2016

An Analysis of the Impact of K-12 Educational Leadership Program Graduates: 1992-2012

Roseann Bennett
University of Central Florida

AN ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF K-12 EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM GRADUATES: 1992-2012

by

ROSEANN M. BENNETT
B. S. University of Florida, 1987
M. Ed. University of Florida, 1989
Ed. S. University of Florida, 1995

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the College of Education and Human Performance
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2016

Major Professor: Rosemarye Taylor

ABSTRACT

This study addressed the problem of insufficient information concerning the economic and professional impact of educational leadership program graduates. In Florida, there is often times a delay in obtaining an administrative appointment after graduating from an educational leadership program. The delay in appointments causes difficulty with tracking careers and economic impact. The research questions were:

1. What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992 to 2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?
2. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size rankings)?
3. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal positions in the selected school districts (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size rankings)?
4. What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?

This study utilized descriptive statistics and was designed to analyze program performance outcomes delivered by graduates of a large urban research university's educational leadership program (1992-2012) and their responses to a survey. The value

of activities, projects, and research completed while enrolled in the educational leadership graduate program was determined to arrive at economic impact. Graduates were matched with administrative positions including K-12 superintendent, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, school district level directors, public school principal or assistant principal. In addition, Florida school grades for those graduates that held principal positions in a specific geographical area during the 1998-2012 period were identified.

Measures of central tendency and descriptive statistics were conducted, as appropriate, for each of the four research questions. Research findings indicated there were data to support that while enrolled in the educational leadership graduate program, economic impact was provided to school districts. Furthermore, graduates who were identified as principals in K-12 public schools had student outcomes that outperformed the state average as indicated by school grades. The data trend of meeting high expectations determined by student achievement results increased each year as evidenced by a greater number of schools earning "A" grades.

Recommendations made for future research were for universities to create and maintain a university database and survey graduates to gather data. The data would be used to align the preparation program curricular and instructional practices with the professional experiences needed to prepare leaders to be position ready. Additionally, universities must continuously communicate with graduates in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the preparation program, measure economic impact and capture career paths. This would be performed through a longitudinal study.

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. First, my husband, Matthew, whose support and encouragement make my personal and professional endeavors possible; my sons, Ryan and Michael, who are a source of great joy, pride and inspiration; and my mom, Louise, who taught me to embrace learning and believe that anything is possible through determination and a strong work ethic.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The journey to a doctoral degree is demanding and cannot be achieved alone. I am eternally grateful to those who encouraged and supported me throughout this process.

-To my husband Matthew, my deepest gratitude for your understanding of the time commitment required for a doctorate; your love and support sustained me during the most challenging times of this process and in my moments of self-doubt.

-To my sons, thank you for understanding the time working on this goal took away from you; Ryan and Michael, thank you for backing me and never complaining when my studies interfered with your activities; I am so proud of you both.

-To my mom, Louise, a strong woman who taught me how to face challenges with courage; thank you for your support.

-To my extended family and friends, I appreciate your understanding and encouragement.

-To Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, my dissertation chair, thank you for your guidance and encouraging me to accomplish beyond what I ever believed I was capable of achieving.

- Finally, to Dr. Lee Baldwin, Dr. Walter Doherty, and Dr. Beth Thedy, thank you for the support and recommendations as members of my dissertation committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
PROBLEM OF PRACTICE

Background of the Study

There has been a considerable amount of research conducted confirming that leadership is the characteristic that most influences top performing schools (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Orphanos & Orr, 2014; The Wallace Foundation 2012; Ward, 2013). Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) cited evidence indicating that effective school administrators make a difference in teacher quality and student performance. Beyond curriculum, budgets, managerial tasks, and policy, the administrators in school systems are responsible for personnel and instructional practices. These broad duties performed by the administrator have an impact on overall school performance.

Thomas and Bainbridge (2001) explained there are increased demands in educational leadership including less financial support and more accountability placed on leaders in educational settings. Understanding that educational leaders are accountable for both instruction and management, applicable experiences in preparation programs are needed in order to lessen effects of decreased budgets and increased responsibilities. Educational leadership preparation programs need to be research-based and incorporate content that is reflective of current research in a variety of areas consistent with the organizational development, leadership skills, and management (Thomas & Bainbridge, 2001).

With the passing of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2002, education reform was implemented to establish high standards and measurable outcomes. Since the inception of NCLB, education stakeholders have analyzed the accountability in school districts, schools, and policies that contribute to student achievement. Consistent with higher expectations and increased accountability for students and student achievement, there are increased expectations for educational leaders. School boards, superintendents, and community stakeholders have increased expectations for principals. Clark, Martorell, and Rockoff (2009) concurred, stating:

> . . . the focus on schools. . . presupposes that school-level policy decisions matter. These decisions are, in large part, determined by school principals, who have an important influence on the composition of the school workforce and course content, and who are responsible for monitoring the quality of instruction delivered by teachers. (p. 1)

Gray and Lewis (2011) explained the need for school principals to shift from their roles as managers and become curriculum specialists, but noted that there is a lack of preparation of principals to be instructional leaders. A principal's responsibilities range from ensuring the safety and security of students and their learning environment to establishing teaching methods and accountability systems for student learning. The accountability expectations for educational leaders align with the state of Florida's historical and present perspectives that mandate that "high-quality teachers and administrators are in every classroom across the state" (Florida Department of Education, 2007, p. 7).

People in the workforce who are interested in educational leadership positions in the state of Florida will realize, after researching prerequisites for the position, that they

must have a master's degree or higher in order to obtain such a leadership position. "Institutions of higher education offer degree programs to prepare individuals to assume educational leadership roles and serve as training ground for leaders of public schools" (Ringler & Rouse, 2007, p. 1). Florida Legislature and State Board of Education rules "ensure capacity and quality of pre-service school leadership programs that lead to initial certification in educational leadership for the purpose of preparing individuals to serve as school leaders. Certification and preparation process includes programs offered by Florida postsecondary institutions" (Florida Approval of School Leadership Programs, 2007, para. 1).

"While the financial benefits of earning a college degree are well-established, higher education may also bring non-financial benefits to graduates as well as benefits to the economy at large" (Department of the Treasury & Department of Education, 2012, p. 15). Non-financial benefits to graduates include a higher employment rate, health care, pensions, and job satisfaction. In 1998, Clark, Feng, and Stromsdorfer wrote, "Post-secondary education is a major contributor to economic growth and development." (para. 9). The researchers examined, "the return on investment in education, and evidence of significant savings in social costs resulting from providing college education opportunities for the public" (para. 9). According to D'Allegro and Paff (2010), "Better health, increased volunteerism, improved likelihood to participate in government politics, enhanced moral character, and propensity to donate to charitable organizations are some of the social, cultural, and economic benefits attributed to higher education" (p. 3).

Statement of the Problem

There is insufficient data concerning the economic and professional impact of educational leadership program graduates. In regard to economic impact, there is a significant amount of research on the benefits of the extent of education obtained, including higher education degrees, with employment wages. Yet, when examining the economic impact that is provided to communities through projects, activities, and research delivered by graduate students in educational leadership programs, the research is scant.

