize the need for integrity, fairness, and ethics in the duties of each of these positions. Although the particular tasks that one must perform and the job description that defines them are both important, the ethical manner in which school administrators carry out these tasks is what gives them the referent power discussed earlier. School administrators can understand theories and can exhibit tasks essential to their jobs without ever being considered great leaders. What makes great school administrators is the perception that school stakeholders have of the administrator’s acceptance of diverse viewpoints and commitments to always doing what is right for students. These are two pieces that are closely related to issues of equality and equity in education.

ISLLC Standards 5 and 6 transcend the administrative tasks that are immediately thought of when examining the work that must be done in running a school. The two standards are similar in that they both speak to issues of doing what is right in the larger sense. In this way, many of the theories and concepts first introduced in the presentation of ISLLC Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4 are still applicable to these two standards. In the upcoming presentation of ISLLC Standard 6, the work of school administrators relative to legal issues and policy implementation is featured. For now, though, the emphasis has been on simply being a leader of
integrity and acting in fairness to all people. This transcends legal and political boundaries and is the very essence of effective school leadership.

Summary

The role of the federal government in American public education has changed considerably throughout history. Along with these changes, the responsibilities and priorities of school administrators have also undergone considerable transformations. Whereas the federal government initially provided very little support to public schools, school administrators initially provided little instructional support to teachers. As the federal government’s role changed and funds became available for targeted groups, school administrators naturally began providing more school leadership designed to assist the teaching staff in providing for these targeted populations. Today, in a period known as “new federalism” (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000), the federal government has substantially increased its role in education while enacting legislation that significantly ratchets up the need for public schools to be successful for all students. This change has contributed to a new role for school administrators.

This chapter briefly described the typical duties and ordinary challenges of school administrators at all levels. Not intended to include all duties performed, the purpose was to characterize school administration as a profession with many different facets. The specific duties of school administrators across all school levels in all areas of the country vary greatly. ISLLC Standard 5 reminds administrators of one common tie that binds all administrators together. That common tie is integrity. All school administrators, regardless of their school level or community demographics, must behave with integrity and fairness and with an ethical mind.

This need for integrity manifests itself in many ways, several of which have been featured in previous chapters. It must be noted, however, that integrity ought to be evident in the process of negotiations with teachers as well. Collective bargaining, so named because of the notion that contracts are negotiated collectively by groups representing management interests and teaching interests, can often lead to contentious dialogue and hurt feelings in school districts who abide by its rules. Contentious feelings can also arise in areas void of collective bargaining, as teachers may feel mistreated and misrepresented by certain language in their contracts. Regardless of whether a school district collectively bargains its contract, the process of negotiations must be driven by ethics, fairness, and integrity. When it is, then the result is a school culture characterized by a common vision and increased employee motivation. ISLLC Standard 5 reminds school administrators not to lose sight of this reality.

Issues of equity and equality in education have been raised since public schooling began. In the contemporary school environment these issues are most evident in school funding. This chapter does not provide a thorough explanation of school funding formulas. Instead, the basic premise of funding schools largely on the revenue gained from property tax collection is the focus. Draw-
Understanding the Evolution of Public School's Purpose

Point

Collective bargaining improves education by giving teachers a larger voice in educational decisions. Salaries, benefits, and working conditions that are collectively bargained tend to be palatable to represented teachers, and they are negotiated through representation so that all teachers need not get involved in the process. Collectively bargained contracts offer teachers greater job security and protection, as they result in contracts that are binding. Teacher unions are expected to represent the interests of all teachers, which gives every member an equal voice in decision making.

Counterpoint

Collective bargaining often damages the climate of a school by pitting administrators and teachers against each other. Unionization inevitably brings up divisions or differences that previously were hidden. As a result, school climate is often affected negatively. Collective bargaining units charge dues to members. Faculty who are members may end up paying dues and representing nonmembers or non-dues payers. A minority of those represented can consume a majority of resources. A teacher’s independent views may not align with the majority position advanced by the collective bargaining unit.

Questions

♦ Are teacher contracts in your state collectively bargained? Do you think there is fairness in the process typically used in your state?
♦ Is the concept of unionization outdated?
♦ Does the decision whether or not to collectively bargain a contract have any affect on student achievement?

On some of the writing done by Jonathan Kozol, the intent is to cause school administrators to consider that they are leaders for all schools. As such, they must be concerned about how we can create fair educational opportunities for all children.
Chapter Highlights

♦ The Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution created the basis for granting legal authority for public education to the states.
♦ As the federal government altered its level of involvement in education, the role of the school administrator has undergone many natural changes.
♦ Although the specific job functions of administrators vary greatly from school district to school district, there are some commonalities that lead to an understanding of the complexity of administration in contemporary educational settings.
♦ The truth is that students have never been more successful at any earlier point in American educational history than they are in public schools today.
♦ Collective bargaining is the process of negotiating and then administering the contract between a union and management. The term collective indicates that representatives are selected from within the organization to work as a unit in representing the concerns of their members.
♦ Although the negotiations process can be challenging, regardless of whether the contract is bargained collectively or simply approved by the school board, school administrators must behave with integrity, ethics, and fairness while focusing on the goal of improving student learning.
♦ Although it varies from state to state, the major determinant of funding that any given public school receives is through the collection of local property taxes.
♦ It is critical that school leaders and those aspiring to such positions understand the importance of working for fair, ethical means of ensuring the progress of all students.

Application Questions

1. Consider the changes in the federal government’s role in public school education over time. Do you think that the federal government is appropriately involved in education today? Do you think that the future will bring more federal involvement or less federal involvement? Why do you believe as you do?

2. Defend or disagree with the salary differences between administrators at all levels. Do you think school administrators are appropriately paid for the work that they do? What changes would you suggest, if any, to the current salary differentials between school administrators at all levels?
3. Examine the teaching contract used in your school district. How was it arrived at? Do you believe that the contract represents the needs of all employees in your school?

4. School funding formulas are complex and are the result of great thinking on the part of educators and legislators who generally desire equality in education for all. Are you aware of the public school funding formula in your area? Is there evidence that attempts have been made to equalize funding for different communities? To what extent do you support these efforts?

**Field Activity**

Ask the appropriate person in your school district’s human resources office for copies of administrative job descriptions at various levels. Compare and contrast the duties of each of these positions. How do they compare with the brief descriptions of typical roles and responsibilities outlined in this chapter? Are there responsibilities not spelled out in the job descriptions that are ordinarily performed by administrators?

Ask how often these job descriptions are revised to reflect current school needs. Who conducts these revisions? If job descriptions are not available, try to discover the reasons for their absence.

Speak with at least one school administrator about his or her perception of the expected roles and responsibilities as listed in their job description. Try to uncover how accurate the job description is in explaining the required duties.

**Have You Thought About It?**

Hiring decisions invariably bring about questions of equity and fairness. It seems as though Mrs. Walker believes that she was treated unfairly. Her response, however, was self-deprecation and not anger. I can’t help but wonder if the superintendent recognized the perceived inequity between Mrs. Walker and Mr. Jimenez. If so, I wonder what his reaction was. Perhaps Mr. Jimenez has qualifications that Mrs. Walker is lacking. Or perhaps Mrs. Walker is more qualified. There are so many issues that could be at play here. One thing is certain. Both candidates need to be involved in an open, honest discussion about the new role and their credentials.

What do you think?
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Chapter 11 provides a brief overview of pertinent educational legal cases that have shaped a considerable amount of public school policy in this country. Focusing on the four amendments to the United States Constitution that are most often the focus of legal issues in education (Amendments I, IV, X, and XIV), this chapter seeks to demonstrate how the behaviors of school administrators have changed over time to reflect legal interpretations.

Furthermore, Chapter 11 examines policy development and implementation in schools. Focusing on how policies are shaped within the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context, the chapter urges school administrators to be aware of the outside factors that affect the work they do in our schools. Relating these policies to improved student learning must be the goal of all school administrators.

Chapter 12 explains the importance of educational leaders as data gatherers and analyzers. This chapter, like several others, is applicable to more than one standard. It has been placed under Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 6 in this edition because of the social and political climate in which educational institutions operate today. Data reporting has become an important responsibility of educational leaders, as policy makers and the general public both use educational data for political advantages.

In reading the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 6, it is clear that school leaders must be knowledgeable of the world around them. It is evident that all school administrators must recognize that the work of schools does not take place independent of the larger society. Examine the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators below as evidence of this point.
Standard 6

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Knowledge

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
- principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools
- the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation
- the law as related to education and schooling
- the political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools
- models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling
- global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning
- the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system
- the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
- education as a key to opportunity and social mobility
- recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures
- importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education
- actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education
- using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
- the environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students and their families
- communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate
- there is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups
the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities

- public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students
- lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community

School administrators need to remain aware of changes that occur in society which impact the educational needs of the community. Utilizing the skills required by the previous five ISLLC Standards, school administrators must create, foster, and sustain avenues for communication that allow them and their schools to stay connected to the outside world. Also, school administrators must operate within the legal framework of our country, staying aware of the changes in how courts interpret constitutional issues. As they act in a manner that ensures student success within the confines of what is legal and fair, school administrators fulfill the vision of ISLLC Standard 6.

As part of a comprehensive textbook, Chapter 11 seeks to relate the legal issues presented with the theories and concepts previously discussed. A deeper examination of school law is essential for school administrators. The focus in this chapter, however, is to present legal issues in the context of policy formation and adherence to the suggestions of all six ISLLC Standards.

Chapter 12, new to this edition, relates the use of data to the social and political aspects of school leadership. The gathering and analysis of data are crucial components of instructional leadership, as instructional decisions all should be data driven. Also, the unique era in which contemporary educational leaders operate demands that those leaders understand how to convey data to the public and how to interpret data from policy makers.
Governance of Schools in a Legal and Political Environment

Think About It

There are no lawyers, only educators working at Monroe High School. In this way, Monroe is like virtually all public high schools in the country. Another way in which it is similar to others is that accidents can happen in its hallways.

Teacher Mitchell Spicer thought that this morning would be just like any other morning when he arrived at school. He got some coffee, talked to some colleagues, worked in his classroom for a few minutes, and then entered the hallway to monitor as students arrived. What he saw shocked him. Mr. Alvarez, the principal, had three student lockers opened, and he was rummaging through them, obviously searching for something. When Mr. Alvarez’s gaze met Mr. Spicer’s he appeared to be embarrassed, and he quickly shut the locker doors. When students arrived at these lockers a few minutes later and opened them, they immediately knew that somebody had been in there. Quickly, they turned to Mr. Spicer and asked him if he had seen anybody in their lockers.
Principals and other educational leaders have the legal right to search students’ lockers under certain conditions. But what are those conditions? It is imperative that educational leaders understand their legal roles and responsibilities to maintain a safe environment for learning to take place. Likewise, students have rights to privacy, although not to the same extent as average citizens in their homes. Educational leaders maintain fairness while ensuring that their behaviors are within the legal scope of their responsibilities.

