



# Teaching in Educational Administration



Division A • American Educational Research Association • Spring 2006 • Vol. 14, No. 1

## An Update on the TEA-SIG’s Work and Highlights of Its Taskforce Research

Margaret Terry Orr (Bank Street College), TEA-SIG chair

April is fast approaching when we will be convening again at the annual AERA conference, this year in San Francisco. We hope you will attend our exciting, cutting edge research paper presentations and symposia, and will join us for our business meeting and reception.

This past year, the TEA-SIG made great strides in stimulating new research on our teaching and learning in leadership preparation, and in supporting and acknowledging the good work being done in our field. We have done this by co-sponsoring TWO research taskforces to synthesize existing research and support new research in our field, and creating awards to recognize new scholars and outstanding research in the field, while continuing to sponsor sessions at AERA.

### UCEA/TEA-SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation

Our first task force, now in its sixth year, is the UCEA/TEA-SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation. This taskforce has both synthesized a considerable body of evaluation research on leadership preparation programs and leadership development, and has initiated several long-term research projects. At the fall UCEA convention and at the AERA conference this year, our recent research findings are highlighted, as summarized below.

a. Follow up survey of graduates. The taskforce’s study on the impact of leadership preparation programs on leadership practice led to several pilot studies and presently a national follow up survey of leadership preparation program graduates. The survey is being (or has been) fielded by 15-20 programs nationwide. At the UCEA 2005 convention, the taskforce deliberated on

further replication of the survey. Other scholars are invited to field the survey and participate in the taskforce’s integrated program comparison data analysis. The taskforce will make the survey, IRB template and SPSS template available to interested researchers on a restricted use basis; for more information, contact Terry Orr (Bank Street College, morr@bnkst.edu). At the UCEA convention, Terry Orr presented preliminary findings in comparisons of four programs, highlighting graduate reported differences in program emphasis, content and post-career advancement. She and other

*Continued on page 3, right column*

### IN THIS ISSUE

<b>“An Update on the TEA-SIG’s Work and Highlights of its Taskforce Research”</b>	
Margaret Terry Orr .....	page 1
<b>“Mapping the Terrain” of School Leader Preparation</b>	
Brenda S. Roberts .....	page 5
<b>Non-University Based Preparation Programs: A Taskforce Summary of Alternatives and a Research Agenda for Further Study</b>	
JoAnn Danelo Barbour.....	page 7
<b>Outstanding Program for 2006 Annual Meeting: Program Chair Report</b>	
Tricia Browne-Ferrigno.....	page 9
<b>2006 TEA-SIG Program Summary</b> .....	page 10
<b>Excerpt from Roland S. Barth’s Foreword</b>	
<i>Lead with Me</i> , Moller and Pankake .....	page 13

### **TEA-SIG Executive Committee**

<b>Chair</b>	Terry Orr, <i>Bank Street College</i>
<b>Program Chair</b>	Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, <i>University of Kentucky</i>
<b>Co-Program Chair</b>	Edie Rusch, <i>University of Nevada-Las Vegas</i>
<b>Treasurer</b>	Kathleen Jorissen, <i>Bowling Green State University</i>
<b>Secretary</b>	Brenda LeTendre, <i>Pittsburgh State University</i>
<b>Newsletter Editor</b>	Miles Bryant, <i>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</i>
<b>Past President</b>	Robert Kottkamp, <i>Hofstra University</i>
<b>Member at Large</b>	Judy A. Alston, <i>Bowling Green State University</i>
<b>Member at Large</b>	Donald Hackmann, <i>University of Illinois-Champaign-Urbana</i>
<b>Member at Large</b>	George Petersen, <i>California Polytechnic State University</i>

## **From the TEA-SIG Chair**

Dear TEA-SIG members,

In looking ahead at the upcoming AERA conference, I have thought more about our role in the field. There have been many efforts to reform leadership preparation over the past 30 years, ranging from sharply critical reports from within the field and outside, to policy mandates and foundation intervention. Little attention, however, has been given to how programs actually change and improve and the source of influence and change. Case study profiles of program reform (Carr, C. S. (2005). Evolution of a leadership preparation program in the 21st century, *NCPEA Education Leadership Review*, 6(1), 33-41.) illustrate the interplay between two primary change strategies: policy mandates and the natural diffusion of new approaches, through research and development.

In the climate of accountability, much attention has been given to the potential influence of state policy to improve the quality of school leaders and thus their singular influence on school performance and student achievement. As the articles in this TEA-SIG newsletter illustrates, states are addressing leadership preparation program reform through adding requirements for principal and superintendent certification, testing leadership competencies, and specifying leadership preparation program content and delivery (such as the scope and length of internships). Several national foundations are working with state agencies to add performance requirements for preparation programs, their graduates and educational leaders, while encouraging alternative pathways to educational leadership as well.

Such an emphasis on policy levers to reform leadership preparation has diminished attention to the other powerful change strategy—field initiated research, development and diffusion of innovative approaches to leadership preparation. While policy influences—through standards, program requirements, and certification and licensure—provide strong impetus and direction for leadership preparation program change, program quality appears to be most influenced by the innovations that emerge from field-initiated research and its dissemination. Although the research in our field has been characterized as scant and of limited methodological quality, it appears to have served as a powerful vehicle for fomenting ideas and approaches for broader diffusion. Our work through two national taskforces (as summarized in a related article) has enabled us to review historic lines of research in our field, highlighting when several currently common program practices had been novel innovations. There was a time, for example, when cohort groups, action research, on-line courses and portfolios were new ideas in program design and delivery. Through several, albeit small scale, studies, we as a field have explored these design and delivery strategies on their educating purpose, use and contributions to student learning and leadership development. Now, these strategies have become common to programs nationwide, primarily through the natural diffusion and adoption process of new ideas and strategies.

Professional forums, like the TEA-SIG, have been instrumental in facilitating this diffusion process and the adoption of innovative approaches and program

*Continued on page 3, left column*

## From the TEA-SIG chair

*Continued from page 2*

improvements. We have provided a means for encouraging and regularly showcasing research and discussing these strategies and approaches. Until recently, much of the research in our field was disseminated primarily through conference presentations, as there were limited publication outlets. In the last two years, UCEA has made great strides in expanding publication opportunities for our field, through a proposed handbook on research and a new research journal. Research forums, like the TEA-SIG, continue to be critical for this important means of program improvement.