Evidence of what is provided in educational leadership programs to meet the needs of K-12 public schools and school districts has evolved in the last 20 years. Components of these programs must align with current standards if educational leaders are to be prepared for the demands of the positions they pursue in educational leadership. With increased mandates for accountability, measurements on the educational leader's professional impact are based on student outcomes. This impact has the potential to reach more students than classroom teachers because educational leadership positions are over schools and school districts (Nettles & Harrington, 2007).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the economic and professional impact of graduates from the target research university's educational leadership program. The economic impact was measured through graduates' activities and projects in the educational leadership master's degree program as well as research dissertations

completed as part of their educational leadership doctoral programs. This study was also conducted to investigate graduates' performance trends based on Florida's School Accountability system as measured by school grades. Graduates from 1992 to 2012 who were appointed to and/or serving in (a) educational leadership positions as superintendents in the United States, (b) senior staff, and/or school district level directors in the state of Florida, and (c) principals or assistant principals in 10 central Florida school districts were identified.

Significance of the Study

Through this study, the researcher intended to contribute to professional knowledge in the field of educational leadership on preparation program components and their economic impact, as well as professional impact measured through student outcomes. This research focused on graduate students in educational leadership programs and their economic impact on schools and school districts. The study further concentrated on the educational leadership graduates who were appointed to leadership positions in K-12 public schools and school districts from the target research university and the professional impact measured through student achievement and growth.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to ensure uniformity and understanding throughout the study.

Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC)--an organization comprised of 10 central Florida school districts whose purpose is to address educational issues impacting Central Florida

Economic Impact--the in-kind dollar equivalent for consulting services from activities, projects, and/or research dissertations in practice.

Activities--school-based that includes, but not limited to volunteering and mentoring.

Projects--action research that is long term, expert support such as the administrative internship.

Dissertations--feasibility studies or evaluations.

In-kind equivalent--rate calculated from a mean of consultant fees from a convenience sample.

School District Director or equivalent--administrator of school system-wide program (i.e., Title I, Transportation, Food Services).

Senior Staff, Deputy Superintendent, Associate Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent--identified as being just below the Superintendent in the administration of school systems.

Site Administrators--K-12 school site administrators (i.e., principal and assistant principal).

Superintendent or equivalent--the manager of a school district or system.

Conceptual Framework

The fundamental idea of this study was that instructional leadership programs have an impact not only on student outcomes but on the community at large. Several researchers (Brazer & Bauer, 2013; Carver, 2012; Donmoyer, Yennie-Donmoyer, & Galloway, 2012; Hale & Moorman, 2003; Hess & Kelly, 2007: Lashway, 2003; Lyons & Algozzine, 2006) have all recognized the importance of leadership preparation programs in providing the education and support necessary to develop the leaders to meet the needs of the nation's students and improve outcomes in schools throughout the United States. In an era of increased accountability for school results, there is an "intense pressure for principals to be instructional leaders who can more effectively implement standards-based reform" (Hale & Moorman, 2003, p.3). Hallinger (2005) expanded this thought, observing that "Principals again find themselves at the nexus of accountability and school improvement with an increasingly explicit expectation that they will function as instructional leaders" (p. 222).

As universities graduate educational leaders, professors in preparation programs must remain aware of the direct and indirect effects that leaders, specifically principals, have on student outcomes and their communities. Hallinger and Heck (1998) organized 15 years of studies (1980-1995) using the following three different models for organization:

> direct effects (i.e., where the principal's actions influence school outcomes); mediated effects (i.e., where principal actions affect outcomes indirectly through other variables); reciprocal effects (e.g., where the principal affects teachers and teachers affect the principal, and through these processes outcomes are affected). (pp. 162-163)

Studies that incorporated the direct effects model most commonly showed no significant relationships, "with occasional findings of mixed or weak effects" (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, p. 166). Studies that incorporated the mediated effects model showed "evidence of positive effects of principal leadership on school outcomes" (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, p. 167) with occasional mixed effects. Studies that incorporated the reciprocal effects model were inconclusive as the studies were not designed for this model (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, p. 168).

Hallinger and Heck's 1998 research influenced other researchers and studies. It "was important in that it shifted the focus from behaviors of principals in effective schools to the effects these principal behaviors have on student achievement, and how to best measure these effects" (Chappelear & Price, 2012, p. 4). Leithwood and Jantzi (1999), in their replicated study on principal leadership, effects found mediated, indirect effects of leadership via student engagement. Witziers, Bosker, and Kruger (2003) "used a quantitative meta-analysis to estimate the effect size of educational leadership on student achievement" (p. 399). They concluded that educational leaders have a weak direct effect on student achievement. According to Witziers et al. (2003) "Leadership is no longer proposed as having a direct influence on learning outcomes but as having an indirect influence through the way it has an impact on school organization and school culture" (p. 401). Kelley, Thornton, and Daugherty (2005) found that "the presence or absence of a strong educational leader, the climate of the school, and attitudes of the teaching staff can directly influence student achievement" (p. 18).

In 2005, Marzano, Waters, and McNulty performed a meta-analysis of 70 studies (1978-2001) in which they identified 21 leadership responsibilities that had a significant effect on student learning. The authors identified both direct and indirect effects which resulted in a small mean effect size. Similarly, in 2008 Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe analyzed 27 studies (1978-2006) to determine the impact of instructional leadership on student outcomes based on five leadership dimensions. The results indicated both moderate and strong effects. According to Robinson et al., "The more leaders focus their relationships, their work, and their learning on the core business of teaching and learning, the greater their influence on student outcomes" (p. 636).

It is important for student achievement in K-12 schools to be on an upward projection. Nettles and Herrington (2007) explored this concept in their study and found the following:

> In the research that has been done in this area [school leadership], significant relationships have been identified between selected school leadership practices and student learning, indicating that evidence existed for certain principal behaviors to produce a direct relationship with student achievement. (p. 724)

"Researchers focused on the principal's influence on student achievement have made some progress in supporting the fact that some sort of relationship between principal leadership and student learning exists" (Donmoyer et al., 2012, p. 7). If the specific principal leadership factors that can contribute to the trajectory are ascertained, student outcomes will improve (Gieselmann, 2009).

With the data garnered from the various research studies on leadership practices and principal behaviors, educational leadership preparation programs could be more robust in their instructional content for impact. Nettles and Herrington (2007) noted

"individual improvements in principal practice can impact thousands of students. It is in this light that potential direct effects of principal practices should be revisited" (p. 732). What is learned in preparation programs can then transfer to the school setting for the educational leader since "Education[al] leadership is possibly the most important single determinant of an effective learning environment" (Kelley et al., 2005, p. 17). "It is the responsibility of the instructional leadership to align the school's standards and practices with its mission and to create a climate that supports teaching and learning" (Hallinger, 2003, pp. 332-333). Hallinger (2003) continued, "The preponderance of evidence indicates that school principals contribute to school effectiveness and student achievement indirectly through actions they take to influence what happens in the school and in classrooms" (p. 333). In summary, leadership in schools has been determined to make a difference (Donmoyer et al., 2012; Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Marzano et al., 2005; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Robinson, 2007).

Research Questions

The research was conducted in an effort to understand the economic and professional impact of educational leadership programs and, by extension, the programs' graduates. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992 to 2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?
2. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or

superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size rankings)?

3. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal positions in the selected school districts (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size rankings)?
4. What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?

Delimitations

This study was delimited to include graduates from a large urban research university over a period of 21 years (1992-2012) who held administrative positions as school district superintendents, school district-level directors and senior staff, and site-based principals and assistant principals. The study was also delimited to the Florida School Grade criteria. Economic impact was delimited to and defined as activities, projects, and research delivered as in-kind consulting through students' clinical experiences and student dissertations over a 21-year period (1992-2012). Given the delimitations of this study, results cannot be generalized to other university educational leadership programs.