As you read this chapter, consider the issue of school governance and the policies and procedures that must determine an administrator’s behavior. Think about which behaviors are legally permissible when considered within the scope of school safety. Mr. Alvarez may have had every legal right to search the students’ lockers. The issue for now is not whether he was right or wrong, but whether or not what he did is consistent with the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standard 6.

Thus far this textbook has presented the key concepts and theories that guide the behaviors of school administrators. In doing so, the preceding chapters outlined how both effective and ineffective administrators behave and how their behaviors are linked with the ISLLC Standards. Although the ISLLC Standards do not govern the actions of effective school administrators in each American locality, the language of the standards provides a strong framework from which to analyze what school administrators do and ought to do.

While research has demonstrated certain behaviors that are effective in school leadership, these behaviors and actions must be considered within the framework of what is legal. Motivational theories, for example, assist school administrators in understanding how and under what conditions they can improve student and employee morale and motivation. Process theories of motivation, in particular, can be very helpful to an administrator’s ability to analyze employee motivation and take appropriate actions to improve such motivation if necessary. However, if an employee is motivated by something that is illegal or politically and socially unacceptable, then school administrators must obviously find additional, more appropriate ways to motivate that particular employee. For this reason, even though the theories and concepts presented thus far in relation to the first five ISLLC Standards are important, understanding the legal and political issues surrounding the work of contemporary school administrators is a necessary foundation.

Organizations that foster the continuous professional development of school administrators continue to recognize the importance of adhering to sound legal practices. These organizations provide online links to current issues involving legal cases, legislative decisions, executive directives, and other aspects of governmental relations pertinent to effective school leadership. The goal in each case is to provide members with up-to-date information regarding the legal and regulatory issues facing public schools.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) has a feature on its website known as the Legal Lowdown (http://www.principals.org/
services/legal_lowdown.html). At this site, viewers can learn of recent court decisions and the effects of these decisions on schools. Similarly, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) has a government relations link on its website (http://www.naesp.org/govt.html) that allows viewers to learn of federal legislative updates and recent legal decisions at the state and local level. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) also has a government relations link (http://www.aasa.org/government_relations/) featuring, in addition to legislative updates and positions, links to the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, and the U.S. Department of Education. These three organizations offer evidence that the legal and political environments are critical ones to understand if school administrators want to be effective for all students.

Finally, as evidence of the interest public school administrators have in staying updated on legal issues in education, consider that a large number of school administrators hold membership in the Education Law Association (ELA). Although ELA membership also consists of university professors, lawyers, and students, the ranks of membership have consistently included a sizeable number of K-12 school personnel. These personnel, particularly those holding administrative positions, find the publications and website to be among the most useful sources of information relative to the application of legal updates in education.

Public Education and the United States Constitution

The United States Constitution is the body of precepts that provides the framework of law from which our government operates. All laws and all legal decisions created in the United States are measured against the United States Constitution. But what specifically is educational law? Furthermore, which part of the United States Constitution sets the foundation for these laws? These questions are important ones for school administrators to ask, and their answers provide the foundation from which sound administrative practice and the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 6 are built.

Hudgins and Vacca (1991) define law as “a body of principles, standards, and rules that govern human behavior by creating obligations as well as rights, and by imposing penalties” (p. 2). These principles, standards, and rules have their origin in the United States Constitution. Educational law, as a particular aspect of the legal system, emanates from four related sources:

1. Constitutions, such as the United States Constitution and individual state constitutions;
2. Statutes, which are written law coming from the legislative branches of government;
3. Administrative law, which comes from a state or federal level agency or official; and
4. Case law, the rules of law as explained by the courts.
Specifically looking at educational law, one can logically conclude that it is the portion of law relevant to the administration of schools and school systems. Based, as all laws are, on the United States Constitution, it is more focused and is a necessary guide from which school administrators reach decisions. Alexander and Alexander (1992) define school law as

a generic term covering a wide range of legal subject matter including the basic fields of contracts, property, torts, constitutional law, and other areas of law that directly affect the educational and administrative processes of the educational system. (p. 1)

As noted in Chapter 10, the United States Constitution makes no specific mention of education. However, the Tenth Amendment does leave the responsibility for creating an organizational framework for public education to the individual states. All fifty state constitutions do provide for a system of public education (Sperry, 1999). The authority for including public education in the state constitutions is granted by the Tenth Amendment. Specifically, the United States Constitution’s Tenth Amendment states, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people” (U.S. Const., Amend. X).

Because educational law emanates from four distinct sources, as mentioned earlier, an examination of the relationships among and between those sources is helpful as it reveals the significance of the United States Constitution as the source superior to all others. First and foremost, it must be recognized that the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of our land. As the basic framework upon which the structure of our government is built, the United States Constitution takes precedence over state constitutions, legislative enactments, administrative law, and case law.

At the national level the Constitution is supreme, then, followed in hierarchical order by statutory law, and finally by administrative law. Case law is interpretative law and its place in the hierarchy depends on the kind of law being interpreted. The rank order is always: first, constitutional; second, statutory; third, administrative. (Sperry, 1999, p. 13)

Figure 11.1 illustrates the hierarchy of legal authority described above. In addition to showcasing the supremacy of the United States Constitution, Figure 11.1 also illustrates the division of power that exists between state and federal levels of government.
Figure 11.1 Hierarchy of Legal Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Constitutional</th>
<th>Statutory</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1A Source: Constitution of the</td>
<td>1B Source: U.S. Congress Subject to interpretation by 1D</td>
<td>1C Source: Executive branch and administrative agencies of the United States Subject to interpretation by 1D</td>
<td>1D Source: Supreme Court of the United States and other federal courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States Subject to interpretation by 1D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>2A State constitution Subject to interpretation by 2D and if a federal question is involved, by 1D</td>
<td>2B Source: State legislature Subject to interpretation by 2D and if a federal question is involved, by 1D</td>
<td>2C Source: Executive branch and administrative agencies of the state Subject to interpretation by 2D and if a federal question is involved, by 1D</td>
<td>2D Source: State supreme court and other state courts; if a federal question is involved, must not conflict with 1D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constitutional Amendments Related to Public Education

Although the United States Constitution never mentions education specifically but grants this responsibility to the states through the Tenth Amendment, there are three other constitutional amendments that are the basis for much of the body of educational law. Each of these three amendments creates the framework for a distinct set of school related issues that have been argued before courts throughout their history.

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.
There are three distinct issues that have arisen from this amendment over time. First, there have been challenges to governmental support of parochial schools and of public school policies that may have infringed on religious freedoms. Second, many court cases have been built around questions of students’ and teachers’ rights to freedom of expression. Third, there have been numerous cases regarding the rights of student organizations to assemble and of employee groups to engage in collective bargaining. What follows is a brief description of some of the most notable court cases dealing with these issues.

Although many court cases have dealt with the separation of church and state and the religious freedom of individuals, three noteworthy ones warrant specific mention here. In the first, *Engel v. Vitale,* the United States Supreme Court found a New York statute allowing the recitation of a prayer in school to be a violation of the establishment clause of the First Amendment. This 1962 decision specifically stated that “it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government” (*Engel v. Vitale,* 370 U.S. 421 [1962]). This finding occurred despite the fact that the prayer in question was nondenominational and that students were permitted to remain silent while the rest of the students recited the prayer.

In 1971, the *Lemon v. Kurtzman* decision created a test of constitutionality under the Establishment Clause. In order for any statute to withstand constitutional challenge, the court said that the following three-factor test must be passed:

1. It must have a secular purpose.
2. It must have a primary effect that neither advances nor prohibits religion.
3. It must not foster excessive government entanglement with religion.

This three-factor test, commonly referred to as the *Lemon Test,* has since become the gauge by which church–state relations cases are measured. Although the *Lemon Test* is clear in its description of the three factors that must be met, these factors are still subject to human interpretation. For example, the third factor’s reference to excessive government entanglement means different things to different courts. What one justice believes is representative of excessive entanglement, another justice may not see so clearly.

One of the most significant Supreme Court cases in which the *Lemon Test* was applied came in 1985 with *Wallace v. Jaffree.* This case pertained to the right of a state to authorize a period of silence at the beginning of each school day for students to engage in silent meditation or voluntary prayer. The Court, after applying the three-factor *Lemon Test,* held that such activity was unconstitutional in its violation of the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause.

Other notable court cases have dealt with the freedom of expression granted by the First Amendment. In *Pickering v. Board of Education of Township High School District 205* the court responded to the constitutional right of public school teach-
ers to speak on public issues. This case affirmed the notion that public employees, simply by virtue of their government employment, do not relinquish their right of free speech to comment on matters of public interest. Specifically, the court said, “absent proof of false statements knowingly or recklessly made by him, a teacher’s exercise of his right to speak on issues of public importance may not furnish the basis for his dismissal from public employment” (391 U.S. 563 [1968]).

On the pupil side, there are two notable cases that have identified the privileges of students to have their First Amendment rights protected. The first, decided in 1969 and considered one of the most relevant cases regarding student rights, is Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District. This case involved the rights of a student who wore a black armband to school in protest of the Vietnam War. As a result of wearing the armband, the student was suspended; he claimed that this was a violation of his First Amendment right to freedom of expression. As part of the Court’s ruling in this case came what now ought to be familiar words to all school administrators: “It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the school house gate” (393 U.S. 503 [1969]). Furthermore, in its decision the Court said,

In order for the state in the person of school officials to justify prohibition of a particular expression of opinion, it must be able to show that its action was caused by something more than a mere desire to avoid the discomfort and unpleasantness that always accompany an unpopular viewpoint. Certainly, where there is no finding and no showing that engaging in the forbidden conduct would materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school, the prohibition cannot be sustained. (393 U.S. 503 [1969])

This case initiated the emergence of a new era in terms of students’ freedom to express themselves in public schools. Whereas students had previously been regarded as passive followers of school rules and regulations, the Tinker v. Des Moines decision strengthened the First Amendment rights of students by recognizing them as “persons” under the United States Constitution.

Another important decision, which limited these rights somewhat, occurred in Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier. This case dealt with the constitutional right of public school officials to exercise editorial control of student publications sponsored by the school (Sperry, 1999). The decision essentially stated that educators do not offend the First Amendment when they exercise editorial control over student speech so long as their actions are related to legitimate pedagogical concerns. Specifically, the decision stated that a school “retains the authority to refuse to sponsor speech that might reasonably be perceived to advocate drug or alcohol use, irresponsible sex, or conduct otherwise inconsistent with the shared values of a civilized social order” (484 U.S. 260 [1988]).

Looking at the decisions rendered in Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District and in Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, one gets a
pretty clear understanding of the rights afforded students by the First Amendment. While students clearly are afforded protection in their freedom of expression, such protection can only exist if the expression does not violate reasonable rules of conduct as established by a school board. When student expression interferes with the educational process or is deemed offensive to the community, then school officials do have the right to prohibit it. When the prohibition of student expression only serves to avoid discomfort but is not based on a legitimate pedagogical concern, then such prohibition is likely not going to be upheld by the courts.