Our role as the TEA-SIG (and the role of other professional forums including UCEA, NCPEA, and Division A of AERA) will be to continue to support and encourage program innovation and improvement through field-initiated research and the diffusion of good ideas. As a group, the TEA-SIG can help to set standards for quality research practices, provide strategic advice on how to research our own program innovations, and be “critical friends” to each other’s emerging research and its dissemination. Most important, we must find ways to expand our research beyond how we teach and organize learning in our programs, to what we teach and what our graduates learn. Our taskforces’ work is providing critical first steps in this direction by asking graduates about what they learned (in our follow up survey) and reviewing research on curriculum and instruction in our field. As a group, we must go beyond policy-prescribed program content (based on national standards), to inquiry into how what our graduates learn influences their leadership practices.

Thus, I hope that we can use our business meeting at AERA to talk further about how we can strategically strengthen innovation and the diffusion of good ideas, strategies and practices for improved leadership preparation.

I look forward to seeing you in San Francisco in April.

Sincerely,

Terry Orr  
TEA-SIG chair

## Update on the TEA-SIG’s Work

*Continued from page 1*

taskforce members, Ruth Silverberg and Brenda LeTendre, will present further findings at AERA this April.

b. Student selection and admissions study. Taskforce members, Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Kaetlyn Lad, and Alan Shoho have conducted two rounds of research on programs’ selection and admissions criteria. Their results suggest that programs are increasingly focused on leadership potential in their student selection and estimate that more than 70% complete the program with the intention of pursuing a leadership career.

c. The nature of leadership development. A third line of research has been a study of the roots of leadership, through life history interviews of exemplary principals, how they developed their leadership practices and the role of preparation program participation. Lew Smith, Tricia Brown-Ferrigno, Gini Doolittle and Terry Orr have been interviewing 18 principals selected from among the 36 awardees of the National School Change award. At the UCEA 2005 convention, they presented preliminary findings, showing that many had early leadership experiences through sports and extra-curricular activities, and in their adult life gained early and multiple opportunities to organize team effort and develop individual capacity in others. Many had significant leadership setbacks and learned from the leadership flaws in others—how not to bully others or be autocratic. Their formal preparation had a secondary influence on their leadership development, serving more as a source of new practices (such as distributed leadership) or strategic knowledge. How these leadership experiences connect to their current leadership practice will be discussed in the authors’ AERA presentation this April.

d. Mapping the terrain of leadership preparation. Various taskforce members have mapped the terrain of leadership preparation programs, through two strategies, looking at state policies and looking at institutional practices. The first study is summarized in two articles in the newsletter. In two related papers, Grant Norgaard and Miles Bryant, and Brenda LeTendre and Brenda Roberts made state-by-state comparison of current principal certification requirements. Among other findings, they found that there are broad similarities across the states, but distinct differences which make full reciprocity of certification difficult even among neighboring states.

*Continued on page 4*

## Update on the TEA-SIG's Work

*Continued from page 3*

Complementing this work, Joanne Barbour did a state-by-state study on the types of university-based and non-university-based leadership preparation programs (e.g. for-profit and not-for-profit) available and the relationship between policy options and the growth and prevalence of different types of programs.

In the second line of research, Bruce Baker, Terry Orr and Michelle Young analyzed national data sets on higher education institutions to document the shifting landscape of preparation programs nationwide. They found, among other results, that from 1993-2003, the number of masters degree programs increased by 16 percent and the number of masters degrees granted by 90 percent. Degree production shifted by institutional type over this decade. The number of Research Universities producing masters, specialist and doctoral degrees declined dramatically while Comprehensive Colleges and Universities had over a four-fold increase in the share. Bruce Baker will be presenting further results at AERA.

e. Encouraging state and local evaluation of leadership preparation. The taskforce work has inspired several state leadership preparation program associations to undertake collaborative evaluation research. These state associations are similarly documenting the nature of preparation in their states and jointly conducting a follow up survey of their graduates and their subsequent school improvement work as school leaders. Representatives from Utah (Diana Pounder and Madeline Hafner), Missouri (Jerry Waddle and Robert Perry) and Indiana (Martha McCarthy and Bill Black) presented their state associations' progress at the UCEA Convention and provided first hand experience on how to organize a state association for collaborative research. They recommend working in a step-wise fashion through program documentation to compare key program features; agreeing on and fielding a joint follow up survey of graduates; and planning for a follow up study of graduates who are principals through a review of school performance indicators and other school attributes. Diana Pounder and Madeline Hafner will be providing an update on their state's work at AERA.

### **A second taskforce collaboration**

The TEA-SIG is now part of a second national taskforce. The Joint Taskforce on the Research of Leadership Preparation, co-sponsored by four professional associations—UCEA, NCPEA, AERA, Division A, and TEA-SIG. According to Michelle Young of UCEA, the

primary aims of the taskforce are to: 1) provide a foundation about existing research and theory in the field of leadership preparation; 2) identify gaps and new directions for research on leadership preparation; 3) stimulate more, better quality research in the field of leadership preparation; 4) encourage new and experienced researchers to undertake research in the field; and 5) provide a community of scholars for on-going conceptual and methodological work.

Rather than look narrowly at just evaluation research on leadership preparation, the taskforce has encouraged broad field participation in synthesizing the existing research in ten domains—Leadership Education as a Field of Study, The Context of Leadership Education, Models and Theories of Leadership Education, Recruitment, Selection and Development of Leadership Candidates, Providers of Leadership Education, Curriculum and Pedagogy in Leadership Education, The Delivery of Leadership Preparation, Student Assessment and Program Evaluation, Professional Learning, and Leadership Education Around the Globe. Each domain has a coordinating domain leader. The taskforce sections will present each domain's literature reviews at AERA and host a meeting to plan next steps research. To join in the discussion and research in a particular domain, contact the domain leader, through the UCEA link (<http://ucea.org/doc/Descripttaskforce.doc>).

### **Other TEA-SIG initiatives**

Another TEA-SIG initiative has been to bring recognition to the outstanding work in the field. Last year we honored our first exemplary dissertation, with a new TEA-SIG dissertation award. This year, we will be honoring our second exemplary dissertation at the TEA-SIG business meeting, and will be making our first award for outstanding research, with the TEA-SIG outstanding research award (to be given bi-annually by the SIG). These awards are now regular features of our SIG, which we hope will stimulate new and interesting research and elevate high quality research underway.

### **Meeting at AERA**

As Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, our program chair has outlined in a related newsletter article, we have a wonderful series of papers, symposia, and roundtables to attend. As well, please join us in our business meeting to celebrate this good work and our accomplishments as a field. We look forward to seeing you there.