Limitations

The following limitations may influence the generalizability of this study:

1. The inability to track graduates through a graduate student database to identify graduates' current professional positions.
2. The recall of faculty and administration information to locate graduates.
3. The accuracy of commencement books and other data to identify graduates.
4. Faculty recall of graduates not in public school K-12 professional positions (i.e. private, state department of educations, college, virtual).

Research Design

This study utilized descriptive statistics and was designed to analyze program performance outcomes delivered by a large urban research university's educational leadership program. This study was based on 21 years of data obtained from available resources on educational leadership program graduates (1992-2012) including commencement programs, doctoral dissertation listings, and the graduates' responses to the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey. The data obtained were used to identify economic impact (activities, projects, and research), the location of graduates, their professional employment, and school performance trends.

Population and Sample

This study's population was comprised of 1,109 graduates (1992-2012) of a large urban research university's educational leadership program. Graduates from the

educational leadership program were identified and economic impact of activities, projects, and research while in the program were calculated. Graduates were then further defined by those who obtained educational leadership positions in K-12 public school districts.

Sources of Data

The data collected for this research came from a variety of sources: Commencement programs were used to determine the number of students who graduated from the large urban research university educational leadership program. Internet search engines that included the websites for the 10-school districts in the CFPSBC served as sources of data. The websites were used for employee directories, school board agendas, and administration salary schedules. The National Center for Educational Statistics website was also utilized to collect data. The Florida Department of Education Master School Identification Lists were obtained from the Florida Department of Education. Finally, a survey instrument, the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey, was used to collect data directly from graduates.

Instrumentation

The 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey was developed in conjunction with faculty members from the target university. The process used to generate the items began with a review of the purpose for the survey. Beginning with the end in mind, faculty members were able to communicate with the researcher about items

that needed to be part of the survey. The researcher reviewed relevant literature and research, and was informed by other survey instruments. From the information gathered, an initial survey instrument was developed.

The 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey was designed to identify and obtain information from graduates about the research university's educational leadership programs. The instrument contained eight items in three sections: (a) background information, (b) professional positions/impact, and (c) open-ended questions. In Section A, Background Information, the first two items called for specific identifiable/demographic information (name and gender). The third and final item in this section asked respondents the year they earned a graduate degree. In Section B, Professional Positions/Impact, Items 4 and 5 requested respondents to complete charts/tables with information on administrative positions held, including the school(s) in the 10-school district Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) where graduates had been principals when they earned Florida School Grades. The third section, Section C, Open-Ended Questions, consisted of three open-ended questions specifically about class activities, projects, and/or dissertations with ample space provided for respondents' replies. The electronic survey was administered by educational leadership faculty. The faculty organized the data in an Excel spreadsheet. The survey was pilot tested and reviewed to establish validity, insuring it was measuring what it was supposed to measure using appropriate methods and procedures. The survey had face validity, and each question or item on the survey had content validity for the research. .

Data Analysis

The research design for this study was descriptive. Based on survey results, as well as identifying graduates from commencement programs, an Excel spreadsheet was utilized to tabulate numbers of respondents/graduates. Once the tally was completed, a calculation based on the lowest mean assistant principals' salary from the 10 school districts in the CFPSBC was calculated. The total was multiplied by the lowest mean salary for all graduates to determine the economic impact provided by graduate student research based on enrollment in the educational leadership program. The data derived from internet search engines and school district websites were utilized to match graduates with administrative positions. Once the positions were identified, the K-12 data were analyzed along with the data obtained from the National Center for Educational Statistics to determine school district student enrollment size ranking. Lastly, the educational leadership program graduates who were principals in the CFPSBC of school districts school grades were displayed in tabular form. The Florida Department of Education Master School Identification Lists were used for additional data. Table 1 reflects the linkage between the research questions, the sources of data, and the data analysis.

Summary

A variety of explanations for what is regarded as effective leadership are available. In addition, there are a number of ways to evaluate programs. According to The Wallace Foundation (2009), "Research and practice confirm that there is slim chance of creating and sustaining high-quality learning environments without a skilled and

committed leader to help shape teaching and learning" (p. 1). The quality of the educational leader matters; and the evaluation of program impact can enhance and support schools and school districts, leading to an increase in student achievement.

Higher education programs in educational leadership need to prepare graduate students for their future roles. With all the university resources available to education and its stakeholders, university educational leadership programs must be viewed as a core element of educational impact as a whole. The economic impact of a graduate degree, in-kind consultation concerning service in the education industry, as well as providing relief to the Florida taxpayer, must be recognized.

Table 1

Research Questions, Sources of Data, and Data Analysis

Research Question	Data Source	Analysis
1. What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992-2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?	Commencement Programs, 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey	Descriptive
2. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using school district student enrollment size rankings of 2012-2013)?	School District Directories, National Center for Educational Statistics, Internet search engine	Descriptive
3. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal positions in the selected school districts (using the student enrollment size rankings of 2012-2013)?	School District Directories, National Center for Educational Statistics, Internet search engine	Descriptive
4. What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?	School District Directories, National Center for Educational Statistics, internet search engine, Florida Department of Education Master School Identification Lists	Descriptive

Organization of the Study

This chapter has provided an introduction to the study. It contains a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, the study's delimitations and limitations, and definitions for key terms. It also provides an overview of both the conceptual framework and design of the study. The review of literature and research related to the problem is presented in Chapter 2. The methodology that was used to conduct the study is detailed in Chapter 3. It includes a restatement of the research questions, the research design, population, sample, data collection and analysis descriptions, as well as a summary. Chapter 4 consists of a summary of the analysis of the data. Chapter 5 presents the findings as they relate to the research questions and the review of the literature. In addition, recommendations based on those findings will be provided.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of literature provides the rationale for further research on the economic and professional impact of educational leadership program graduates who have obtained K-12 leadership positions either while in the program or after graduation. Though there has been much research on the benefits of higher education and reforming preparation programs, peer-reviewed, empirical studies on the educational leaders' impact on student academic achievement is lacking. This researcher explored relevant research in the areas of higher education, graduate degrees, educational leadership, and student achievement.

This chapter presents the findings from peer-reviewed articles, empirical research, and reports, searched in ERIC (EBSCO Host), ProQuest, and PsycINFO databases, and research at the target institution's university library. Key terms used in the search included economic impact, higher education, employment potential, value of degree, graduate programs, educational leadership programs, economic impact, and career development. The lack of references obtained in these searches supports the statement of the problem that there was very limited data concerning the economic and professional impact of educational leadership program graduates.

The chapter has been organized around literature reviewed in three relevant areas: (a) higher education and graduate education, (b) educational leadership, and (c) student achievement. The higher education and graduate education section includes a report of the limited findings related to employment differences and economic benefits. The

educational leadership section provides a brief history and a review of preparation programs including program components and evaluation. The final section is focused on student achievement in K-12 school districts and how it is impacted by educational leadership programs and graduates.