Although there are many other significant court decisions that can assist school administrators in understanding the interpretations of the First Amendment and how such interpretations impact much of what transpires on public school grounds, this section illuminates just a few landmark cases so as to create an understanding of the role the First Amendment has played in shaping the business of public schooling. Public school administrators must understand the rights and limitations of the First Amendment and must carefully apply them to their school environments. As ISLLC Standard 6 says, “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.” In order to influence the larger contexts in which our schools operate, school administrators must first understand and respond to them. The First Amendment gives clear direction as to the response leaders must have in church–state relations. Nevertheless, this clarity can be blurred in certain communities. Similarly, the First Amendment protects students and staff in their ability to freely express themselves. The degree to which this freedom is granted, however, has been altered by different court decisions throughout time. School administrators must understand their communities and must be aware of the political context in which all courts interpret the Constitution and arrive at decisions.

**Amendment IV**

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

The Fourth Amendment continues growing in its significance to educational law as issues of weapons and/or drug possession receive greater attention. As school officials’ concerns for school safety increase, so do their needs to ensure that no students or staff members are in possession of any weapons or illegal substances while on school grounds. The Fourth Amendment cases that have been argued before courts in recent years have attempted to strike a balance between the rights students have to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizure with the need for school officials to provide a safe environment free of
potentially dangerous discipline issues. School administrators need to be aware of this necessary balance, as it speaks strongly to the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of both ISLLC Standard 5 and ISLLC Standard 6.

The most noted Fourth Amendment case occurred in 1985 in the state of New Jersey. This particular case, *New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, went all the way to the United States Supreme Court where the Court redefined the standard by which school officials could conduct searches of student property and seize materials uncovered during such searches. Introducing the term *reasonable suspicion*, the Court held that a search of a student or of a student’s property must be justifiable at its conception. Essentially, this means that a school official must have a “reasonable suspicion” that such a search will turn up evidence that the student has violated the law or the rules of the school before initiating the search. This is a significantly lower standard than the one facing law enforcement officials. While public school officials are subject to the Fourth Amendment’s prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures, they are not required to obtain a warrant before searching any student who is under their authority. They simply need “reasonable suspicion” before conducting such a search.

The decision in *New Jersey v. T.L.O.* further clarified the roles of school officials in conducting student searches in that it stated that the scope of a student search must be “reasonably related to the objective of the search and not excessively intrusive in light of the student’s age and sex of the student and nature of the infraction” (469 U.S. 325 [1985]). School administrators must understand that such language does not prohibit intrusive searches, but it clearly allows them only in cases with the potential of seriously jeopardizing the safety of students if such an intrusive search were not performed. School administrators, through the decision in *New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, can conduct searches with “reasonable suspicion,” but they must constantly monitor how the extent of the search fits in with the seriousness of the assumed offense. They also must consider the age and sex of the student being searched as they make such decisions.

In addition to proceeding with caution regarding searches conducted of students and their property with the intent of finding tobacco, drugs, weapons, or other illegal or illicit contraband, school administrators must also be careful in questioning or examining students in regards to suspicions of abuse. Parents and guardians often allege that there were Fourth Amendment violations in suspected child abuse cases. The typical claim is that school personnel are in violation of the Fourth Amendment when they question or examine a student to determine possible child abuse. In a Pennsylvania case, *Picarella v. Terrizzi*, the U.S. District Court concluded that the Fourth Amendment had not been violated by school personnel questioning a student about suspected child abuse.

In many states, limited immunity has been granted to the school officials who are responsible for investigating and reporting child abuse cases. This limited immunity comes about because of the school official’s role as acting *in loco parentis*. This term, from original Latin languages, literally means “in place of the parent.” As courts interpret school officials to be acting *in loco parentis*, offi-
cials are granted limited immunity to conduct such searches if the school official needs to determine whether or not a child has been the victim of abuse.

While other court cases, Picarella v. Terrizzi being one, have further defined the rights granted students and staff members by the Fourth Amendment, New Jersey v. T.L.O. has set the standard and is, therefore, the most significant. School administrators, in following the law and in achieving the objectives of ISLLC Standards 5 and 6, need to be mindful that students do have a legitimate expectation of privacy. Searches of students and/or seizure of their property are permissible as school officials do have authority over students, but they are permissible only within guidelines that must be clearly adhered to.

**Amendment XIV, Section 1**

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Numerous court cases involving alleged Fourteenth Amendment violations in the educational arena have been argued throughout the years. For the most part these cases fall into one of the following three categories:

1. Cases dealing with property and liberty rights of students and staff members. Compulsory attendance laws and teacher tenure laws have been interpreted by many to give property rights to students and teachers, respectively.

2. Cases dealing with procedural due process. In cases dealing with procedural due process, there is an allegation that an individual has been deprived of life, liberty, or property without a prescribed constitutional procedure having been followed. Procedural due process is met when the following factors are present: the person must have proper notice that he or she is about to be deprived of life, liberty, or property; he or she must be given an opportunity to be heard; and the hearing must be conducted fairly.

3. Cases dealing with the Equal Protection Clause. Many educational cases dealing with issues of discrimination (age, sex, race, and ethnicity) have been argued on the basis of “the equal protection of the laws.”

One of the most noted Fourteenth Amendment cases dealing with the first of these three categories is Meyer v. Nebraska. In this 1923 case, Meyer, a teacher at Zion Parochial School, violated a Nebraska Act that prohibited teaching any subject in a foreign language to a student who had not yet passed eighth grade. The court, in agreeing that Meyer broke a rule, also found that he had been deprived of his liberty rights as granted him by the Fourteenth Amendment, stat-
ing “[t]he power of the State to compel attendance at some school and to make reasonable regulations for all schools, including a requirement that they shall give instructions in English, is not questioned.” The Court further concluded that “[t]he Act goes beyond the police power of the State and violates the liberty interests of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution” (262 U.S. 390 [1923]). Essentially, the court thought that the teacher’s knowledge of the German language was not, in and of itself, harmful. The fact that he was a qualified teacher, although in error by teaching in the German language, meant that his liberty rights were infringed upon because what he taught was in no way harmful to the students.

The second category under the Fourteenth Amendment, cases dealing with procedural due process, is replete with landmark cases that have shaped much of how student discipline procedures are currently viewed. Among the most notable in the field of educational law is Goss v. Lopez. This 1975 U.S. Supreme Court decision prescribed the minimal constitutional requirements of school officials who suspend students for ten or fewer days. The case arose after several students had been suspended from a Columbus, Ohio, high school without any sort of hearing either before the suspension or immediately after. The families of these students alleged that such suspensions were in violation of the students’ due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment.

There are several important pieces of the Court’s decision in this case of which school administrators should be aware. First, the decision written by Justice White said, “[a] ten-day suspension from school is not de minimis (insignificant or not worthy of judicial attention) in our view and may not be imposed in complete disregard of the Due Process Clause.” This comment serves as a caution to school administrators to recall that removal from school is a serious event in the life of the suspended child. Second, the decision said, 

Due process requires, in connection with a suspension of ten days or less, that the student be given oral or written notice of the charges against him, and if he denies them, an explanation of the evidence the authorities have and an opportunity to present his side of the story. (419 U.S. 565 [1975])

This part of the ruling forever altered the means by which some students are suspended or removed from school. Since the Goss v. Lopez decision, it has been required that students receive notice and the opportunity for an explanation of the charges. Also important for school administrators to realize, the Court recognized in this decision that there are times in which a student’s behavior jeopardizes the welfare of others and/or seriously disrupts the academic environment. In such cases, as it may be impractical to provide the student with notice and a hearing because of the immediacy with which the student must be removed from the school, the notice and hearing can occur as soon after as is practical.

The third important aspect of the Goss v. Lopez decision is in reference to the amount of time necessary between notice and a hearing. In this regard, the Court found “[t]here need be no delay between the time notice is given and the time
of the hearing.” This is important for school administrators to understand because it illustrates the Court’s desire to afford students necessary, constitutional protection, but not to bog down the school administrator and make student discipline inefficient. Rather, in this decision, the Court attempted to explain that school administrators merely need to afford students the opportunity to be told what they are accused of, have the basis of the accusation explained to them, and be given an opportunity to comment on the charges. This can occur in minutes, and is not intended to delay discipline in a way that renders it inefficient. Another important case for educators to recognize under the Due Process Clause involved the decision not to retain a teacher after his first year of employment. In *Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth*, administrators at Wisconsin State University chose not to renew the contract of Roth, an assistant professor of political science. Roth maintained that the failure of University officials to give him notice of any reason for nonrenewal and an opportunity for a hearing violated his right to procedural due process under the Fourteenth Amendment. In the finding, the court responded that the Fourteenth Amendment does not require a hearing before the nonrenewal of a nontenured teacher’s contract unless the teacher can demonstrate that such a decision deprived him of a liberty interest. Deprivation of a liberty interest has been considered in cases in which a person’s good name, honor, integrity, or reputation are at stake because of what the government is doing to him. Had this been the case with Roth, the University officials would have been required to afford him due process to refute such charges. However, the mere act of nonrenewal, particularly as the teacher had not achieved tenure status, caused the Court to rule that “there is no suggestion whatever that the respondent’s good name, reputation, honor, or integrity is at stake” (408 U.S. 564 [1972]). Consequently, Roth was not entitled to due process in this situation.

The third category under the Fourteenth Amendment, cases dealing with the Equal Protection Clause, is also one in which many important decisions have helped shape the behaviors of school administrators in relation to educational law. One significant case, decided in 1982, is *Plyler v. Doe*. In this case, the Court said that alien children had an important constitutional interest in education and that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects them just as it protects children who are citizens of the United States. Interpreting the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the Court said, “[n]o state shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws” and “[w]hatever one’s status under the immigration laws, an alien is surely a person in any ordinary sense of that term” (457 U.S. 202 [1982]).

A completely different case, but still one dealing with the Equal Protection Clause, is the 1973 U.S. Supreme Court case, *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez*. In this case, the Texas system of financing public education was attacked by Mexican-American parents whose children attended the public schools in an urban school district in San Antonio. The parents brought a class action on behalf of schoolchildren throughout the state who were poor and resided in school districts with a low property tax base. As the Texas school finance system relies heavily on revenue generated by property tax collection, the suit
alleged that it was in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The District Court, in agreeing with the parents, found that the Texas system was in fact in violation of the Equal Protection Clause in that it provided a better system of education to wealthy students. Upon appeal by the State of Texas and in recognition of the far-reaching constitutional questions presented by the case, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the lower court’s ruling by a 5-4 decision. As part of their decision, the Court stated, “[t]he Equal Protection Clause does not require absolute equality or precisely equal advantages. Nor indeed, in view of the infinite variables affecting the educational process, can any system assure equal quality of education except in the relative sense…” (411 U.S. 959 [1973]).

In addition to upholding the constitutionality of the Texas method for financing public schools, the Supreme Court held that education was not a primary interest requiring strict scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause (LaMorte, 1999). The majority opinion of the Court was that school finance reform should germinate in the state legislative processes.