# “Mapping the Terrain” of School Leader Preparation

Brenda S. Roberts, Pittsburg State University

This article is a synopsis of the LeTendre and Roberts (2005) paper, “A National View of Certification of School Principals: Current and Future Trends” presented at the 2005 UCEA Convention. The paper was developed in response to the “mapping the terrain” subgroup initiative that focused on researching the big picture of leadership preparation programs. This group represents part of the on-going work of the TEA-SIG Taskforce for Evaluating Educational Leadership Preparation Effectiveness.

Numerous studies confirm the school principal as a key influence when addressing the challenges of accountability directed at the school level (Herrington & Wills, 2005). The principal is responsible for influencing and shaping learning that results in a positive impact on student achievement (Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom, 2004). This unrelenting focus on the need for strong principal leadership has fueled the current criticism directed at the quality of educational leaders. University-based leadership preparation programs are the predominant means states use to prepare principals and educational leaders for their schools, as such, these programs are drawing criticism concerning the quality of leaders they produce (The Broad Foundation & The Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2003; Hess & Kelly, 2005; Levine, 2005).

A current initiative to garner research on the nature and effectiveness of university-based leadership preparation programs requires mapping the field of educational leadership preparation programs. In order to create a generalized knowledge base on leadership preparation approaches two questions were addressed: (1) What patterns to certification currently exist across the states? (2) What might these current patterns suggest for the future of school principal certification? The “mapping the terrain” initiative to develop a state-by-state matrix requires the concentration on information about the following aspects of principal certification:

- The structure and standards underpinning the state’s principal certification requirements,
- Requirements for the initial certificate and requirements for renewal,
- Documents required for application, and
- Alternate routes to certification.

Data were obtained from state websites as compiled by the National Center for Education Information (Feistritzer,

2003) and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certifications (NASDTEC) Manual on the Preparation & Certification of Educational Personnel, 9th Edition (NASDTEC, 2004). State statutes on certification and personal contacts with state officials served as additional information sources.

A review on the current status of state certification requirements produces remarkable similarity across states (McCarthy, 2002). For example, all states, except Michigan, require that public school principals meet certification requirements and Michigan legislators are currently contemplating reinstating certification (Watkins, 2004). Over 90% of the states require that a principal candidate complete a state-approved preparation program to receive a certificate as a school leader with some states requiring candidates to take specific courses (Feistritzer, 2003; NASDTEC, 2004).

Almost all states require candidates for principal certification to be eligible for a teaching certificate, currently hold a valid teaching certificate, or have held one in the past. Furthermore, most states require that principals show previous work in schools, most often as teachers (Feistritzer, 2003; NASDTEC, 2004). However, the number of years of experience varies from one to five years and states differ in how they define a year of teaching experience. These slight differences affect the portability of a certificate from one state to another. In fact few states have full reciprocity for principal credentials. These differences in the details make full portability and reciprocity of certification difficult (NASDTEC, 2004).

Based upon the contention that present patterns often serve as the best predictors of future trends, consider the following as abbreviated examples from the original list of 15 predictions for the future in terms of certification requirements for school principals:

- State policy makers will continue to use certification requirements as a policy lever to change leadership preparation (McCarthy, 2002).
- Certification requirements will remain idiosyncratic by state (NPBEA, 2001; NASDTEC, 2004).
- More states will pass legislation allowing alternative certification pathways for non-educators to come into the school principal’s role (Feistritzer, 2005; Herrington & Wills, 2005).

*Continued on page 6*

- Increased federal influence on the preparation and certification of school building leaders with the expectation that school principals will be the next group required to meet the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) “highly qualified” standards (NCLB, 2001).
- Universities will continue their involvement as full providers of “traditional” course work and degree based leadership preparation required for certification (Kansas State Department of Education, 2004).
- Universities, foundations and state departments of education will evolve as partners in innovative non-degree preparation programs (Barbour, 2005).
- More states will move to a two-tiered certification structure, with principals receiving an initial certification and then having to pass a performance-based “assessment” (such as an internship) to move to a standard or professional certification (Fry, Bottoms, O’Neill, & Jacobson, 2004).

As current debates over the “merits of deregulation and alternative certification versus strengthening the traditional preparation and certification programs” (Björk & Reinhart, 2004, p. 1) continue, only a few general statements of certainty surface concerning future certification efforts. First, states will continue to hold considerable influence as a result of licensure and accreditation requirements with a direct impact on preparation programs, which in turn will intensify the need to examine the congruency in program content. Second, certification requirements are not static. Consequentially, a matrix of state-by-state information that’s accurate today may not be accurate tomorrow. Finally, the heightened focus on some of the most prominent emerging trends among states, such as, alternative certification routes and/or partnerships, national leadership standards, standardized leadership assessments, and issues surrounding state-to-state reciprocity/portability of licensure demand continued research. The link between the overlying issue of K-12 accountability and quality leadership preparation undeniably validates the on-going efforts of the Taskforce to Evaluate Educational Leadership Preparation Program Effectiveness.

Address correspondence to: B. Roberts, School of Education, Special Services and Leadership Studies, Pittsburg State University, 301 Hughes Hall, 1701 South Broadway, Pittsburg, Kansas 66762, USA. Telephone: 620-235-4498. E-mail: broberts@pittstate.edu

#### Citations:

Barbour, J. D. (2005, November). Non-university-based Principal Preparation Programs: Analysis and Discussion of Findings. Paper presented at the meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.