Higher Education and Graduate Education

"A commonly held belief is that formal education has a strong positive association with earnings. Individuals are motivated to pursue and complete an education beyond high school to achieve a higher paying job and a higher position" (Sanchez & Laanan, 1998, p. 6). There is a considerable amount of research and data to support the findings that higher education brings financial benefits (Acemoglu & Autor, 2011; Baldwin & McCracken, 2013; Brand, & Xie, 2010; Danziger & Ratner, 2010; Department of the Treasury & Department of Education, 2012; Fogg, & Harrington, 2009; Sanchez & Laanan, 1998; U.S. Department of Labor, 1992). In an extension of this data analysis, it was concluded that members of the workforce who have increased educational attainment also have lower unemployment rates, less vulnerability in recessions, and economic stability.

"Since the mid-1970s the demand for college graduates has steadily increased as the structure of technological change and economic growth favored those with college degrees" (Fogg & Harrington, 2009, p. 27). One example of this occurs as employers review potential candidates for positions. Some utilize the certification or screening method. "By virtue of possessing the bachelor's degree, individuals are perceived as

meeting a certification that distinguishes them from non-degree recipients, and are therefore rewarded with higher paying jobs or career paths" (Sanchez & Laanan, 1998, p. 7). Brand and Xie (2010) explained, "Individuals choose to attend college according to expected economic returns; people attain college educations only if the economic returns outweigh the costs" (p. 274).

An investment in human capital is an investment in anything that will "raise earnings, improve health, or add to a person's good habits over much of his lifetime" (Becker, 2008, para. 2). Choudhury & Jones (2010) concurred, noting that "Human capital theorists' argument is that investment in education and training are important to improve individuals' earnings and thus enhance career success." (p. 91). Psacharopoulos and Patrinos (2004) stated, "Returns to schooling are a useful indicator of the productivity of education and incentive for individuals to invest in their own human capital" (p. 118). Baldwin & McCracken (2013) expanded on this thought: "Higher education enhances human capital and, thus, the productivity and efficiency of labor" (pp. 184-185).

Economic returns come in ways other than wages (Baldwin & McCracken, 2013; Clark et al., 1998; D'Allegro & Paff, 2010; Danziger & Ratner, 2010; Department of the Treasury & Department of Education, 2012; Sanchez & Laanan, 1998; Schejbal & Wilson, 2008). As a result of a higher education, individuals experience a higher quality of life and are more socially mobile (Sanchez & Laanan, 1998). Other individual benefits include private pensions and employer-subsidized health insurance (Danziger & Ratner, 2010). Clark et al. (1998) observed that "Better health, increased volunteerism, improved

likelihood to participate in government politics, enhanced moral character, and propensity to donate to charitable organizations are some of the social, cultural, and economic benefits attributed to higher education (p. 3).

Qenani, MacDougall, and Sexton (2014) presented a benefit of graduate employability as follows: “Universities also engender economic growth through the knowledge, skills, and understanding that students develop at university as well as through the direct contributions by the university” (p. 200). Further, there are higher education “economic impact indicators associated with faculty productivity include research, external grant acquisition, and entrepreneurial enterprises” (D'Allegro & Paff, 2010, p. 4). These benefits were supported by the Department of the Treasury & Department of Education (2012):

> Research universities also devote significant resources to knowledge creation and innovation, which benefits not just the university and its students, but also the general public. While the benefit of higher education to students is substantial and well-documented, it is more difficult to measure spillovers of higher education to the economy at large. Comparisons have found that countries with higher educational attainment have higher gross domestic product GDP growth rates. (p. 15)

These benefits overflow into the community when human capital is increased and communities can attract higher quality labor that in turn will offer quality education for children (Baldwin & McCracken, 2013, p. 184). Schejbal & Wilson (2008) expanded on the value of higher education:

> Higher education--and continuing education as one arm of that enterprise--is not just an economic engine; it contributes directly and in a multifaceted fashion to the common good. It generates and makes accessible a great deal of the knowledge that drives our economy; it helps develop an understanding of our society and the world for millions of students; and it helps develop the personal, social, and human competencies. (p. 32)

Tax revenues, student spending, and student volunteer, community service all impact economic growth (D'Allegro & Paff, 2010).

When considering the value of higher education, the cost effectiveness of outcomes impacts graduates, universities, and communities. Economic impact of higher education was summarized by Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner (as cited by the Department of the Treasury & Department of Education, 2012):

> The moral case for doing a better job of giving Americans the opportunity to succeed is very compelling. The economic case is just as strong. If more Americans are educated, more will be employed, their collective earnings will be greater, and the overall productivity of the American workforce will be higher. (p. 13)

The research to expand the discussion of economic impact from higher education to graduate information specifically related to educational leadership was sparse. Although some studies were completed in other countries, little beyond the previously identified benefits was available for graduate programs. However, Fatima (2009) found "strong evidence of the existence of substantial public or external benefits due to the investments in advance education (master's, professional, and doctoral)" (p. 27). The general conclusion one can make is that graduate degrees mean more educational attainment, and hence more benefits, earnings and other, as well as a better chance of employment. Fatima (2009) did state "More educated people are more productive because they are more skilled in high-level and more widely generalizable knowledge" (p. 25). In educational leadership, a master's degree or higher is required in the state of Florida. Those who are seeking an educational leadership certification in order to apply for administrative roles will enroll in a university program (Eadens et al., 2012, p. 2).

Conrad, Duren, and Haworth (1998) had noted earlier that "master's programs have become bridges between our colleges and universities and the larger society, thereby benefiting not only individuals but society as well" (p. 76).

"In 2011, there were 4.1 million graduate students and 82 percent of them worked" (Davis, 2012, p. 2). Results from Fatima's 2009 study "indicate that investments in graduate and professional education yield substantial public benefits. This suggests the existence of a substantial public demand for optimum investment in these education programs" (p.27). Based on their position in the workforce and a graduate program, "students look for an immediate return on their investment of time and money. The practical ideas a student can bring back to the workplace become important for both the student and his or her coworkers" (Duvall, 2003, p. 70).

"The doctorate degree in educational leadership (Ed.D.) may be viewed as the credentialing measure which may potentially have the greatest impact on individuals who hold the degree as well as those for which those individuals serve" (Ringler & Rouse, 2007, p. 1). Ringler and Rouse (2007) continued, "The purpose of the Ed.D. degree is to prepare individuals as practitioners for their professional field" (p. 2). Duvall (2003) previously stated:

> Doctoral programs are designed to encourage the student to explore new knowledge and to consider new ideas. Basic to study at this level is the challenge to think in a different way. Modern doctoral work aims to be less about the acquisition of knowledge (although that is an important part of any program) and the ability to restate that knowledge in exams. Instead, it strives to be more about the ability to question, to investigate, to be able to view issues from different perspectives, and to understand and accept the prevalence of ambiguity and paradox. (p. 65)

According to Fatima (2009), “Graduates from masters, doctoral, and professional educational programs are more likely to increase productivity among coworkers, employers, or employees” (p. 25). Table 2 contains a summary of the literature reviewed.