It is clear that the Fourteenth Amendment will continue to generate much discussion as states search for ways to provide equal treatment to students and staff in various senses of the term. A very high percentage of legal disputes in education that have arisen in recent years have been a result of Fourteenth Amendment challenges. As schools struggle with issues of providing due process and equal protection to students and staff without regard to race, sex, age, wealth, and ability, the Courts likely will continue to define what the parameters are.

School leaders need to see the relevance of the ISLLC Standards, in particular Standards 5 and 6, in issues of equity and equality. While the court decisions briefly explained in this chapter represent a small percentage of the significant legal cases heard by courts throughout educational history, it is prudent for school administrators to be aware of their findings and the resulting implications.

**Educational Policy and the School Administrator**

Succinctly, a policy can be thought of as a guide that gives directions and orders about how an organization is to proceed. In the educational arena, policy is made by the federal government, the state government, the courts of law, and the local school boards (Kowalski, 2003). The school administrator then takes these policies, typically boiled down into school board policies and/or regulations, and ensures that they are adhered to within the school or school district.

One of the unique features of educational policy is that it is rarely formed, even in part, by teachers or staff. Although collective bargaining strengthens the policy development of some teacher groups, the typical reality in schools is that policies are made by the school board in consultation with administrators, and then carried out by the staff. This apparent disconnect between policy formation and the duty to adhere to developed policies puts the school administrator in
the role of “policy interpreter.” Particularly at the school-building level, it is the administrator who knows the policies of the governing school board and who has the responsibility for ensuring that the teachers and staff are familiar enough with the policies that the work they do will support policies and not violate them.

When one considers the wording of ISLLC Standard 6, the need for school administrators to act as “policy interpreters” is apparent. ISLLC Standard 6 states “[a] school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.” Inherent in this statement are the needs to understand the dynamics of policy development, to actively participate in policy making, and to ensure that public policy is shaped with the purpose of providing a quality education for students. In doing so, it is incumbent upon school administrators to have a voice in the policy development and implementation in their own school districts. Furthermore, it is essential that they interpret these policies to staff members in a way that facilitates their work with students. With knowledge of the legal issues framing much of the work educators engage in and with an active role in developing and interpreting appropriate policies, school administrators are poised to provide the best kind of leadership for their schools.

**Teacher Evaluation**

The evaluation of teacher performance and teaching effectiveness is one of the most important components of successful school administrator work. Particularly today, as schools are held accountable for the achievement of all students, the focus of all improvement efforts must be on the classroom dynamics. School administrators must be aware of what goes on in all classrooms, and they must provide instructional and curricular leadership that enhances teaching and learning. As such, and consistent with the themes of all six ISLLC Standards, school administrators must be visible in classrooms on a regular basis and they must be cognizant of best teaching practices. While visibility should be a regular and expected part of the school administrator’s work there are times, often defined by the school district’s teaching contract, in which formal evaluations of teaching must occur. These times provide one important example of the school administrator’s role in policy implementation.

Virtually all of the country’s approximately 15,500 school districts have some mention of teacher evaluation in their policy manual. In some localities, particularly those governed by collective bargaining agreements, teacher evaluation is addressed with much specificity. A formal timeline for evaluations indicates precisely by which dates evaluations must take place; specific attention is paid to the means by which pre- and/or postconferencing between the teacher and the school administrator must occur; and there is a copy of an adopted evaluation instrument, approved by both the administration and the teacher representative group.
Still other localities mention only a timeline by which evaluations must occur, with little or no mention of the means by which they should take place. In these school districts, the school administrator has more leeway in determining methodologies for evaluating teachers, but they still must do so within the guidelines established by school board policy.

Whether the policy on teacher evaluation is specific and standardized or more vague and free, school administrators must understand what the policy says and they must carry the policy out in a fair and equitable manner. More importantly, school administrators need to be mindful of the fact that not all teachers are aware of school board policy and not all teachers understand when the administrator’s actions are driven by policy versus when those actions are based on deeply held beliefs of the administrator. It is in this regard that school administrators act as implementers of school board policy. While basing their behaviors and actions largely on what they believe is right and just, school administrators augment their thinking with policy and legal adherence. The school administrator who explains the role of policy and law in their actions to their constituents is often the best understood and most predictable administrator. Followers, it has been shown, prefer to follow leaders whose positions they understand and whose actions can be predicted with some degree of reliability. Consistently applying school board policy and best legal practices to their everyday actions assists school administrators in being seen in this manner. As teacher evaluation is such an important component of school administrators’ work, it is logically an area in which policy and legal adherence are of paramount importance.

Special Education

The education of students with special needs represents a comparatively new aspect of the instructional leadership skills required of school administrators. In fact, in terms of educational history, the national goal of educating all students and assisting them in maximizing their potential is contemporary. As such policy development in relation to special education is a new and growing phenomenon.

Prior to the 1960s, the idea of educating people with disabilities in the United States was not at the forefront of most people’s thinking. In fact, throughout the 1950s, the only special education programs available were those that had been developed and privately funded by parents or parent groups, and these programs only existed in a select few communities. After the passage of Title IX in 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law an enormous array of groundbreaking legislation designed to protect the rights of people with disabilities. As far as education goes, the new legislation clearly expressed the will of society: Children with disabilities must be guaranteed a free and appropriate public education.

In 1975, Congress passed the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, better known at the time as Public Law 94-142. This legislation is known by name today to virtually every educator. This Act was necessary, as despite compulsory
education laws that had been in place nationwide since 1918, many children with disabilities were routinely excluded from public schools. The only viable options afforded these children were to remain at home or be institutionalized. Public Law 94-142 proved to be landmark legislation, requiring public schools to provide students with a broad range of disabilities—including physical handicaps; mental retardation; speech, vision, and language problems; emotional and behavioral problems; and other learning disorders—with a “free, appropriate public education.” Moreover, it called for school districts to provide such schooling in the “least restrictive environment” possible.

Reauthorized in 1990, 1997, and 2004, the law was ultimately renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Thanks to IDEA, formerly excluded students were not only in school, but they were also in many cases assigned to small classes where specially trained teachers tailored their lessons to each student’s individual needs. Schools also were required, for the first time, to provide any additional services that students needed to reach their full potential. And increasingly, special education students began spending time every day in regular classroom settings with their non-special education peers. Although not an intended consequence, many educators today believe that the placement of special education students in regular classroom settings, known as inclusion, benefits all students, not just those receiving special education services.

Although specific school board policies continue to evolve, particularly as legislation is reauthorized, as is the case with IDEA, school administrators must stay current on the specifics of policy and they must lead their school staffs in appropriately implementing these policies. More importantly, school administrators need to ensure that these polices and the behaviors which result from adhering to these policies are fair and equitable. ISLLC Standards 5 and 6 specifically identify the need for school administrators to be moral, ethical, fair, and cognizant of legal, social, and political aspects affecting their schools. The education of all students, particularly those with special needs, is an area that demonstrates the school administrator’s abilities in each of these areas.

Applying Legal and Political Principles to ISLLC Standard 6

ISLLC Standard 6 states that “a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.” More specifically, the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 6 are:

Knowledge

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:

♦ principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools
the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation

the law as related to education and schooling

the political, social, cultural and economic systems and processes that impact schools

models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling

global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning

the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system

the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

education as a key to opportunity and social mobility

recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures

importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education

actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education

using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities

Performances

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

the environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students and their families

communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate

there is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups

the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities

public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students

lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community

In many ways, the statements on this list are a culmination of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances described throughout this textbook in that they are rooted in the theories and concepts of effective leadership. The implied addition to this list, and thus the focus of ISLLC Standard 6’s application to the
work of contemporary school administrators, is that these behaviors and understandings fall within an understanding of how education fits in with a much bigger picture. ISLLC Standard 6 reminds school administrators that the work in which they engage takes place within a much larger context than the physical plant in which their office is located. Standard 6 illustrates that effective school administration is based, in large part, on the school administrator’s ability to make their work applicable and responsive to society’s needs.

Inherent in this understanding is the need for school administrators to be aware of appropriate legal and political restrictions that help guide their behavior. Short of requiring school administrators to be lawyers, judges, or politicians, ISLLC Standard 6 clearly points out the need for school administrators to demonstrate a heightened level of awareness in terms of educational law and local school board policy. While the previous five ISLLC Standards focused on leadership skills essential within the school and externally in the local community, it is ISLLC Standard 6 that ties all of this to the bigger issue of how education fits in with larger society. This fit is more evident as society becomes more global, making the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 6 even more essential. School administrators who make decisions that are based on legal and political principles, particularly when those principles are balanced with an understanding of all that the first five ISLLC Standards promote, will effectively move education forward in the years to come.

Summary

While the theories and concepts presented throughout this textbook in relation to the first five ISLLC Standards are important, understanding the legal and political issues surrounding the work of contemporary school administrators is a necessary foundation. ISLLC Standard 6 has such a focus, and it prompts school administrators to be well aware of the legal environment surrounding education.

The United States Constitution is the supreme law of our land. To reiterate, the United States Constitution makes no specific mention of education. However, the Tenth Amendment does leave the responsibility for creating an organizational framework for public education to the individual states and all fifty state constitutions do provide for a system of public education. Of particular note to educators, there are three constitutional amendments that are the basis for much of the body of educational law. Each of these three amendments creates the framework for a distinct set of school-related issues that have been argued before courts throughout their history.

The First Amendment to the United States Constitution states “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.” Under this amendment, three distinct issues have been argued before American courts. First, there have been numerous court challeng-
es to governmental support of parochial schools and of public school policies that may have infringed on religious freedoms. Second, many court cases have been built around questions of students’ and teachers’ rights to freedom of expression. Third, there have been numerous cases regarding the rights of student organizations to assemble and of employee groups to engage in collective bargaining. Each of these three areas represent issues that contemporary school ad-

pointcounterpoint

**Point**

In the past two decades too many legal decisions have led to the promulgation of too many individual rights for students. As a result, it is becoming more difficult for school administrators to discipline students and to make other decisions on their behalf. Prior to the current legal climate, schools had more latitude in deciding what was best for students. As a result, administrators did not feel like their hands were tied, and it was much easier to reach decisions and implement policies. We need to return to the good old days. Schools will become more effective if there are fewer mandates from the state and federal government and fewer laws regulating the behavior of teachers and educational leaders.

**Counterpoint**

A classroom should be an environment in which students are free to discuss, debate, and express opinions. Yet in typical public school classrooms students are subject to more direct and palpable government control than any adult who is not enlisted in the military, incarcerated, or civilly committed. They are not free to leave the room without permission. Teachers decide when students may speak or be silent and which subjects they must speak about. Rules for proper conduct go far beyond the ordinary obligations imposed by civil and criminal law, and punishments for misconduct are imposed without the protections of a civil or criminal trial. It is hard to comprehend such an oppressive system in a democracy.

**Questions**

- Is it necessary for schools to provide the structure and discipline currently typical in American public schools? Why or why not?
- In the future, do you think public school students will be granted greater or fewer rights? Is the trend moving in the right direction, in your opinion?
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ministrators must respond to while performing the duties of their jobs. As such, an examination of legal decisions relative to these areas is essential.