- Björk, L. & Rinehart, J. (2004). Alternative and conventional certification for education administrators: A look at the debate. *AEL Policy Briefs* (June), 1-10.
- Feistritzer, C. E. (2003). School principal and superintendent certification study results. Retrieved January 6, 2005, from National Center for Education Information website: <http://www.ncei.com/publications.html>
- Feistritzer, C. E. (2005). Alternative teacher certification: A state by state analysis 2005. Retrieved December 10, 2005 from National Center for Education Information website: <http://www.teach-now.org/intro.cfm>
- Fry, B., Bottoms, G., O’Neill, K. & Jacobson, A. (2004). Progress being made in getting a quality leader in every school. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved December 27, 2005, [http://www.sreb.org/main/Goals/Publications/Getting\\_Quality\\_Leader\\_In\\_School.asp](http://www.sreb.org/main/Goals/Publications/Getting_Quality_Leader_In_School.asp)
- Herrington, C. D. & Wills, B. K. (2005). Decertifying the principalship: The politics of administrator preparation in Florida. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 181-200. Retrieved December 27, 2005, <http://epx.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/19/1/181>
- Hess, F. M. & Kelly, A. P. (2005). An innovative look, A recalcitrant reality: The politics of principal preparation reform. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 155-180. Retrieved December 27, 2005, <http://epx.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/19/1/155>
- Kansas State Department of Education. (2004). Teacher education and licensure regulations and standards for Kansas educators. Retrieved December 10, 2005, from [www.ksde.org/cert/CertHandbook.doc](http://www.ksde.org/cert/CertHandbook.doc)
- LeTendre, B. G. & Roberts, B. S. (2005). A National View of Certification of School Principals: Current and Future Trends. Paper presented at the meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). How leadership influences student learning. NY, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved December 27, 2005, <http://www.4j.lane.edu/wallace/biblio.html#leadership>
- Levine, A. (2005). Educating school leaders. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project. Retrieved December 27, 2005, [http://www.edschools.org/reports\\_leaders.htm](http://www.edschools.org/reports_leaders.htm)
- McCarthy, M. (2002). Educational leadership preparation programs: A glance at the past with an eye towards the future. *Leadership Policy in Schools*, 1(3), 201-221.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2001). Recognizing and encouraging exemplary leadership in America’s schools: A proposal to establish a system of advanced certification for administrators. Retrieved December 10, 2005, [http://www.npbea.org/projects/able\\_project.htm](http://www.npbea.org/projects/able_project.htm)
- National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. (2004). NASDTEC manual on the preparation & certification of educational personnel 2004 (9th ed.) Sacramento, CA: Author.
- No Child Left Behind Act. (2001). Elementary and secondary education legislation: Title II Subpart 5 Section 2151b. Retrieved December 11, 2005 from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg25.html>
- The Broad Foundation & The Thomas B. Fordham Institute. (2003). Better leaders for America’s schools: A manifesto. [Electronic version.] Los Angeles, CA: The Broad Foundation. <http://www.edexcellence.net/institute/topic/topic.cfm?topic=Teachers%20%26%20Principals>
- Watkins, T. (Winter 2004). From the superintendent’s office. Michigan Department of Education Leading Change. Retrieved December 12, 2005 from <http://cenmi.org/LeadingChange/W04/article2c.asp>.

# Non-University Based Preparation Programs: A Taskforce Summary of Alternatives and a Research Agenda for Further Study

JoAnn Danelo Barbour, Texas Woman's University

## Introduction

As part of the larger Taskforce effort to better understand preparation programs, this study was designed to gather descriptive information about administrative preparation activities that are not based in universities or colleges. An examination of information available on-line and through foundation websites led to five categories or types of non-university based preparation programs.

- 1) For Profit Preparation Programs
- 2) State-based Alternative Preparation Programs
- 3) Foundations Driven Preparation Programs
- 4) Partnership Preparation Programs
- 5) Out-sourced Preparation Programs

These five approaches exist as contemporary alternatives to the traditional university or college based program. While the acceptance of these alternative pathways varies by state as other papers from the Taskforce have demonstrated (LeTendre & Roberts, 2005; Norgard & Bryant, 2005) there is no doubt that alternative programs have become a part of the landscape of educational administration preparation. Each of these five is described below and I then identify a number of researchable questions generated in this exploration. First a brief summary of each type of alternative is provided.

## For Profit Preparation Programs

Online, non-university for profit programs for principal preparation offer convenience, flexibility, and seem to focus their appeal to members of the armed forces and to full time working adults. While these proprietary programs bear the name of a university, their campuses are often virtual campuses. Instruction is conducted online by instructors working at a distance. Examples of these non-university based alternatives include the University of Phoenix, Walden, Capella, Strayer, and Jones International Universities. The information on most websites was uneven and spotty and did not include program requirements, required coursework, or course descriptions. The websites of these programs provide an online form one can submit for further information about programs and degrees but such information is not offered up front for the potential consumer to assess.

## State-based Alternative Preparation Programs

Some states have moved away from the common practice of delegating all of the preparation of a school administrator to a university or college. California, for example, has implemented a multi-tiered system of credentialing, components of which can be accomplished without university preparation. Included in this process, applicants for the beginning credential may take and pass the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (cut score = 173). Examples of California principal credential programs include initial preparation programs run by the San Joaquin County Office of Education and the Santa Barbara County Office of Education (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2006). While California represents one example of a state-sanctioned alternative to university based preparation, other states have begun to provide for alternatives, often with support from foundations.

## Foundation Driven Preparation Programs

Foundations often provide funding for innovative approaches to principal preparation. With help, for example from the Wallace Foundation, Springfield, MA became "the first school district in that state to create and manage its own principal certification program independent of the university" (Wallace Foundation 2006). The Annenberg Foundation helped Florida's Council for Educational Change, a statewide non-profit organization, build and sustain its Accelerated School Administrator Program, an online preparation program that includes aspiring principals in its base. The Broad Foundation, Kauffman, Sloan, and Wachovia Foundations all have initiatives that focus on leadership preparation. These include an array of academies, institutes, and partnerships between school districts, state departments of education, and other providers. Some of the foundations are state specific like the Sir Richardson Foundation from Fort Worth, TX that provides assistance in leadership preparation.

## Partnerships

Partnerships between different providers and school districts often have at their core some foundation-based

*Continued on page 8*

## Non-University Based Preparation Programs

*Continued from page 7*

funding. Partnerships with aligned groups, for example “New Leaders for New Schools,” can include any combination of the following partners: states, business groups, school districts, individual schools, and academies. Universities are sometimes active partners as well with the distinction that they do not control the preparation.

### Out-sourced Programs

A final type of non-university based preparation program that seems certain to emerge in this time of online education are what I label out-sourced programs. An educational provider from India, for example, recently contacted a regional educational office in Kansas offering to provide educational preparation on line. This suggests that as need expands that there will be more interest in having well crafted online principal preparation programs from a variety of providers, including those from other countries.

### Questions for Further Research

The entry of various providers into what has been a well controlled and transparent preparation program for school administrators raises many interesting research questions. Among them are these:

- 1) How respected, legitimate, and rigorous are the preparation and certification processes of the various programs?
- 2) With respect to foundations and partnerships, are there underlying agendas and assumptions about who should lead schools, based on what foundations assume and value?
- 3) What controls do various non-university based programs have relative to funding, cost, and serving the public agenda?

- 4) What expectations are there for university based programs? Should they accept programs, accept applicants with non-traditional profiles? What sort of accreditation standards need to be maintained for non-university based programs and who should maintain these?
- 5) Do conflicts of interest exist among the various non-university based providers?
- 6) Should states consider contracting the preparation of principals out to non-university based providers, possibly shifting the cost of producing educational administrators more to the individual?