Table 2

Summary of Literature Reviewed: Higher Education and Graduate Education

Summary of Findings	Authors
Employment Differences: Individuals with college degrees have a better chance at gaining full time employment, higher wages, and maintaining economic stability.	Acemoglu & Autor (2011) Baldwin & McCracken (2013) Brand & Xie (2010) Danziger & Ratner (2010) Department of the Treasury & Department of Education (2012) Fatima (2009) Fogg & Harrington (2009) Sanchez & Laanan (1998) U.S. Department of Labor (1992)
Economic Benefits: Individual benefits include better health, pension, and higher quality of life. Community benefits occur through enhancing human capital.	Baldwin & McCracken (2013) Becker (2008) Clark, Feng, & Stromsdorfer (1998) D'Allegro & Paff (2010) Department of the Treasury & Department of Education (2012) Fatima (2009) Sanchez & Laanan (1998) Schejbal & Wilson (2008)

Educational Leadership

History of the Program

"The field of educational administration was launched by Elwood Cubberley in the 1920s" (Hess, 2003, p. 6). Historically, leadership positions in public education were filled by those who were able to distinguish themselves as effective teachers. Frequently, these teachers were first promoted to a curriculum type leadership role and then worked their way up the administrative ladder to roles as assistant principal, principal, school district director, and possibly superintendent's staff (Duvall, 2003). A more modern way of achieving a leadership role in public education is through advanced college degrees (Chell, 1995). Duvall concurred, stating "Formal degrees or training, once not necessary for higher-level positions, became an expectation" (p. 64).

Section 231.087, F.S., established the Florida Council of Educational Management (FCEM) when the State Legislature of Florida passed the Management Training Act. In order to make recommendations on Florida public schools' management, the council was tasked to find the distinctive defining features of educational managers that had been recognized as outstanding and "determine standards and procedures for evaluating performance of identified competencies" (Florida State Statute, Personnel of School System, 1997). Through this evaluation process, the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) was created for those seeking Educational Leadership certification in the State of Florida, as stipulated in Rule 6A-4.00821, FAC (Florida Administrative Code) and the specific authority of Section 1012.56 F.S. (Florida

State Statute, Personnel, 2002). Implementation of the FELE as a statewide examination as a means to assess knowledge of the competencies. Furthermore, it was determined by the studies Florida Council of Educational Management conducted that the principal competencies would be organized into eight categories tested on the FELE. The first area on the FELE, School Management, consisted of three of the categories (1) Leadership, (2) Management, and (3) Personnel. The next area was (4) School Communications, the third and final area was School Operations which included (5) Curriculum, (6) Finance, (7) Law, and (8) Technology (Florida Department of Education, 2002).

The Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) were developed as standards to guide educational leaders similar to the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices Standards (FEAPS) for teachers. Standards for school leaders centered on student achievement as a focus and the reason for the work. Florida State Rule 6A-5.081 Approval of School Leadership Programs, required institutions to incorporate objectives into programs to meet the needs of school leaders.

> The Standards are set forth in rule as Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. The Standards are based on contemporary research on multi-dimensional school leadership, and represent skill sets and knowledge bases needed in effective schools. The Standards form the foundation for school leader personnel evaluations and professional development systems, school leadership preparation programs, and educator certification requirements. (Florida Department of Education, 2007, para. 1)

In addition, the eight tested categories of the FELE "were aligned with the Florida Principal Leadership Standards to identify 10 standards" (Florida Department of Education, 2014, p. 1). These 10 standards are (a) Instructional Leadership, (b) Managing

the Learning Environment, (c) Learning, Accountability, and Assessment, (d) Technology, (e) Human Resource Development, (f) Ethical Leadership, (g) Decision-making Strategies, (h) Community and Stakeholder Partnerships, (i) Diversity, and (j) Vision.

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) is a national consortium of major stakeholders in educational leadership and policy interested in the advancement of school and school-system leaders (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, 2012) "committed to quality leadership preparation and practice" (Young et al., 2013, p. 7). The NPBEA created the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Standards to provide consistent criteria for preparing candidates for a broad range of leadership roles. The ELCC standards are "the most commonly used set of standards for assessing principal preparation programs" (Young et al., 2013, p. 7). The ELCC Standards set a framework for excellence upon which leadership preparation programs can ensure that candidates are prepared to meet the complex demands of educational administration.

Alignment of educational leadership preparation programs to state and national standards for school leaders that are clear and rigorous is essential. The ELCC Standards "implemented by universities, and the way they will be reviewed for accreditation reflect a new direction for educational leadership" (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, p. 4). "This new direction calls for a more results focused orientation. Programs will now be assessed on how well graduates are prepared to

perform in the workplace" (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, p. 6). The ELCC Standards were developed with the following underlying beliefs:

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 but specifically exclude business managers. 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, curriculum directors, supervisors, 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 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, pp. 8–9).

Under the NPBEA, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Steering Committee established performance expectations for effective school leadership, the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders. Young et al. (2013) noted that similar to the ELCC Program Standards, "the ISLLC standards place significant emphasis on the leader's role in improving teaching and learning" (p. 8). Rigby (2014) concurred, stating "The prevailing logic represented a shift from the traditional role of a school site principal two decades ago. Rather than a focus purely on management of the school as an organization, principals' foci were on teaching and learning" (p. 619). Though both sets of standards are reflective of the educational leader's responsibilities, "the ELCC standards were designed for educational leadership preparation, whereas the ISLLC standards were designed with leadership practice in mind" (Young et al., 2013, p. 8). In 2008, both the ELCC and ISLLC standards were updated, redesigned, and merged (Hale & Moorman, 2003; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2012; Young et al., 2013).

Through the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders, the consortium identified the knowledge, skills and dispositions associated with six key concepts of educational leadership.

These standards serve to define expected outcomes and activities for effective school leaders. Central to the new standards is a focus on student learning, upon which all the standards are based.

> Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning That is shared and supported by all stakeholders.
>
> Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
>
> Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
>
> Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
>
> Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
>
> Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

When, in 2009, the Race to the Top initiative was created to increase rigor in schools, states aligned with the ISLLC Standards for school leaders. "The ISLLC

standards have been integral in establishing a common language and framework for what school leaders should know and be able to do" (Clifford, 2010, p. 2). The focus of reform was on curriculum standards and assessments, teacher recruitment, and evaluation as well as understanding and interpreting data in order to analyze student/school trends. Flumerfelt, Ingram, Brockberg, and Smith (2007) concurred, maintaining that "Using the ISLLC standards as a taxonomy for evaluating learning processes of desirable leadership behaviors as a measure of student achievement is a worthwhile assessment practice" (p. 109).

Preparation Programs

Certification in Educational Leadership in the state of Florida began in the 1970s. In that time, Educational Leadership roles have evolved and preparation programs need to do the same. Hale and Moorman (2003) noted that principal preparation programs need continual support to implement the multifaceted processes essential to progress. These improvements can be developed by redirecting operations for the organization to reinforce and assist with the implementation of the educational leadership program components (Hale & Moorman, 2003). "Surely quality university programs of study encourage students to engage in organized inquiry, to research their field in search of new discoveries, and to examine the veracity of those discoveries" (Duvall, 2003, p. 65). Components of the curriculum for educational leadership programs may include clinical hours, use of data, and situational leadership scenarios. The clinical hours should be specifically geared to the continual increase of student achievement. In addition, national

and state experts should evaluate all leadership programs using high expectations, and eliminate programs that do not meet those expectations. Similarly, Gray, Fry, Bottoms, and O'Neill (2007) argued the need for holding preparation programs accountable for both graduates' performance on the job and the achievement of students in the schools they lead.