The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution states “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.” Some of the more notable Fourth Amendment cases that have been argued before courts over the last half century have attempted to strike a balance between the rights students have to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizure with the needs of school officials to provide a safe environment free of potentially dangerous discipline issues. It is incumbent upon all school administrators to understand these court rulings so as to become aware of the aforementioned necessary balance between students’ rights and administrative needs.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution states, “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” The Fourteenth Amendment is the basis for a large body of legal decisions affecting education and is the amendment requiring perhaps the closest scrutiny by school administrators. Essentially, Fourteenth Amendment cases are argued on the basis of one of three important tenets: the property and liberty rights of students and staff members; the procedural due process rights of students and staff members; and the rights of all persons to full protection from discrimination under the Equal Protection Clause. The Equal Protection Clause continues to be the foundation of many educational arguments and has strong implications in the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standards 5 and 6.

Along with a strong understanding of relevant educational laws and their application to school governance, school administrators ought to have an awareness of educational policy formation. With an understanding that policy is essentially a guide that gives directions and order to behaviors within an organization, school administrators should play an active role in both policy formation and policy implementation. Moreover, it is essential that school administrators act as “policy interpreters” to other school stakeholders who may not be as adept at policy interpretation as is the administrator.

Although policy manuals in school districts throughout the United States vary in their scope and length, there are numerous common elements spelled out in some detail in most localities. Among these commonly addressed policies are two areas in which school administrators clearly demonstrate their understanding of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 6: teacher evaluation and special education. Both of these areas require school administrators to carefully work within some preset policy guidelines while also
demonstrating the leadership skills apparent in a leader who cares about fairness, equity, and appropriate treatment of all people.

**Chapter Highlights**

- The United States Constitution is the body of precepts that provides the framework of law from which our government operates. All laws and all legal decisions created in the United States are measured against the United States Constitution.
- Although the United States Constitution never mentions education specifically but grants this responsibility to the states through the Tenth Amendment, there are three other constitutional amendments that are the basis for much of the body of educational law.
- Three distinct issues have arisen from the First Amendment. First, there have been challenges to governmental support of parochial schools and of public school policies that may have infringed on religious freedoms. Second, many court cases have been built around questions of students’ and teachers’ rights to freedom of expression. Third, there have been numerous cases regarding the rights of student organizations to assemble and of employee groups to engage in collective bargaining.
- The Fourth Amendment continues growing in its significance to educational law as issues of weapons and/or drugs possession receive greater attention. As school officials’ concerns for school safety increase, so does their need to ensure that no students or staff members are in possession of any weapons or illegal substances while on school grounds.
- A very high percentage of legal disputes in education in recent years have been a result of Fourteenth Amendment challenges. As schools struggle with issues of providing due process and equal protection to students and staff without regard to race, sex, age, wealth, and ability, the Courts will likely continue to define what the parameters are.
- One of the unique features of educational policy is that it is typically made by the school board in consultation with administrators, and then carried out by the staff. This apparent disconnect between policy formation and the duty to adhere to developed policies puts the school administrator in the role of “policy interpreter.”
- Among the most commonly addressed school policies are two distinct areas in which school administrators clearly demonstrate their understanding of the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC Standard 6: teacher evaluation and special education.
Application Questions

1. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution provides for the separation between church and state. Consider some common practices in your school that may be related to the church–state topic. Pay particular attention to holiday celebrations, musical programs, and morning rituals. Are there any common behaviors in your school that are reminiscent of issues that the courts have already grappled with in this regard?

2. Examine your school district’s policy on teacher evaluations. Is this policy uniformly adhered to? What are the consequences of an administrator’s failure to adhere to this policy?

3. In reading your school district’s policy manual, approximately what percentage of the policies were written with teacher input? Why do you suppose the percentage is what it is? Are there logical reasons why some policies are designed without teacher input?

Field Activity

Choose one of the following legal issues:
- Separation of church and state
- Protection of free speech
- Search and seizure of students and their possessions
- Student suspension
- Nonrenewal of a teacher’s contract

Search the school board policy manual for your school district and look for specific policies related to this issue. Do any exist? If so, is there specific legal code cited in the policy manual? From the cases about which you have some knowledge, does the school board policy seem consistent with prior court rulings?

Next, informally interview two teaching colleagues and an administrator. During your conversations, ascertain the extent to which each person has knowledge of the particular school board policy you examined. Also, try to discover the interviewee’s opinion of what is legal and what is illegal relative to the topic you’re discussing.

From this exercise, gauge the knowledge that your colleagues have regarding policies and legal issues affecting their work. If the knowledge seems adequate, try to determine how the interviewees obtained the knowledge. If it appears inadequate to you, make a plan for improving the knowledge. Finally, consider what you would do as a school administrator to ensure that your staff was knowledgeable regarding essential legal and political issues.
Have You Thought About It?

If he’s like most teachers, Mr. Spicer really doesn’t know if Mr. Alvarez’s actions were legal. All he has to go on is the embarrassed look on Mr. Alvarez’s face. Mr. Alvarez is the boss, but the students are the reasons why Mr. Spicer gets up in the morning. It seems as though Mr. Alvarez may have been out of line searching the lockers of three students who were not there while in the presence of other students. Granted, the standard of “reasonable suspicion” may be lower than that of “probable cause,” but Mr. Alvarez may have crossed the line this time. At least, that’s what Mr. Spicer is starting to think.

What do you think?
Spring is in the air, and so too is the dreaded state achievement test season. Principal Carson Hill knows that student achievement must show improvement over last year, and he is worried because this year’s plan was essentially for everybody to try harder. When the results of last year’s assessments came back, Principal Hill looked at the bottom line—achievement scores. The familiar three questions came into his mind. How many students met or exceeded the benchmarks? How were scores distributed among classes? Did the scores look different across the different demographic groups?

Principal Hill knew that there were some differences in scores when he compared one group of students to another group. His frustration built because the data didn’t seem to tell him why. “It’s one thing to know how the students did,” he thought. “What I really need to know is why? I can’t possibly do more than encourage teachers to work harder,” he lamented.
As you read through this chapter, think about whether or not Principal Hill is examining the data correctly. If Principal Hill was trained for his role as an administrator many years ago, it is likely that he never worried too much about what student achievement data looked like. It’s possible that Principal Hill has succumbed to the level of thinking that was drummed into school administrators’ heads for years—namely, some students achieve at a higher rate than others. Data simply tells us who they are.

Throughout this chapter, you will be exposed to different types of data. When combined, these data sources can, and should, drive instruction. The answers to almost any questions are found in data. The issue is whether or not we have the capacity to listen carefully to the story told by the data.

Success as a school administrator today requires the ability to read, interpret, analyze, and use data of different types. This is primarily because we now understand that improvements in student learning simply cannot occur without the deliberate and appropriate use of data. However, we haven’t always thought this way. For a very long time, school administrators failed to collect meaningful data, and they often ignored those sets of data that they did collect. For decades, school administrators delegated responsibilities related to data to other faculty members, such as guidance counselors. Even such delegation only happened in the relatively few schools that actually examined data at all. The majority of schools merely reported student learning data on report cards issued to parents, while providing few, if any, other measures of how students in their school were progressing. And, as educational leaders know, report cards are limited in their ability to report a true representation of student learning and understanding. Not all parents realize this, so school administrators need to focus on parent beliefs regarding assessments and data.

When most of our parents were in school, the only data ever reported came in the form of a grade on a report card. Most parents regard this traditional reporting method as the most objective indicator of student progress. They see A, B, C, D, and F as an approximate representation of a numerical average of test scores, homework assignments, and class work, and most believe those grades accurately reflect their children’s level of progress. It is up to school administrators to reverse this and to make all members of the educational community aware that multiple data measures are available to schools, and these data measures have many uses. To do so requires a reversal of history. Educational history does not illustrate extensive use of data by most schools until the enactment of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001 necessitated a change in this regard. In fact, recent educational history does not even illustrate any attention at all being paid to data or standards.

Many educators see the publication of the now-famous report A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) as the first event of the modern educational data movement. Few calls to action have been so often quoted as the dire pronouncements from that report: “The educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people….We have, in effect been
committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 5). This report, even this very quote, sparked a movement to establish standards, collect data, and analyze that data in respect to the standards. But, what types of data should be collected? Furthermore, how can we utilize that data to ensure that standards are met or exceeded? These questions traditionally have been answered by the reporting of student learning data. To respond to critics and concerned community members, educational leaders have reported and attempted to analyze student learning data only. The reason for this is simple. Up until very recently, student learning data is the only type of data that most of us knew even existed.

**Getting Started with Data**

There is a growing body of literature stressing that the use of high-quality, targeted assessment data, in the hands of school staff trained to use it effectively, can improve instruction. For example:

♦ Schools demonstrating success with “closing the gap,” profiled by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction in a 2000 study, were more likely than others to assess students periodically for diagnostic purposes and to disaggregate the data (Evaluation Section, Division of Accountability Services, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 2000).

♦ In a study of four school districts (each serving high percentages of students who would typically be characterized as at-risk) that significantly increased student performance on state-mandated tests, Cawelti and Protheroe (2001, p. 3) identified the following as a central finding of the study:

  Large gains in test scores require: (1) extensive efforts to align instruction with test content; (2) detailed analysis of student responses to the tests or assessments designed to parallel these; and (3) the provision of immediate and appropriate corrective instruction for individual students as indicated by that analysis.

♦ “Using data to drive improvement” was identified as a key to success in a report developed by the National Education Goals Panel after a series of hearings designed to find examples of successful schools and to understand why those schools were succeeding. Specifically, the successful schools “use performance information to determine where they were succeeding and where they needed to direct their efforts for improvement” (Rothman, 2000, p. i).

♦ In a study of Maryland elementary schools, Schafer et al. (n.d.) found that in schools they characterized as more successful, “principals are involved with assessment of student improvement and make classroom decisions based on these assessments.”
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A key element observed in all these successful schools and districts was a well-organized approach to using assessment data. This did not happen overnight. Typically, it was an evolutionary process that may have included some false starts (Cawelti & Protheroe, 2001). However, even without a coherent approach, just rolling up one’s sleeves and digging into the data can prove to be helpful. Typically, the challenge is not with accessing data. Instead, many school administrators are hampered by not knowing what the data says once they find it.

**Four Types of Data**

Educational leaders recently have developed stronger skills in data analysis, but such a development is difficult without first understanding the different types of data available to schools. Victoria L. Bernhardt (2004) is one of the most prolific writers in this area, and she has divided useful school data into four distinct categories. Enumerated and explained below are demographics, perceptions, student learning, and school processes.

1. **Demographics**—Demographic data refers to data that statistically characterizes people. Demographic data helps to build the context of the school, as it helps us to define who we are and what characteristics we possess. Typically, schools have more demographic data available to them than they know what to do with. Examples of demographic data include
   a. The number of teachers in a school
   b. The ratio of males to females
   c. How many students have graduated from the school
   d. Employment of parents
   e. Class sizes
   f. Age of the school facility
   g. Attendance by classroom

2. **Perceptions**—Perception data tells us what people believe, how they perceive things, and what their views are on a wide variety of topics. Perception data is extremely important because it explains why people (i.e., teachers, administrators, students, and parents) behave as they do. People rarely behave in a manner that is inconsistent with their view or basic beliefs. Typically, schools do a poor job collecting perception data. One reason why is that they don’t know how to go about collecting it. Oftentimes, perception data is collected through questionnaires, although it can also be gleaned from formal and informal conversations.