In conclusion, the confluence of factors such as the growing use of the Internet combined with technology grants, university need for funding sources, and state departments of education leaving university-based programs for programs that may or may not include universities, may provide a sea change in how we prepare leaders. The ultimate question is what might these changes mean for schools?

Address correspondence to: JoAnn Danelo Barbour,  
Texas Woman’s University, Denton, TX 76204.  
profbarbour@mindspring.com

#### Citations:

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2006). [Retrieved from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/default.html> on January 31, 2006]

LeTendre, B., & Roberts, B. (2005). Mapping the terrain of preparation providers: State policies and regulations. A Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administrators. Nashville, TN Nov. 10-13.

Norgard, G., & Bryant, M. (2005). Principal Certification Practices in New England and the Northern Great Plains. A Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administrators. Nashville, TN Nov. 10-13.

Wallace Foundation. (2006). [Retrieved from, <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/WF/GrantsPrograms/FocusAreasPrograms/Leadership/LeadProgram.htm>]

### Join the TEA-SIG!!

Strengthen our ability to engage in professional development, reflection and dialogue by joining the Teaching in Educational Administration SIG. All it take is \$10.00 dollars US. Welcome a new faculty member or say thank you to a colleague by paying for their first two years of TEA-SIG dues. Please contact Brenda LeTendre at [bletendr@pittstate.edu](mailto:bletendr@pittstate.edu) to get signed up.

# Outstanding Program for 2006 Annual Meeting: Program Chair Report

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno

Thanks to hard work by proposers and reviewers, TEA-SIG members and others will have opportunities to hear and discuss high-quality presentations during the 2006 annual meeting. AERA was not able to add program sessions for us this year, despite growth in our membership numbers. Thus, we were allotted 7 time slots in the program, which include the annual business meeting (Friday, April 7 from 6:15–8:15 PM in Room 2012 of Moscone Center West) and 4 substantive sessions and 2 paper discussion sessions (formerly called roundtables). Complete information about the program appears below.

To assure that presentations were appropriate for our SIG, we revised and expanded the descriptions used by reviewers as they rated proposals. Following are the criteria and the rating scale from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) for each.

- **Alignment with TEA-SIG Purpose**  
**[Insignificant to Critically Significant]**

To what extent is the proposed presentation aligned with the TEA-SIG mission as stated in the 2006 Call for Proposals? [See statement below.] To what extent are the objectives or purposes of the proposed presentation significant to the TEA-SIG membership?

“In keeping with its mission, the TEA-SIG invites proposals dealing with research, evaluation, and scholarship in educational leadership preparation and development, and the impact of preparation on leadership practice. We encourage theory-based research on strategies and program models for leadership preparation, as well as policy studies on state and national leadership standards assessment and credentialing.”

- **Perspective or Theoretical Framework**  
**[Not Articulated to Well Articulated]**

Are research purpose(s) or objective(s) clearly stated in the proposal? Does the proposal include well articulated perspective(s) or theoretical framework?

- **Methodology**

- [Not Well Executed to Well Executed]**

Are methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry clearly described in the proposal? If so, is there evidence that study design was/will be executed appropriately?

- **Data Sources (s) [Inappropriate to Appropriate]**

Does the proposal provide evidence of appropriate use of data sources? Were sufficient data sources and appropriate analysis strategies used to support reported findings?

- **Conclusions/Interpretations**

- [Ungrounded to Well Grounded]**

Do the results, conclusions, or points of view link back to study purpose(s), perspective(s) or theoretical framework? Are the conclusions based on findings? Are the interpretations well grounded?

- **Quality of Writing**

- [Unclear/Unorganized to Clear/Well Organized]**

Does the proposal reflect high-quality academic writing that would suggest delivery of a well organized paper, paper discussion, or poster presentation? Are sources used to support statements? Is the proposal well organized?

- **Contribution to TEA-SIG**

- [Routine to Highly Original]**

Does the proposal add to the knowledge base in research, evaluation, and scholarship in educational leadership preparation and development? Will it contribute to understanding the impact of preparation on leadership practice?

- **Membership Appeal**

- [Small Audience to Large Audience]**

Assess the potential audience size for this presentation, if it is included in the 2006 AERA annual meeting. IMPORTANT: Rooms are assigned based on projected audience size.

- **Would You Attend This Session? [No to Yes]**

Rate the probability of your attending this presentation, if it is included in the 2006 AERA annual meeting.

- **Overall Recommendation**

- [Not Acceptable to Outstanding Proposal/Accept]**

In addition to providing an overall rating of the proposal, please provide comments to assist the Program Chair in determining proposal's acceptability in the 2006 AERA annual meeting.

Competition was keen among the 30 proposals submitted that included 21 papers, 5 paper discussions, 1 poster, and 2 interactive symposia. A total of 35 members volunteered to serve as reviewers for the TEA-SIG proposals; because we had more volunteers than needed, several members assisted other groups with their reviews. We appreciate the efforts by everyone involved in submitting proposals and conducting careful analysis of their appropriateness. Total average scores of ratings by three viewers for each accepted proposal ranged from 5.00 to 3.10. Thanks again to all who helped create a program of exceptional quality this year!

# 2006 TEA-SIG Program Summary

## *New Perspectives about Teaching in Educational Administration*

Paper Discussions (formerly known as Roundtables)  
Fri, April 7 12:00–12:40 PM  
Moscone Center West, 3rd Floor, Room 3005

## **Educational Leadership Preparation: A Call for Cultural Consciousness**

Nanci L. Shaw (Iowa State University)

## **Developing Small-Schools' Leaders: An Evaluation of an Apprenticeship-Based Leadership Preparation Program**

Monique Y. Ouimette (Center For Collaborative Education), Rosann M. Tung (Center for Collaborative Education)

## **Promising Practices in the Preparation of Educational Leaders**

Daniel Gutmore, George Roesser (Lehigh University), Charles P. Mitchel (Seton Hall University), Rosemarie Gutmore (Seton Hall University)

## *Teaching in Educational Administration SIG Business Meeting*

Fri, April 7 6:15–8:15 PM  
Moscone Center West, 2nd Floor, Room 2012

**Chair:** Margaret Terry Orr (Bank Street College of Education)

**Program Chair:** Tricia Browne-Ferrigno (University of Kentucky)

**Program Co-Chair:** Edith A. Rusch (University of Nevada-Las Vegas)

**Secretary:** Brenda G. LeTendre (Pittsburg State University)

## *Improving Candidate Performance during Leadership Preparation*

Paper Discussions (formerly known as Roundtables)  
Sat, April 8 11:25 AM–12:05 PM  
Moscone Center West, 3rd Floor, Room 3009