University Programs

"Generally speaking, becoming a licensed principal requires the successful completion of a fixed number of credit hours in an approved principal preparation program" (Hale & Moorman, 2003, p. 4). The large, urban research university in Florida depicted in this research has three different degrees available for graduate students to earn Educational Leadership certification in Florida (UCF, 2012). Entrance into the Master of Education in Educational Leadership program requires students to have completed a Bachelor's Degree. The Master of Education program also includes two semesters of administrative internships which provide opportunities for graduate students to have on-the-job training with educational leadership experiences. The two other programs, Educational Specialist (Ed. S.), and Doctor of Education (Ed. D), both require a graduate program of 36 semester hours beyond the master's degree. The education specialist degree requires graduate students to conduct research, and the culminating activity is a research report. Students enrolled in the Doctor of Education (Ed. D.) program are required to conduct dissertation research. Once students graduate from an

educational leadership program and pass the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE), they are eligible for Educational Leadership certification in the state of Florida.

Although the university based certification process for school administrators has the broadest range of experiences and content, "given the increasing demands on school leaders, the question of what candidates are actually being taught in principal preparation has taken on heightened significance" (Hess & Kelly, 2007, p. 3). According to Hale and Moorman (2003), although "the jobs of school leaders have changed dramatically, formal preparation programs based in higher education institutions have not adequately prepared those holding these jobs to meet the priority demands of the 21st century, namely, improved student achievement" (p. 1). The researchers continued, "The intense pressure for principals to be instructional leaders who can more effectively implement standards-based reform has given unprecedented prominence and political visibility to the problems of preparing school principals" (Hale & Moorman, 2003, p. 3).

In order to support educational leadership graduate students in their future administrative roles, preparation programs must move from programs that are "out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's school district" (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001, p. 31). "Educational administration programs need to equip graduates with the skills and knowledge necessary to lead today's schools, not yesterday's" (Levine, 2005, p. 66). The focus of university programs must shift from research, managerial, and academic knowledge based curriculum to accountability for student, school, and school district achievement and continual improvement. (Hale & Moorman, 2003; Korach, 2011). According to Lashway (2004, p. 5) "Independent action

by universities is not the only pathway to transforming leadership preparation. States hold considerable influence through licensure and accreditation requirements." University educational leadership programs are governed by the state; and according to Hale and Moorman (2003), "States have established policies on certification, licensure and program accreditation as well as standard processes to validate and accredit administrator preparation programs" (p. 4).

In reporting their research findings, Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005) observed that "The structure of educational leadership preparation programs often fails to seek out or establish interdisciplinary links within the university or to fully utilize potential outside resources in schools and other organizations" (p. 11). Universities have started to shift from their "ivory tower" attitudes that keep what is happening on campus separated. Rather, they have begun to move toward a more introspective configuration to improve programs and support higher education students as they prepare to enter the workforce and begin their careers. Varner (2007) explained the importance of this approach:

> Developing school leaders who are flexible, courageous, and capable of effectively leading in the changing educational landscape is of supreme importance. With increasing criticism of school leaders and the programs that prepare them, gleaning a better understanding of how to build strong educational leadership programs is vital to the institutions charged with this responsibility. (p. 33)

Preparation Program Components

In an effort to find the best ways to prepare and develop highly qualified school administrators, university preparation programs should incorporate objectives into

programs to "provide a seamless continuum of professional training" (Lashway, 2003, p. 4) and meet the needs of school leaders. Results from researchers (Brazer & Bauer, 2013; Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007; Hale & Moorman, 2003; Murphy, Moorman, & McCarthy, 2008) indicated that the approach to course instruction should be comprehensive and include pedagogy on authentic project based methods. In addition, the incorporation of real school situations where students can develop and practice their skills is integral to a successful bridge of knowledge from the classroom (preparation program) to the position (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Goldring, Huff, May, & Camburn, 2008; Hale & Moorman, 2003).

In order to achieve the levels of improvement in performance for both students and schools, the focus of preparation programs needs to shift from developing managers to preparing leaders. According to Brazer and Bauer (2013), university preparation programs need to "transform themselves from a collection of segmented courses based on national standards in which instructional leadership is periodically featured to a holistic candidate experience in which instructional leadership is the central organizing concept" (p. 647). Candidate experiences should move to integrated "opportunities to practice leadership to learn the extent to which they have the skills necessary to manage day-to-day processes, work collaboratively, solve problems, make decisions, and motivate others" (Brazer & Bauer, 2013, p. 671).

These instructional practices force university instructors to move away from lecture formats to hands-on opportunities that align to leadership performance standards.

The use of rubrics, evidence based artifacts, discussions, and observations are other components essential to the continual improvement process of programs.

A mainstay of preparation programs that supports leadership in practice is the administrative internship or clinical hours. As reported by the National Center for Education Statistics (2012), data show 40 of 50 states have included a supervised administrative internship as part of university preparation programs. Because this time is typically spent in school districts, clinical hours create an opportunity for universities to collaborate with local school districts where educational leadership students can put the knowledge and skills learned in the program into practice. According to Lashway (2003), universities are not alone in changing preparation programs. "School districts can apply leverage through collaboration with university programs" (p. 5).

As university programs and school districts work together, program consistency is enhanced, and a sense of shared purpose and common vocabulary between school districts and local colleges of education is developed (Davis et al., 2005, p. 11). Extensive mentored administrative internships or clinical hours in school districts provide graduate students with opportunities to apply program knowledge, develop practical understandings, reflect, and demonstrate required real world competencies that improve school for all stakeholders (Brazer & Bauer, 2013; Hale & Moorman, 2003; Levine, 2005). These experiences provide the opportunity for future administrators to participate in application of knowledge or transfer of learning. According to Subedi (2004), "Transfer of learning relates to generating knowledge and information through education, which refers to the capacity to generalize and learn by analogy" (p. 593).

In addition, the partnership between the university and school district will allow open communication and exchanges of information about the implementation of preparation programs and demonstration of skill application (transfer of learning). Subedi (2004) stated:

> Transfer takes place when our existing knowledge, abilities, and skills affect the learning or performance of new skills or tasks. In other words, when learning in one context with one set of materials impacts on performance in another context or with different but related set of materials then transfer of training has occurred. (p. 592)

A quality educational leadership program needs to have all the pieces in place to prepare educational leaders for the challenging roles they will assume. With the purpose of meeting the demands of 21st century school leaders, "leadership development requires the application of knowledge--management skills, organizational theory, pedagogical content knowledge, educational connoisseurship and criticism, and the context of teaching and learning" (Brazer & Bauer, 2013, p. 670) to meet the needs of school leaders for 21st century schools.

Evaluation

The standards and expectations of education administrators must be explicitly connected to the successful completion of coursework (Goldring et al., 2008; Levine, 2005; Murphy et al., 2008). Knowing future school and school district administrators in education need to be prepared with the knowledge and skills necessary to begin practice, evaluation of the preparation program's quality must be rigorous. This is necessary due to the expectations of educational leaders for accountability in schools and school

districts. The scope of expectations was supported by Keaster and Schlinker (2009) when they stated, "School administrators invoke the vision, facilitate the design, initiate the implementation, and monitor the organizational structures and hands-on accommodations that make schooling work" (p. 94).