3. **Student Learning**—Student learning data is what most of us have traditionally classified as “hard” data. It is those pieces of data that come about as the result of assessments in the classroom or other
learning environment. Although not necessarily more important than other types of data, student learning data includes
a. Standardized tests
b. Norm-referenced tests
c. Criterion-referenced measures
d. Authentic assessments
e. Teacher-made tests
f. Teacher-assigned grades

4. School Processes—School processes data, while often the type of which fewest people are aware, is the only data over which we actually have control in the educational setting. School processes refer to the actual events that take place in schools or classrooms. Many of them can be changed if we don’t like what the data is telling us. Examples of school processes data include
a. Instructional strategies
b. Student–teacher ratios
c. Student groupings
d. Scheduling
e. Dropout rates
f. Use of technology

Assumptions About Data Usage

Although data use and data analysis are becoming more sophisticated and developed in schools across the country, there are some general assumptions that can be made about how schools typically use—or fail to use—the four types of data. The first assumption involves our use of demographic data. Schools of all types—private, public, elementary, and secondary—collect volumes of demographic data and often have such data readily accessible in the school’s main office. The problem is not the amount of demographic data that is available, but rather what should be done with all of the data. In many cases, how it can be made useful to us is a mystery. The fact is that demographic data can answer many questions about our students and their families, which can help us to make informed instructional decisions. As an example, demographic data can answer the questions found in Figure 12.1 (page 286).

Second, we can assume that perception data is rarely collected, and when it is collected, it is rarely utilized. As noted in Chapter 8, educators are often put out when their opinion is sought but not utilized. Consequently, it is imperative that perception data only be collected when there is a purpose for it and a plan for utilizing the data. Experiences indicate that educators are willing to share their opinions and beliefs. For them to be honest, however, they need to know that the information will be used in a manner that will help teaching and learning.
Figure 12.1 Questions Answered by Demographic Data

1. Which, if any, extracurricular programs are offered at the school?
2. How many students use school buses for transportation to and/or from schools?
3. What is the percentage of students who go on to college?
4. What is the employment status of parents in our school community?
5. What are this school's retention rates by gender, ethnicity, language spoken at home, and socioeconomic status?
6. What are the numbers and percentages of students receiving free/reduced lunch?
7. How many students participate in such programs as AP or IB?

Third, it is safe to assume that student learning data is the most often thought about data collected by school leaders. Since the inception of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, schools have increasingly focused attention on student learning data. However, school administrators have exhibited a tendency to disaggregate this data at the most basic level. Typically, schools understand what students scored on standardized assessments and to which of the federally recognized educational subgroups the students belong, but they rarely can tell anything at a deeper level than that. As more educators are aware of how data can be disaggregated and analyzed, we will see a change in this regard.

School leaders, particularly in complying with the knowledge, dispositions, and performances indicated by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, must have a keen understanding of how their school performs in terms of data analysis. As some schools are farther along than others, the astute leader must make evaluative judgments about his or her school’s ability to disaggregate data at a deep level and about the school’s success at analyzing available data overall.

In 2005, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) released a report entitled, How are Educators Using Data? A Comparative Analysis of Superintendent, Principal, and Teachers’ Perceptions of Accountability Systems. Englert, Fries, Martin-Glenn, and Michael, the report’s authors, examined differences between how educators from different groups performed at analyzing data and for what purpose their analysis was done. When evaluating your school’s ability to utilize and analyze data, it is important to consider what the McREL study illustrated, namely the following:

♦ Using data to make informed decisions about instruction is a crucial component to an effectively functioning accountability system. In particular, the data indicate that administrators need to support teachers in ways that make data usage more effective and easier. This may include developing better supplemental sources of data in addition to the statewide test to provide teachers with diagnostic data on their current students.
Training for teachers, principals, and administrators needs to be developed that facilitates dialogue about how to best allocate resources, identifies weaknesses in the curriculum, supports teachers, and effectively monitors policy implementation.

Educators in schools and districts that have not seen improvements in student achievement might critically examine their practices regarding using data to inform their work, communicate with parents, and allocate resources, as well as ensure that they are in fact holding to the philosophy that all students can become proficient in meeting rigorous academic standards. (Englert, Fries, Martin-Glenn, & Michael, 2005)

Although critical findings and suggestions emerged from this study, an important issue remains. How do we best support the use of data given limited resources and competing demands for time? This issue is complex, but addressing it becomes essential as the focus on student progress sharpens.

**Reasons for Analyzing School Data**

The main reason for analyzing school data is to determine what students have learned, what they need help to learn, and how teachers can plan instruction to ensure that they all do learn. Beverly Nichols and Kevin Singer (2000), in an *Educational Leadership* article entitled, “Developing Data Mentors,” wrote that simply gathering student-assessment data is inadequate. Instead, educational leaders and teachers must learn to analyze data and apply what they learn from the data in the classroom. There are a number of key questions that an examination of school data should address.

- What percent of students demonstrated proficiency?
- What implications does that percentage have for instruction?
- Which students have not demonstrated proficiency?
- What diagnostic information did an examination of student work provide?
- Based on individual student performance, what do teachers need to do next to move the student to a level of proficiency?
- Based on the class performance, what reteaching do teachers need to do?
- After reassessing occurred, did students demonstrate proficiency?
- Has reteaching or some other intervention resulted in improved student performance?
- When we compare performance by subgroups (e.g., by racial group, gender, students with disabilities, ESL students, or students receiving free or reduced price lunch), are there any groups not performing as well as the whole group? If so, what is going to be done about that?
Are there any students who are not attaining proficiency across indicators?
What interventions have been tried? What interventions are planned for the future?

The most important thing to keep in mind when approaching a data analysis project is to remember that the data can reveal voluminous information. The challenge lies in recognizing this fact. Too many educators attempt to analyze data without pausing to really examine what it is that they want to learn. The next mistake is often the administrator’s inability to really recognize what the data is saying. A colleague describes the process best. He says that we need to torture data until it confesses. The real message in the data is sometimes hidden. It must be examined and reexamined, or tortured, until it finally reveals its meaning.

Establishing Benchmarks:
The Beginning of Data Analysis

Benchmarks are baseline points from which measurements can be made. The establishment of these points represents an initial phase in analyzing data. To measure progress, we need to know what the baseline is, that is, from where we are beginning. From this point we can begin collecting data and comparing it to our benchmark. Let’s examine what benchmarks could look like in terms of collecting data from the four types described earlier.

1. **Demographic Benchmark**: Currently, a school has an enrollment that looks like this, when broken down by ethnicity: forty-one percent African American; thirty-two percent white; nineteen percent Hispanic; and eight percent other. If a school administrator wants to examine how the demographic makeup of his or her school changes over a three-year period, these figures would represent the benchmark, or starting point for data collection.

2. **Perception Benchmark**: In a survey conducted last week, twenty-seven percent of parents indicated that the front office staff was unfriendly. If a school administrator wanted to improve this perception and was going to enact measures to ensure a friendly, welcoming climate in the front office, then this data would represent the benchmark from which the school is trying to improve.

3. **Student Learning Benchmark**: The most recent data from statewide testing indicates that eighteen percent of boys in a school scored below the eightieth percentile. If the school’s administrator wants to see that percentage decrease by ten percent over the next two school years, then the eighteen percent of boys failing to score at or above the eightieth percentile would represent the student learning benchmark.
4. **School Processes Benchmark:** Current observations and discussions with teachers indicate that seventy-five percent of the faculty use cooperative learning techniques in the classroom daily. If a school administrator expects cooperative learning to be used by every teacher every day, then the benchmark figure of seventy-five percent represents that starting point, baseline, or benchmark from which this issue is measured.

As a school community, interested members need to know where they are before determining where they want to go. That is the real purpose of establishing benchmarks. Benchmarks give us a starting point on the map. From that starting point, school communities can chart a course toward improvement. Without the starting point, data analysis becomes a hit and miss proposition. You can’t decide if a right turn or a left turn will lead you home unless you know where you are starting from.

**Disaggregating Data**

Typically, student achievement data are reported for whole populations, or as aggregate data. It is not, however, until the data are disaggregated that patterns, trends, and other important information are uncovered. Disaggregating data simply means to be looking at the data by specific subgroups of students. Often, disaggregated student data addresses gender, race, ethnicity, and socio-economic status. However, disaggregated data also can help educators compare results in other ways. For example, educators could compare:

- Special education students and the general population;
- English language learners and the general population;
- Students with more and less than five absences; and
- Teachers with a graduate degree and teachers with a bachelor’s degree.

Disaggregating student learning data within and among student groups and to the classroom and school level are important ways to understand what happens in classrooms and schools, and thus better serve all students. Data disaggregation often sheds light on critical issues that were undetected previously. In consideration of math and science achievement, what follows are some questions that can be answered once achievement data is disaggregated:

- Is there an achievement gap in math and science among different groups? Is it getting bigger or smaller?
- Are minority or female students enrolling in higher-level math and science courses at the same rate as other students?
- Are poor or minority students overrepresented in special education or underrepresented in gifted and talented programs?
Disaggregating data is a critical part of the No Child Left Behind legislation which is intended to close the “achievement gap”—the differential academic performance of students according to their ethnic background. The achievement gap is an excellent example of disaggregated data, as it shows how different students perform on standardized tests, according to which ethnic group they belong. In fact, while many school districts across the United States were disaggregating data long before NCLB became law, it was the enactment of the No Child Left Behind legislation that forced states to disaggregate data based on certain demographic indicators.

Combining Data Sources

To derive a deep level of meaning from data, different data sources must be combined in new and unique ways. It is not possible for educational administrators to develop meaningful improvement plans based on only one data source. Instead, it is the intersection or combination of data sources that has the potential to answer some of education’s most important questions.

If schools focus only on student learning data, they are very limited in what analyses they can accomplish. Even if the student learning data is disaggregated so that schools know which groups of students perform better than other groups of students on achievement tests, schools are still severely limited in what they can learn from the data. Focusing merely on student learning data creates an environment in which the focus is on improving performance on tests. Although test improvements are important, these improvements cannot come about without understanding why scores are as they are and what processes should be employed to improve them. This is why the four types of data discussed earlier are so important.