## **Low-Inference Observations as a Tool for School Improvement and Program Evaluation**

Helen A. Scharff (Baruch College-The City University of New York), Sandra Sandy (Center for Social & Emotional Education)

## **Exploring the Connection Between Preservice Principal Beliefs and the Implementation of Urban School Reform**

Robert Cooper (University of California-Los Angeles), Tina M. Trujillo (University of California-Los Angeles)

## **Professional Vulnerability and the Principalship: Learning and Becoming a Humanistic Leadership**

Gary D. Kiltz (South Milwaukee School District), Arnold B. Danzig (Arizona State University)

## *Strategies to Improve Educational Leadership Preparation Programs*

Sat, April 8 12:25–1:55 PM  
Moscone Center West, 3rd Floor, Room 3016

**Chair:** Ruth P. Silverberg (College of Staten Island-The City University of New York)

**Discussant:** Paul Michael Terry (University of South Florida-Lakeland)

## **Candidates' Perception of Diversity Preparation in Educational Leadership Programs**

Tak C. Chan (Kennesaw State University)

## **Using Standards for Reflective Practice to Assess Development of Reflection Among Principal Students**

Michael Silver (Seattle University), Daisy E. Arredondo Rucinski (Seattle University)

## **Teaching Online: To Be or Not to Be**

Virginia Roach (The George Washington University), Linda K. Lemasters (The George Washington University)

## **How a Continuum of Urban School Leadership Development Before and Through the First Principalship Impacts Leadership Success**

Margaret Terry Orr (Bank Street College of Education), Margaret E. Barber (Lehigh University)

## **Redesigning Educational Leadership Programs: Lessons From Three Partnership Projects**

Scott C. Bauer (George Mason University), David S. Brazer (George Mason University), Bonnie Pfoutz (George Mason University), Jim Upperman (George Mason University)

*Continued on page 11*

***Lessons Learned about Socialization of Aspiring Principals into the Community of Administrative Practice***

Sunday, April 9 12:25–1:55 PM

Moscone Center West, 3rd Floor, Room 3014

**Chair:** Virginia Doolittle (Rowan University)

**Discussant:** Monica Byrne-Jimenez (University of Massachusetts-Boston)

**Designing Principal Preparation Internships to Strengthen School Leadership**

Jenny S. Tripses (Bradley University), Michael Risen (Bradley University)

**The Politics of Fit Inside a District-Sponsored Program for Administrative Aspirants**

Autumn K. Tooms (Kent State University)

**Assessing Principal Internships and Habits of Mind: The Use of Journey Mapping to Enhance Reflection**

Donna Cooner (Colorado State University), Faith Tijardes (Colorado State University), Heidi Frederiksen (Colorado State University)

**Examining the Impact of a Preparation Program on the Socialization of Beginning Educational Leaders**

Steven M. Shiraki (Hawaii State Department of Education), Stacey Butler Roberts (University of Hawai'i-Manoa)

**The Emotional Intelligence of School Principals: Implications for Administrator Preparation**

Kay S. Cushing (The University of Arizona), Judith Kerrins

***The Landscape of University-based Leadership Preparation and Programs' Role in Graduates' Career Pathways, Career Retention, and Leadership Effectiveness***

Monday, April 10 2:15–3:45 PM

Moscone Center West, 2nd Floor, Room 2014

Efforts to reform the field of leadership preparation have been primarily through standards-setting and innovative practices based on effective leadership research and adult learning theories. While recent reports have decried the field as woefully inadequate, only limited, small scale evaluation research has existed. This symposium presents new, broadly and deeply focused evaluation research on leadership preparation from multiple lens. Using national

data sets, the first paper demonstrates the changing landscape of degrees by type of institution, raising questions about the diminished role of higher ranked institutions in principal preparation. The second paper draws on a 10-year, multi-cohort state data set on new principals' career histories, evaluating leadership preparation program effects on job retention and advancement. The third paper presents a case study and evaluation findings of a statewide, multi-institutional collaborative self-study to evaluate their programs' design-related impact on graduates and their career outcomes. The fourth paper uses a life history approach to look backwards at the leadership development of 18 nationally recognized effective school principals. The fifth paper presents comparative evaluation results of 10 institutions' program impact on their graduates, their career advancement, and their leadership practices as principals, based on a commonly administered survey to all 5–10 year graduates.

**Chair:** Robert B. Kottkamp (Hofstra University)

**Discussant:** Judy A. Alston (Widener University)

**The State of the Field: Recent Trends in Degrees, Institutions, and Graduates**

Bruce D. Baker (The University of Kansas)

**Explaining Principal Retention: The Influence of Leadership Preparation and Other Factors in Principal Longevity**

Edward J. Fuller (The University of Texas at Austin)

**Statewide Leadership Preparation Study**

Diana G. Pounder (The University of Utah), Madeline M. Hafner (The University of Utah)

**The Roots of Leadership: The Exemplary Principal Study**

Lew Smith (Fordham University), Donna M. Jones (Bark Street College), Virginia Doolittle (Rowan University), Tricia Browne-Ferrigno (University of Kentucky), Margaret Terry Orr (Bank Street College of Education)

**Comparing Leadership Development From Pipeline to Preparation and Practice**

Margaret Terry Orr (Bank Street College of Education), Ruth P. Silverberg (College of Staten Island-The City University of New York), Brenda G. LeTendre (Pittsburg State University)

*Continued on page 12*

*Perspectives on Program Staffing and Content Topics  
for Improved Teaching in Educational Administration*

Tues, Apr 11 12:25–1:55 PM

Moscone Center West, 3rd Floor, Room 3016

**Chair:** Madeline M. Hafner (The University of Utah)

**Discussant:** Sandra L. Harris (Lamar University)

**The Integral Role of Clinical Faculty in a  
Differentiated Faculty Staffing Model for Educational  
Leadership**

Donald G. Hackmann (University of Illinois-Urbana-  
Champaign)

**Staffing Principal Preparation Programs: A  
Preliminary Analysis of University Departments of  
Educational Leadership in Southeastern States**

Patricia Diane Ricciardi (Clemson University), Frankie  
K. Williams (Clemson University)

**Ethics Education in Educational Administration  
Preparation Programs: International Perspectives**

Keith Douglas Walker (University of Saskatchewan),  
James E. Green (Azusa Pacific University)

**Including Feminist Perspectives in Educational  
Leadership Programs: Lessons Learned Leading to  
Improved Pedagogical Practices**

Meredith L Mountford (Florida Atlantic University),  
Joyce Pivalar (Northwest Missouri State University)

**THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL  
FOR EDUCATIONAL  
ADMINISTRATION (UCEA)  
ANNOUNCES A NEW  
RESEARCH JOURNAL  
Journal of Research on  
Leadership Education (JRLE)**

This new electronic peer-reviewed journal, Journal of Research on Leadership Education (JRLE), is edited by Edith Rusch of the University of Nevada-Las Vegas and is sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). JRLE will be published on a quarterly basis with the first issue appearing in Spring 2006.