A preparation program that is consistently evaluating itself and its graduates, will equip instructional leaders "with the beginning knowledge and skill needed to evaluate curriculum, observe and assess instruction, interact meaningfully with teachers about instructional decision-making, and design professional learning opportunities that enhance student learning outcomes" (Carver, 2012, p. 2). Furthermore, the programs will "develop principals who have the knowledge, skills and attributes of an instructional leader and the capacity to galvanize the internal and external school communities in support of increased student achievement and learning" (Hale & Moorman, 2003, p. 8). An educational leadership preparation program that encompassed all these pieces was explained by Korach (2011) as occurring when:

> . . . a university and a large urban school district began collaboration to systematically refocus both institutions on improving the preparation of principals. The common goal was to accelerate academic outcomes for district's students. The district recognized the principal as the keystone to supporting and improving teacher practice. District leaders believed that to close achievement gaps, improve student achievement, and hold all adults accountable for higher expectations, they had to develop new leaders who were capable of turning around low-performing schools. (p. 659)

Flumerfelt et al. (2007, p.108) stated, "It is possible to measure knowledge construction, disposition development and performance acquisition from the classroom to leadership practice through taxonomy use" (p. 108). Flumerfelt et al. continued, "Because the ISLLC standards are presented as a taxonomy of holistic educational

leadership development, including knowledge, dispositions, and performances, a match with transformative pedagogy in this regard is sensible" (p. 109). Subedi (2004, p. 591) concurred that "transfer is a key concept in adult learning theories because most education and training aspires to transfer" (p. 591). Perhaps the best evaluation of an educational leadership preparation program will be application through transfer.

Table 3 presents a summary of the literature reviewed related to educational leadership preparation programs. Categorized within the table are researchers and writers who addressed three specific areas: (a) university programs, (b) preparation program components, and (c) evaluation of programs.

Table 3

Summary of Literature Reviewed: Educational Leadership Preparation Programs

Subsection Summary of Findings	Authors
University programs: In the enhanced state of accountability in education, preparation programs need to meet the needs of future educational leaders.	Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson (2005) Duvall (2003) Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno (2001) Gray, Fry, Bottoms, & O'Neill (2007) Hale & Moorman (2003) Hess & Kelly (2007) Korach (2011) Lashway (2004) Levine (2005) UCF (2012) Varner (2007)
Preparation Program Components: Moving from theory to practical experiences that include project based learning, real world simulations, administrative internship, and partnerships with local school districts in an effort to transfer learning from practicum to practice.	Brazer & Bauer (2013) Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen (2007) Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson (2005) Goldring, Huff, May, & Camburn (2008) Hale & Moorman (2003) Lashway (2004) Levine (2005) Murphy, Moorman, & McCarthy (2008) Subedi (2004)
Evaluation: Preparation programs need to graduate school administrators who are ready to lead schools and increase student achievement.	Carver, 2012 Flumerfelt, Ingram, Brockberg, & Smith (2007) Goldring, Huff, May, & Camburn (2008) Hale and Moorman (2003) Keaster & Schlinker (2009) Korach (2011) Levine (2005) Murphy, Moorman, & McCarthy (2008) Subedi (2004)

Student Achievement

It is safe to say that improving student achievement has been the focus of public education in the 21st century thus far. The Wallace Foundation (2009) reported, "Research and practice confirm that there is slim chance of creating and sustaining high-quality learning environments without a skilled and committed leader to help shape teaching and learning" (p. 6). Young, O'Doherty, Gooden, and Goodnow, (2011) agreed, stating that "Although a leader's influence on school outcomes is largely indirect, leaders influence school conditions and teachers' work, which then affect school outcomes" (p. 704).

This translates to public school leaders in a variety of ways. According to Leithwood et al. (2004), commenting on the national situation, researchers have indicated that school "leadership is second only to teaching among school related factors in its impact on student learning" (p. 3). Similarly, Hessel and Holloway (2002) maintained "Research affirms that principal leadership positively affects student achievement and that successful schools are characterized by a clear sense of purpose supported by the instructional leadership of the principal" (p. 18). Specifically, when examining the principal's role, to be effective in this position, one must "boost academic achievement for all students, increase the effectiveness of their teaching staffs, and consistently take leadership actions shown to improve outcomes for students" (New Leaders for New Schools, 2010, p. 1). Educational leaders need to provide the vision and mission, monitor progress, lead instruction, and communicate their continual improvement to all stakeholders. Brazer and Bauer (2013) weighed in on the importance of improving

"teaching and learning to keep pace with progressively higher benchmarks for school performance and achieve at least minimally satisfactory results on state assessments for all children" (p. 646). Rigby (2014) added the expectation "for principals to focus on learning and instruction, establish relationships with teachers, and to guide teachers to improve instruction to lead toward increased student achievement" (p. 613).

New Leaders for New Schools (2010) reported that "principal effectiveness is central to raising student achievement" (p. 1). In fact, according to Marzano et al. (2005), principals are credited with an effect size of .25 of the total impact on student achievement. That translates into a difference of 10 percentile points in mean student achievement based on effective school leadership practices (p. 26). This demonstrates a significant impact based on the principal's actions. "The ways in which leaders effect change is shaped by the knowledge they have created by combining theory and experience" (Brazer & Bauer, 2013, p. 658). The potential impact of graduates who attain roles in educational leadership positions goes back to the university preparation program, albeit indirectly.

The literature was, however, somewhat controversial with regard to impact on student achievement. For example, Levine (2005) asserted that "The body of research in educational administration cannot answer questions as basic as whether school leadership programs have any impact on student achievement in the schools that graduates of these programs lead" (p. 44). Many researchers have relied on self-perception, teacher perception, leadership behaviors, surveys, interviews, or principal characteristics (Donmoyer et al., 2012; Hallinger, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005; Robinson et al., 2008;

Waters et al., 2003). Donmoyer et al. reported a circumstantial link between principal preparation impacting principal's instructional leadership and then student achievement. They observed that "the relationship between principal preparation programs and principal performance and the relationship between principal performance and student learning" (p. 6) was not definitive. Levine (2005) claimed there was evidence to support the claim that some impact occurs, echoing the statement "principals make a difference in the success of students" (p. 12).

Student success is measured by their learning. In Florida, student learning outcomes were measured through the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). The FCAT was implemented in 1998 to determine if at the end of the school year, students achieved a year's worth of learning. In 1999 statutory requirements for the state assessment program were revised by the Florida Legislature and enacted The "state accountability system, known as the Florida A+ Accountability Plan (Florida Department of Education, 2004, p. 4; Jones & Egley, 2004, p. 170; McCullers & Bozeman, 2010, p. 55). Schools were assigned letter grades A-F based on student performance on the FCAT and rewards were offered to schools that earned an "A" or improved at least one letter grade in the form of monetary incentives (Florida Department of Education, 2004, p. 29; Jones & Egley, 2004, p. 170; McCullers & Bozeman, 2010, p. 55).

There have been several changes throughout the years to School Grades, constantly raising the standards (Florida Department of Education, 2012, p.15):

- 2001- more grade levels added
- 2002- learning gains added

- 2005- all students included
- 2007- Science added, and learning gains for the lowest 25%
- 2010- new High School components, including graduation rate
- 2011- writing criterion score increased
- 2012- multiple changes

Even with all the changes to the Florida A+ Accountability Plan and School Grades, principals are expected to lead their students to meet high expectations, and they are able to do so. "The impact of raising standards results in greater achievement over time (Florida Department of Education, 2012, p.15). According to McCullers and Bozeman (2010) "research and literature have repeatedly revealed a clear relationship between effective principals and successful schools" (p. 55).