If educational leaders combine data sources from two different categories, then they can dig deeper and gain a clearer picture of what is going on in their schools relative to student learning. Questions, such as these proposed by Victoria Bernhardt (2003), can be answered:

- Are students at certain grade levels doing better in math and science than students at other grade levels?
- Is transience or attendance a factor in math and science achievement?
- Are students whose teachers participate in ongoing professional development doing better than students whose teachers do not?
- Are the improvements we are making in the math and science program raising the performance of students in the lowest quartile?
Do students who attend school every day get better grades? (Demographic/Student Learning)

Do students with positive attitudes toward school do better academically, as measured by teacher-assigned grades? (Perceptions/Student Learning)

Did students enrolled in interactive math programs this year perform better on standardized achievement tests than those who took traditional math courses? (Student Learning/School Processes)

What strategies do third-grade teachers use to teach students with native languages different from their own? (Demographic/School Processes)

Furthermore, combining data sources allows for strong statistical analyses to occur. When looking at only one data source, say demographic data, it is only possible to report comparisons and not any causal relationships. Combining two data sources allows for relationships between variables to be explained, causes and effects to be determined, and predictions to be made. Although a strong knowledge of statistical processes and quantitative analyses are helpful, several software packages exist that can do most of the analysis for a school. Also, there are packages in existence that report the data in common language. These provide a real boost for educational leaders as they attempt to explain to stakeholders what the data actually says.

**Reporting the Results of Data Analysis**

Although it may sound ridiculous, many schools collect large volumes of data, perform analyses of the data at a variety of levels, and make changes or modifications based upon the analyses they have conducted, but then end the process at that point. To be translated into language that school stakeholders can understand, the end product of data collection and analysis needs to be a report. The ability to report the results of data analysis to different constituents is an important piece of the social and political dispositions described in ISLLC Standard 6.

The data analysis “report” is one of the most important parts of the data analysis process. The report becomes the official record of the analysis. For many stakeholders, particularly those external to the school, the report is the only part of the analysis that is ever seen. When done well, a good data analysis report accomplishes several important objectives. Among them, it

- Describes the data and the steps in analyzing it;
- Explains the procedures used in the analysis;
- Presents the findings;
- Draws conclusions about those findings; and
- Is prepared with the audience in mind, in language that is neither too technical nor too condescending.
A data analysis report is often used for different purposes, and with different audiences. It can be prepared for a school board, a PTA, a school faculty, or any other stakeholder group. Many of these groups do not need a long report, or even a written report. A short summary report, or a verbal report, will satisfy the needs of some audiences. On the other hand, some audiences need the detailed information that can only be provided by a long report. Additionally, some audiences need the report to be formatted in a particular manner. An example is a state agency requiring a data analysis report from every school district in the state.

There are many ways of communicating the results of data analysis, including:
- Informal communications (in the hall, over coffee, before and after meetings);
- Formal meetings;
- Less formal meetings (small groups, no minutes);
- Memos;
- Written reports;
- Newsletters;
- Electronic communication;
- Visual presentations (slide show, video show);
- Public meetings; and
- Local media presentations.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress

Since the enactment of NCLB, all states have been required to assess students, analyze the data resulting from these assessments, and report the data to the public. As education is a state-governed enterprise, it is the state’s responsibility to ensure that this federal mandate is completed annually. In addition to the state responsibility, the federal government has been conducting assessments and reporting on student progress annually since 1969 through the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). NAEP is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas. NAEP assessments are conducted periodically in mathematics, writing, reading, science, the arts, civics, economics, geography, and history. Assessments in world history and in foreign language are anticipated to be available in 2012.

In accordance with federal law, the NAEP Assessments are administered by the Institute of Educational Sciences (IES). The purpose of the IES, as described in the law is as follows:

The mission of the Institute is to provide:
national leadership in expanding fundamental knowledge and understanding of education from early childhood through post-secondary study, in order to provide parents, educators, students, researchers, policymakers, and the general public with reliable information about—

(A) the condition and progress of education in the United States, including early childhood education;
(B) educational practices that support learning and improve academic achievement and access to educational opportunities for all students; and
(C) the effectiveness of federal and other education programs. (Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, Public Law 107-219 Title III, section 303)

NAEP also is referred to as the Nation’s Report Card. It is for this reason that NAEP provides such a good example for this chapter. Anybody can visit the NAEP website and read any sections of the Nation’s Report Card that are of interest. Reports are presented as graphic displays, statistical analyses, and as written prose. Regardless of one’s familiarity with educational terminology, there are sections of the report that are clear and understandable. To view results from NAEP assessments, visit http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/.

If there is a downside to having so much data available to such a wide audience, it is the risk of the data being misunderstood and misrepresented. To help allay potential problems that can arise from stakeholders misunderstanding the data, all educational leaders must be knowledgeable of what the data says. A school administrator at any level should be able to respond to questions or erroneous statements made after parents or community members read of the data in the press or visit the website themselves. Responding is impossible if the school administrator does not first familiarize her- or himself with the data analysis report.

Summary

Data and what schools do with data are increasingly important to the general public. It is essential that all educators, particularly those in leadership positions understand the public’s obsession with data, fostered by the current era of accountability. Without the ability to analyze, interpret, and explain data to the many publics served by our schools, educational leaders will be viewed as being out of touch and incapable of transforming education.

Most current school administrators were not extensively trained in data analysis techniques. For quite some time, data analysis was considered to be the domain of researchers. Conversely, school administrators were labeled as practitioners, and researchers and practitioners were considered to be mutually exclusive. The result of decades of thinking about data this way is that many schools...
pointcounterpoint

Point

Schools today have volumes and volumes of data that could be better analyzed to inform stakeholders of which areas need to be improved upon. At the beginning of the school year alone, large quantities of demographic data are collected revealing everything from the number of parents in a student’s household to a list of allergies that students might have. With very little effort, school administrators could examine student achievement by all sorts of variables and, possibly, discover some patterns that could be helpful in instructional design, methodology, and/or assessment. All that is needed is a stronger commitment to data analysis.

Counterpoint

It’s true that schools collect lots of data that may not ever get used to inform instructional design, methodology, and/or assessment. However, administrators and teachers already analyze volumes of data provided by their districts, state education agencies, and even the federal government. More than ever, data drives all decisions made at the school level. There comes a point at which so much time is spent analyzing and too little time is spent actually implementing changes. Educators have expertise in designing, delivering, and evaluating instruction. Leave the data analysis to the bureaucrats.

Questions

♦ Are administrators in contemporary schools committed to data analysis? What evidence supports your response?

♦ Do you think that we overanalyze data in any areas? Why? Why not?

in our country are missing out on rich opportunities to use data in a manner that informs instruction and increases learning for all students.

Nowadays, when schools do collect data, it is typically in the format of two types discussed in this chapter. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires all schools to report student achievement results by identified subgroups. Because of this, the collection of demographic data and student learning data has become commonplace. Many school administrators feel as though their analyses of these two types of data provide them with the information needed to guide instructional planning in their schools.
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The two data types rarely discussed, school processes data and perception data, have the capacity to exponentially increase our understanding of how individual teachers teach and how individual students learn, while also explaining why things are done as they are. It is one thing to know how a group of students perform on a standardized test. It is more impressive and valuable to know which processes are occurring in the course of a school day for these students and how all these processes make the students feel. Similarly, some teachers perceive the role of parents in a negative light. As ISLLC Standard 4 reminds us, the ability to build supportive and cooperative relationships with parents is an important component of our success as leaders. Knowing how each teacher perceives parents and searching for relationships between those perceptions and teaching styles, years of experience, or gender, for example, can be very helpful. Without a strong ability to analyze data, school leaders will be lost in this regard.

Since 1969, the U.S. Congress has required the federal government to collect information about student achievement through the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). NAEP results have been reported throughout this time, but the results rarely were analyzed by school practitioners. Instead, the results were reported in media outlets, parents and community members were digesting the reports, and opinions were being formed about our successes and failures in educating our nation’s youth. All of this occurred with no involvement on the part of local school administrators. Now, savvy administrators are aware of what NAEP assessments show, and they analyze these assessment results along with their own state assessment results to reach conclusions that are much more meaningful than those that can be reached by large-scale NAEP data alone. The best administrators among us proactively report these results to the public. The end products are informed constituents and an education for students that is driven by data and is appropriate to their needs.

**Chapter Highlights**

- Success as a school administrator today requires the ability to read, interpret, analyze, and use data of different types.
- Throughout U.S. educational history there are few examples of extensive use of data by most schools until the enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 necessitated a change. For the first time, the federal government required schools in every state to look at student achievement data and chart a course for improvement.
- Data available to all schools can be classified into four distinct types: demographic, student learning, school processes, and perceptions.
- Most schools analyze demographic data and student learning data. These two types are both necessary in calculating a school’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Most schools rarely use perception data and school processes data, yet these two types can answer many important educational questions.
The starting point or baseline for measuring data is called a benchmark. The establishment of benchmarks represents an initial phase in analyzing data. To measure progress, we need to know what the baseline is, or where we are beginning.

Student achievement data usually are reported for whole populations, or as aggregate data. Disaggregating data means to looking at the data by specific subgroups of students. It is not until the data are disaggregated that patterns, trends, and other important information are uncovered.

Combining data sources allows for strong statistical analyses to occur. When looking at merely one data source, it is only possible to report comparisons and not any causal relationships.

After data has been analyzed, it is important to explain its meaning in a report. Data reports can be in many different formats, depending on the audience and the level of analysis that has been done.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas. NAEP assessments are conducted periodically in mathematics, writing, reading, science, the arts, civics, economics, geography, and history.

**Application Questions**

1. Consider the types of data typically collected at your school. Are there examples of perception data being collected? If so, whose perception has been sought and analyzed? Has your school done anything with the results?

2. To what extent would you say teachers in your school use data? Which type of data is most often used by teachers? In your particular school, are there examples of teachers disaggregating data?

3. How has the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* influenced the degree to which your school collects and analyzes data? Has NCLB been helpful in forcing schools to examine data more closely? Why do you feel as you do?

4. Read the official minutes from recent school board meetings in your district. Do you see evidence of data being reported in these meetings? If so, which of the four types of data is most often the subject of conversations at public meetings like the meetings of your local school board?

**Field Activity**

Speak with a building principal or your school district’s testing coordinator and ask to see the most recent student learning data (state assessments). Also,
ask the administrator if there are any reports that have been written explaining or describing the data. Regardless of whether or not such reports exist, try to determine if there are ways to examine the data by combining at least two types. For example, can the data be disaggregated by gender? If so, it can be examined by combining student achievement scores (student learning data) and gender (demographic data). Are there any three-way combinations that you can find? For example, can you look at student achievement scores (student learning data) by gender (demographic data) on the basis of whether or not individual students receive special education services (school processes data)? Do administrators in your school or district combine data sources to better understand what the data says? Alternately, do they simply examine the bottom line scores?

This activity can also be done by visiting your state’s department of education website. States are required to make school achievement data accessible to the public. One way this is done is by reporting data analysis results on the Internet. Is this data reported on a simple level, or are there attempts at combining data sources to drill deeper into the data? If the data is not reported on a deep level, does the state report raw scores in a method that allows you to perform analyses? If not, the same activities can be completed using national large-scale datasets, such as the NAEP data described in this chapter (http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/).