JRLE's editorial team invites manuscripts to be considered for publication. JRLE is seeking research and conceptual papers from multiple epistemological perspectives. JRLE will serve as an international venue for discourse on the teaching and learning of leadership across the many disciplines informing educational leadership. The editors strongly encourage co-authored, cross-disciplinary pieces. Given its electronic format, JRLE also encourages alternative, innovative approaches to representation as well as traditional scholarly manuscripts.

JRLE invites work from a multidisciplinary community including sociology, philosophy, public administration, economics and law. We seek work based on traditional and emergent research paradigms and strongly encourage work that is co-authored, cross-disciplinary or global in nature. We encourage empirical or conceptual work that establishes links between leadership education and student learning. For more information or to submit manuscripts, please contact:

Journal of Research on Leadership Education  
c/o Edith A. Rusch, Ph.D., Editor  
University of Nevada Las Vegas  
jrle@unlv.edu

**Visit Eye On Education  
at AERA**

**Booth #117**

**[www.eyoneducation.com](http://www.eyoneducation.com)**

# Excerpt from Roland S. Barth's *Foreword to* **Lead with Me:** **A Principal's Guide to Teacher Leadership**

Gayle Moller and Anita Pankake

A few years ago I visited a Florida middle school to meet and talk with the principal. I was in for a surprise.

I arrived at the office and asked the secretary the whereabouts of the school's leader. He was in the library at a faculty meeting. I joined the meeting-in-progress and stood unobtrusively at the back of the room where a lively discussion was in progress, relating the curriculum of each grade to that of the other grades. The surprise wasn't that the group was wrestling so successfully with this consequential, often contentious, matter in a forthright, thoughtful, even cordial way. The surprise was that more than an hour passed before it became clear which of these educators was the principal!

That scene has always provided for me a vivid working definition of "teacher leadership."...

Teacher Leadership. Shared Leadership. Distributed Leadership. By whatever name we call it, the concept of a school as a community of leaders is an idea whose time has come. Why?

**Dependency Training:** If the John Wayne or Joan of Arc school of heroic, solitary leadership ever existed, it no longer does. Schools are much too complex and demanding places and have way too many needs for any one person to address them all. I wish that more principals could recognize what one wisely confided to me: "The more adept I get at solving the problems of this school the weaker the school becomes." The true mark of the leader is not how many followers one begets but how many leaders!

**An Overabundance of Underutilized Talent:** Teachers are rightly demanding these days to be treated as professionals, invited to sit at the table with grownups where they can bring their abundant strengths to decisions that will affect them and their students....

**School Reform:** I have just finished reading a book whose authors studied many successful and unsuccessful attempts at school improvement. A major conclusion:

"Schools that made the greatest progress in reform were democratic; they cultivated strong distributed leadership. In each of the schools we studied, school improvement was more likely to occur when key leadership tasks were performed by multiple actors in the school community, especially teachers."

**Leadership Succession:** Principals of even high performing schools will leave one day. All too many schools thereupon revert to low performing ways.... unless a cadre of leaders from within the schools is prepared to take over. Henrick Ibsen put it best: "A community is like a ship. Everyone must be prepared to take the helm."

**Pupil Achievement:** And, finally, of course, there is lots of evidence of the strong relationship between a school culture hospitable to teacher leadership and to student accomplishment. For instance, a Rand Corporation study of 1000 schools concluded: "In high performing schools (low discipline, high pupil achievement) decision making and leadership is significantly more democratic. The teachers are more involved and influential in establishing discipline, with selecting text books, designing curriculum and even choosing their colleagues than are teachers in low performing schools."

These are among the compelling reasons I have found teacher leadership to be so vital to the health of our profession and to our illusive goal of promoting profound levels of learning among students and their educators....

—From the Foreword by

**Lead With Me:**  
**A Principal's Guide to Teacher Leadership**  
Gayle Moller and Anita Pankake  
2006, 230 pp. paper 1-59667-025-8 \$34.95

# ***New ideas...Practical approaches...***

## **SMART, FAST, EFFICIENT: The New Principal's Guide to Success**

**Leanna Stohr Isaacson**  
*Stetson University*

2006, 242 pp. paper 1-59667-016-9 \$34.95

For a newly appointed principal or assistant principal, this book describes the skills and talents necessary to meet the demands on today's school leaders. It provides step-by-step details about what to do, when to do it, and how to do it.

Each chapter includes—

- Survival Tips (practical, savvy advice)
- When Do I Begin? (to help new principals plan & schedule)
- practical advice based on the realities of school leadership
- and more

## **WHAT GREAT PRINCIPALS DO DIFFERENTLY: 15 Things that Matter Most**

**Todd Whitaker**  
*Indiana State University*

2002, 130 pp. paper 1-930556-47-0 \$29.95

This best selling book blends school-centered studies with the author's experiences working with hundreds of administrators. It reveals the 15 qualities and practices of great principals which elevate them above the rest.

### **Brief Contents**

- Its People, Not Programs • Who Is the Variable? • Hire Great Teachers • Standardized Testing • Focus on Behavior, Then Focus on Beliefs • Base Every Decision on Your Best Teachers
- Make It Cool to Care • Set Expectations at the Start of the Year
- Clarifying Your Core

## **20 STRATEGIES FOR COLLABORATIVE SCHOOL LEADERS**

**Jane Lindle**  
*Clemson University*

2005, 150 pp. paper 1-59667-000-2 \$29.95

For school leaders who handle the conflicts and commotions which arise from human nature issues in schools and the shortage of school resources, this book offers 20 strategies which demonstrate how to support teaching and learning in our schools.