**Have You Thought About It?**

Principal Carson Hill faces a situation that virtually every school administrator has faced, particularly since the enactment of *No Child Left Behind*. His admonishments to teachers to work harder have no chance of producing the desired results. Principal Hill needs to understand and then teach his teachers how to drill into data and truly analyze it. He needs to remember that if you torture the data enough, it will confess. I believe that if Mr. Carson and his faculty disaggregate the data and then analyze it by combining different sources to produce meaningful questions, some notable patterns might emerge.

What do you think?
APPENDIX

Educational Leadership Standards and Successful Practices of School Principals

Standards in Educational Leadership

Although the theories and concepts presented in this textbook have been organized around the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, the Standards must be viewed as having an even broader context than what could possibly be presented here and as having a meaningful place as foundations of educational leadership behaviors. There are particular pieces of knowledge, dispositions, and performances that have not been directly addressed in this textbook. Their omission is not intended to cast dispersions on them or to reduce their significance in any way. Rather, their omission signals that the study of educational leadership is broad, and it encompasses a vast array of knowledge and performance indicators.
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Below is a table that has been designed to indicate further some specific behaviors of school principals that relate to the ISLLC Standards. The Standards, themselves, have been retitled with terminology that intends to capture their essence. This table provides one more tool for recognizing the ISLLC Standards in the work of school principals. It, like the rest of the textbook, is not inclusive of all behaviors school principals engage in that can be related back to the Standards. The table does, however, delineate some of the more significant behaviors of accomplished school principals.

## ISLLC Standard 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Accomplished School Principals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1: The Vision of Learning for All</td>
<td>♦ Ensure the involvement of all school stakeholders in creating the school vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Examine their own personal beliefs, assumptions, and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Believe in continuous school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Focus all efforts on improved student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Engage in communication that is broad-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Stimulate positive and critical discussion for school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Challenge values and promote discussion and dialogue on beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Build leadership capacity among staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Consider information from a variety of sources that includes student achievement data, demographic data, and other sources of relevant data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISLLC Standard 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Accomplished School Principals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 2: The Culture of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>♦ Celebrate accomplishments and the reaffirmation of the school’s vision and mission statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Utilize the school’s strengths to support growth areas in need of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Recognize the efforts of staff in bringing about positive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Model the vision for staff, students, parents, and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Develop positive connections with all members of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Provide meaningful opportunities for all members of the diverse school community in shaping the school culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Believe in the importance of professional development in the creation of a positive school climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Provide leadership opportunities for teachers and other school stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Engage the school community in assuring that all students are enrolled in courses that are appropriately challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Use climate and culture surveys to monitor the school environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Analyze student indicators of success such as attendance, course enrollment patterns, and grades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ISLLC Standard 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Accomplished School Principals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard 3: The Management of Learning for All | ♦ Allocate resources linked to values delineated in the vision of school  
♦ Engage members of the school community in the decision-making process  
♦ Engage in a process of continuous learning designed to gain greater understanding of effective teaching and learning  
♦ Remain current with the latest research in areas such as how students learn, curriculum, and assessment  
♦ Explore creative avenues to obtain resources needed to support teaching and learning  
♦ Seek creative ways to increase leadership capacity among the staff related to resource allocation  
♦ Engage all appropriate members of the school community in the management of resources  
♦ Involve all appropriate stakeholders in ongoing decisions related to resource management  
♦ Establish channels of collaboration within the school and community to create a positive and safe learning environment  
♦ Empower the members of the school community in creating and sustaining high academic standards  
♦ Demonstrate a commitment for the creation of a safe environment that supports effective learning  
♦ Build partnerships with local law enforcement and other community groups eager to share the common vision of school safety |
## ISLLC Standard 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Accomplished School Principals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 4: Relation-</td>
<td>♦ Take full advantage of the diversity within the community to gain a deeper understanding of divergent viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ships With the Broader</td>
<td>♦ Communicate directly with the community to gain an understanding and appreciation for its diverse needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community to Foster</td>
<td>♦ Maintain and support a directory of community resources and agencies that are available to the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning for All</td>
<td>♦ Include external stakeholders in the design and implementation of educational programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Become proactive in addressing community issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Seek ways to engage the community in school issues by actively explaining the educational process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Establish procedures and expectations that encourage community involvement in school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Provide opportunities for community business and political leaders to attend and participate in school activities and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Create, foster, and sustain a school culture that is based on respect for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ISLLC Standard</td>
<td>Accomplished School Principals:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 5: Integrity, Fairness, and Ethics</td>
<td>♦ Appreciate and value diversity within the school community ♦ Establish procedures that ensure that everyone’s rights and dignity are preserved ♦ Demonstrate an obvious desire to understand the needs of the learning community and to serve those needs ♦ Treat all stakeholders with dignity and respect ♦ Establish expectations of high standards for all ♦ Foster the school vision both in the school and in the community by including all constituents and confronting and remedying injustices ♦ Provide opportunities for disseminating information and opinions through open, honest discussions ♦ Seek feedback from the community to strengthen the relationships between school and community ♦ Actively seek the involvement of all stakeholders ♦ Identify and confront injustices that occur in the school community ♦ Hold oneself to the same standards established for the school community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISLLC Standard 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ISLLC Standard</th>
<th>Accomplished School Principals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard 6: The Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Contexts of Schooling | ♦ Create opportunities for communication between the school staff and external stakeholders  
♦ Create an awareness of the school’s vision and goals among external stakeholders  
♦ Model effective communication practices by demonstrating respect and awareness for needs and values of external stakeholders  
♦ Share effective instructional strategies with the community to build support and demonstrate sensitivity to their needs  
♦ Exhibit an understanding of how to use policies and procedures to promote the success of all students  
♦ Demonstrate a respect for the individuals, policies, and regulations that shape and govern the school  
♦ Understand the importance of adhering to existing policies and regulations to ensure the safety of all members of the school community  
♦ Build relationships with external stakeholders and decision makers based on character, honesty, fairness, and respect |

Educational Leadership Constituent Consortium Standards

Educator preparation programs that are approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) utilize the Educational Leadership Constituent Consortium (ELCC) Standards as the basis for designing and implementing their graduate school leadership curricula. While not all programs offering graduate programs in educational leadership are NCATE approved, the standards developed by the ELCC are widely accepted as useful standards for the design of educational leadership programs. Published in 2002 as Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership for Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors under the auspices of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, these standards also are accompanied by a list of performance indicators to assist in discovering their application. As you examine the wording of the ELCC Standards in the list below, compare what you read with the wording of the ISLLC Standards. More than likely, you will discover a high degree of similarity between ELCC and ISLLC, underscoring the notion that there really is a set of standards that is associated with successful and
effective school leadership. The multitude of theories, concepts, and constructs presented in the previous twelve chapters are succinctly represented in these sets of standards.

**Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership for Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors (ELCC)**

- **Standard 1:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning supported by the school community.

- **Standard 2:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

- **Standard 3:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

- **Standard 4:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with families and other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

- **Standard 5:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner.

- **Standard 6:** Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

- **Standard 7:** Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge
and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1 to 6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit.

Standard 7 represents the only notable departure from the language of the ISLLC Standards. While great congruence is noted between ELCC Standards 1 to 6 and ISLLC Standards 1 to 6, ELCC Standard 7 stands alone in that it represents the internship requirement to which institutions desiring accreditation must adhere. It is important to note that Standard 7 offers no new knowledge or ability that school leaders must possess. Instead, it simply serves to illustrate the importance of field-based internships as part of the graduate preparation necessary for school leaders.

Assumptions Underlying Standards for School Leaders

Although developed for the ELCC Standards, the following assumptions also are relevant to the ISLLC Standards. These assumptions represent the beliefs about what is really important in school leadership as we move further into the twenty-first century.

1. The central responsibility of leadership is to improve teaching and learning.
2. The purpose of the standards is to improve the performance of school leaders, thereby enhancing the performance of teachers and students in the workplace.
3. The standards apply to the most common positions in educational leadership, including principal, supervisor, curriculum director, and superintendent. While the emphasis in preparation programs may shift among the standards depending upon specific leadership roles (i.e., potential superintendents may focus more on finance and policy development while potential principals may focus more on instructional programs and student personnel), it is important for all school leaders to be familiar with and able to accomplish the tasks associated with each standard as well as to participate in an extensive internship.
4. The exercise of leadership in its various expressions constitutes the core function of principals, curriculum directors, supervisors, and superintendents. Leadership is active, not passive. It is collaborative and inclusive, not exclusive. While leadership may be viewed as a process, it also requires the exercise of certain expertise and the expression of particular attributes.
5. No overarching theory of leadership has proven adequate, but many of the skills and attributes of effective leadership are understood and can be taught and practiced.

6. Preparation programs should focus primarily on developing school leaders for responsible positions in elementary and secondary schools. This preparation requires the cultivation of professional competence through bridging experiences and clinical practice as well as classroom performance activities.

7. Many preparation programs fall short of developing the knowledge, skills, and attributes required of school leaders in today’s workplace. Principals, supervisors, curriculum directors, and superintendents need increasingly to take initiative and manage change. They must build a group vision, develop quality educational programs, provide a positive instructional environment, apply evaluation processes, analyze data and interpret results, and maximize human and physical resources. They also must generate public support, engage various constituencies, and mitigate value conflicts and political pressures. School leaders clearly must be prepared to operate in the community as well as in the academy.

8. Leadership includes an ethical dimension because principals and other leaders are moral agents responsible for the welfare and development of students. Preparation programs should provide opportunities for candidates to formulate and examine an ethical platform upon which to rely when making tough decisions.

9. Preparation programs should be essentially an institutional responsibility, but the design and delivery of these programs should include participants from school districts. In addition, some key learning experiences must take place in operating schools, particularly the application of knowledge and the practice of skills.

10. The standards should be assessed primarily through performance measures. Increasingly, schools are responding successfully to performance-based criteria and educational leadership preparation programs can benefit from similar processes. This approach provides a useful review of contemporary practice and the rationale for that practice. (http://www.ascd.org/aboutascd/ELCC_Instructions.html)

Closing

This second edition contains updated applications of the many theoretical models presented, but the theories themselves remain largely unchanged. Timeless wisdom doesn’t change, but as education changes, so must the application of timeless wisdom in contemporary school settings. Data collection and analysis have been highlighted to more accurately reflect the current environment.
in which school administrators conduct their work. No matter how much has changed, however, the Standards have remained constant. Such is the way with good standards. They can be massaged, their wording can be altered, and different components can receive greater or lesser attention.

The myriad responsibilities of school leaders could render one weak if one was to attempt to learn all relevant theories and apply those theories to what is witnessed in the work of school leaders in contemporary educational settings. Those who have gone before us have left a trail of wisdom from which all school leaders can learn a great deal. The goal in creating this textbook was to tap into that wisdom while giving it a common thread with which different aspects can be connected. The Standards are that thread. We know that learning occurs more readily and is more accessible when connections can be drawn between concepts. Hopefully, by understanding what is intended in the knowledge, dispositions, and performances of the ISLLC Standards, future school leaders will have a framework upon which to place all relevant theories and concepts. The future of our schools depends on the abilities of our future leaders, the efforts of our present leaders, and the wisdom of those who have gone before.
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