## **THE ADMINISTRATOR'S GUIDE TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS**

**Second Edition**  
**George E. Pawlas**  
*University of Central Florida*

2005, 336 pp. paper 1-59667-005-3 \$39.95

Offers practical tips and illustrated examples of handy ideas for—

- preparing successful newsletters, memos and other forms of written communication
- improving relationships with faculty, staff, and students
- using the media
- enhancing parent and family involvement
- dealing with crisis situations
- and more

## **LEAD WITH ME: A Principal's Guide to Teacher Leadership**

**Gayle Moller and Anita Pankake**  
*Western Carolina U. & Univ. of Texas at Pan American*

2006, 230 pp. paper 1-59667-025-8 \$34.95

With a foreword by Roland Barth, this book demonstrates specific actions principals can take to create the conditions under which teacher leadership can thrive. It explains the skills needed by teacher leaders and suggests ways principals can provide opportunities for teachers to learn these skills.

## **THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER'S GUIDE TO INFORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS**

**Sally J. Zepeda**  
*University of Georgia*

2006, 132 pp. paper 1-59667-010-X \$29.95

This short and practical book is for principals, assistant principals, department chairs, teacher leaders, and other instructional leaders. It showcases 23 school-tested tools to help leaders succeed in their classroom walk-throughs and other informal classroom observations. It also provides tools to help leaders engage teachers in discussion and reflection.

## **STANDARDS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION: Enhancing Teaching and Learning**

**Edited by Stephen P. Gordon**  
*Texas State University*

2006, 150 pp. paper 1-59667-011-8 \$36.95

The standards in this book will enhance teaching and learning. The list of the book's contributors reads like a "Who's Who" in the field of instructional supervision. These standards are specific yet flexible, and each set includes professional development activities.

## **MAKING THE RIGHT DECISIONS: A Guide For School Leaders**

**Douglas J. Fiore and Chip Joseph**  
*Virginia Commonwealth University*

2006, 160 pp. paper 1-59667-007-X \$29.95

This book provides a road map for school leaders as they engage in their single most important leadership skill: decision making. With practical examples, it demonstrates how to create a positive school culture, spur school improvement, and make decisions in the context of NCLB.

## **BRAVO PRINCIPAL! Building Relationships with Actions That Value Others**

**Sandra Harris**  
*Lamar University*

2004, 120 pp. paper 1-930556-78-0 \$29.95

Reveals how to build relationships that value your faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members. Topics include actions that are—

- empowering • supportive • courageous • respectful
- challenge the imagination • uphold high standards.

# Textbooks for your courses...from Eye On Education

## SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, 2nd Edition

Douglas J. Fiore

Virginia Commonwealth University

2006, 320 pp. hardcover \$1-59667-022-3 \$74.95

This practical textbook covers school-community relations at both the district and school levels. It demonstrates how to—

- collect and analyze data on public perceptions
- prepare a school-community relations plan
- work effectively with parents and other key members of the school's "external" publics
- open up to their "internal" publics—students, teachers, clerical staff, etc.
- improve relations with the media
- plan for crisis situations

## MONEY AND SCHOOLS, 3rd Edition

David C. Thompson and R. Craig Wood,

Kansas State University and University of Florida

2004, 410 pp. hardcover 1-59667-003-7 \$74.95

Authors David C. Thompson and R. Craig Wood are award-winning scholars of school finance who also served as public school administrators. Their new third edition places school finance in the context of both the NCLB legislation and the ISLLC standards.

### Contents

- Schools, Values, and Money
- A Policy Perspective
- Accountability and Professionalism
- Basic Funding Structures
- Legal Liability
- Budgeting for Personnel
- Budgeting for Instruction
- Budgeting for Student Activities
- Budgeting for Capital Outlay, Maintenance, and Operations
- Budgeting for Transportation and Food Service

## HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION: A School-Based Perspective, 3rd Ed.

Richard E. Smith

Seattle Pacific University

2004, 375 pp. hardcover 1-930556-84-5 \$74.95

This textbook provides easy-to-read lists, sample forms, and summary charts. Each chapter in the new third edition opens with the ISLLC standards covered in that chapter. Topics include—

- Strategic Human Resources Planning • Recruitment
- Selection • Orientation and Induction • Supervision and Evaluation • Assisting the Marginal Teacher • Staff Development
- Collective Bargaining • Legal Issues

## SCHOOL LEADER INTERNSHIP: Developing, Monitoring, and Evaluating Your Leadership Experience, 2nd Edition

Gary Martin, William Wright, Arnold Danzig,

Richard A. Flanary, and Fred Brown

Northern Arizona Univ., Ariz. State Univ., NASSP and NAESP

2005, 164 pp. paper 1-59667-009-6 \$39.95

Included in the second edition are new activities covering ISLLC, NCATE, ELCC, NAESP, NASSP, NCLB, and IDEIA standards. You and your interns select from a large list of suggested experiences and activities in such areas as—

- Staff Development • Student Evaluation
- Parent Involvement • Transportation
- Technology • Finance
- Student Discipline • and more

Joining the author team for this edition are Richard A. Flanary, Director of NASSP's Dept. of Prof. Development Services, and Fred Brown, NAESP's Assoc. Exec. Director of Professional Services. The Foreword was written by Vincent L. Ferrandino and Gerald Tirozzi, Executive Directors of the NASSP and NAESP.

## INTRODUCTION TO EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: Standards, Theories and Practice

Douglas J. Fiore

Virginia Commonwealth University

2004, 320 pp. hardcover 1-930556-63-2 \$74.95

This comprehensive textbook presents theories and concepts in the context of the ISLLC standards. It reveals the real world of practicing school administrators. Topics include—

- Leading Others Through a Common Purpose
- Nurturing the Instructional Program
- Balancing Management and Leadership
- Making Decisions in the Education Arena
- Governance of Schools in a Legal and Political Context

**Free examination copies are available. Photocopy this page and circle the text(s) you'd like to examine:**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip code \_\_\_\_\_

Phone # \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Course title and number \_\_\_\_\_

Book(s) currently used \_\_\_\_\_

Annual enrollment \_\_\_\_\_

Course title and number \_\_\_\_\_

Book(s) currently used \_\_\_\_\_

Annual enrollment \_\_\_\_\_



6 Depot Way West

Larchmont, NY, 10538

Phone: (888) 299-5350 Fax: (914) 833-0761

www.eyoneducation.com



## Feature Article...

# *An Update on the TEA-SIG's Work and Highlights of its Taskforce Research*

**Margaret Terry Orr,**  
*TEA-SIG Chair*



Teaching in Educational Administration Newsletter  
c/o Eye On Education  
6 Depot Way West  
Larchmont, NY 10538

First Class Mail  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
White Plains, NY  
Permit No. 5063