Summary

This review of literature has provided information on several ideas that were relevant to the research in support of responding to the research questions. The literature reviewed on postsecondary education revealed findings on employment differences and economic benefits. The availability of full time employment and higher wages as well as an improved quality of life showed the economic impact higher education provides and the paths by graduate students pursuing advanced degrees. "Education has been turned into one of the most powerful engines driving our economy. To be competitive in a global marketplace, the United States now requires a more educated population" (Levine, 2005, p.11).

The research on educational leadership was reviewed beginning with a program history of the path to educational administration followed by an explanation of leader preparation programs. Discoveries included the need for university preparation programs to meet graduate students' needs to be adequately trained for future educational administrative roles.

> Preparing school leaders who have the knowledge, skill and disposition to be instructional leaders must be a priority. If this country is to realize it's dream for a K-12 educational system that provides all students with a rigorous, standards-based program of study, we will need leaders who do more than manage a curricular program. Needed are leaders who have a robust vision of teaching and learning, grounded in standards and reflective of researched best practice, yet flexible enough to meet the diverse and changing needs of students in today's classrooms. (Carver, 2012, p. 2)

In addition, the components of preparation programs need to support graduate students' learning and real life application for transfer to occur. The need for a rigorous preparation program evaluation was also examined. Concluding the chapter was a discussion of how student achievement K-12has been impacted by these factors. "In this new era of accountability, where school leaders are expected to demonstrate bottom-line, the skill and knowledge of principals matter more than ever" (Hess & Kelly, 2007, p. 2).

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, the methodology used in conducting the research is detailed; the study questions, research design, population, and sample are explained. The procedures used to conduct the research are also presented and include discussion of the collection and analysis of the data, and a summary.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the economic and professional impact of graduates from the target research university's educational leadership program. Economic impact was measured by research delivered as in-kind consulting through graduates' activities, projects, and dissertations while in the educational leadership program. In addition, graduates appointed to and/or serving in the educational leadership position of superintendent in the United States; senior staff, school district level director in the state of Florida; as well as principal, and assistant principal in 10 central Florida school districts were identified. Furthermore, this study was also conducted to investigate graduates' professional impact through performance trends based on Florida's School Accountability system, utilizing school grades.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992 to 2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?
2. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size rankings)?
3. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal positions in the selected school districts (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size rankings)?
4. What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?

Research Design

This study utilized descriptive statistics and was designed to analyze program performance outcomes delivered by a large urban research university educational leadership program. This study was based on 21 years of available data for educational leadership program graduates (1992-2012) and their responses to a survey. The data obtained from the survey included the location of graduates, their professional

employment, school performance trends, and economic impact factors. Consultations delivered through activities, projects, and research including dissertations, were identified through survey responses and categorized in Microsoft Excel, and analyzed.

Population and Sample

This study's population was comprised of the educational leadership program graduates who earned master's, education specialist, and doctoral degrees from 1992 to 2012 at a large urban research university. This study's population was comprised of 1,109 graduates (1992-2012) of the institution's educational leadership program. Graduates from the educational leadership program were identified and economic impact of activities, projects, and research while in the program were calculated. Graduates were then further defined by those who obtained educational leadership positions in K-12 public school districts.

Data Collection

Prior to the initiation of any research activity, the approval of the study was sought and received from the target institution's Institutional Review Board (Appendix A). Because people were asked to participate through interaction that solicits personal information, this study was identified by the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board (IRB) as one that used primary data which are not publicly available.

The data collected for this research came from a variety of sources: Commencement programs, the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey,

school district websites, the National Center for Educational Statistics, internet search engines, and Florida Department of Education Master School Identification Lists. Commencement programs were used to determine the number of students who graduated from the target university's educational leadership program for the years 1992-2012. In addition, a survey was developed in conjunction with faculty members from the research university. The process used to generate the items began with a review of the purpose for the survey. Beginning with the end in mind, faculty members were able to communicate with the researcher about items that needed to be part of the survey. The researcher conducted a literature review and consulted other survey instruments. From the information gathered, an initial survey instrument was developed.

Instrumentation

The 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey (Appendix B) was designed to identify and obtain information from graduates about the research university's educational leadership programs. Three sections (a) Background Information, (b) Professional Positions/Impact, and (c) Open-ended Questions comprised eight items on the instrument. In Section A, Background Information, the first two items called for specific identifiable/demographic information (name and gender). The third and final item in this section asked respondents to recall the year they earned a graduate degree. In Section B, Professional Positions/Impact, items 4 and 5 requested respondents to complete tables with information on administrative positions held, including the school(s) in the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) where

graduates had been principals when they earned Florida School Grades. The third section, Section C, Open-Ended Questions, consisted of three open-ended questions specifically about class activities, projects, and/or dissertations with ample space provided for respondents' replies. The survey was administered electronically, and resulting data were organized in an Excel spreadsheet.

Internet search engines that included the websites for the 10 school districts in the CFPSBC served as sources of data. The websites were used for employee directories, school board agendas, and administration salary schedules. The National Center for Educational Statistics website was also utilized to collect data on the student enrollment size ranking. Finally, the Florida Department of Education Master School Identification Lists were obtained from the Florida Department of Education for the years for which school grades were available.

Data Analysis

The research design for this study was descriptive. The descriptive design was utilized to gather data that described events. The data collection was then organized, tabulated and described. The summary data were analyzed with measures of central tendency including frequency tables, means, and percentages. Based on survey results from the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey, as well as identifying graduates from commencement programs, several Excel Spreadsheets were utilized. Once the graduates were identified, internet search engines and school district websites were explored to find graduates positions. The National Center for Educational Statistics

provided data for school district size and rankings. Finally, the Florida Department of Education Master School Identification Lists were cross-referenced to determine school grades for graduates who were in the position of principal and earned a school grade.

Research Question 1

What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992 to 2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?

In order to determine the economic impact of graduates, the names of graduates for the 1992-2012 years were listed using an Excel spreadsheet. The graduates were listed in the first column and their degree earned, semester and year graduated were listed in separate columns in the rows adjacent to their names. After identifying the number of graduates in the time range, a monetary value was needed to determine the value of the educational leadership program activities, projects, and research completed while enrolled in the educational leadership graduate program and to arrive at impact. Due to the fact that the program activities and projects for master's degree candidates were associated with the assistant principal position, and the economic impact was based on the educational leadership graduates' contribution to the school district(s), the lowest assistant principal salary base was used. The calculation was based on the mean lowest assistant principal salary from the 10 school districts in the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) used for this research. The CFPSBC consists of Brevard Public Schools, Hillsborough County Public Schools, Lake County Schools, Manatee County Public Schools, Marion County Public Schools, Orange County Public Schools, School District of Osceola County, Polk County Public Schools, Seminole County Public

Schools, and Volusia County Schools. The total number of educational leadership master's degree graduates from 1992-2012 was multiplied by the mean hourly lowest salary for assistant principals in the CFPSBC and then multiplied by the number of hours completed for administrative, volunteer, and mentoring experiences to determine the economic impact provided by graduate student while enrolled in the educational leadership program.

Activities defined as school based included, but were not limited to, volunteer experiences and mentor experiences. The project utilized for this research was based on clinical hours or an administrative internship. An administrative internship provides practical experience emphasizing on-the-job training. To establish uniformity in the use and application of the term internship, the National Association of Colleges and Employers [NACE] (2011) recommended the following definition:

> An internship is a form of experiential learning that integrates knowledge and theory learned in the classroom with practical application and skills development in a professional setting. Internships give students the opportunity to gain valuable applied experience and make connections in professional fields they are considering for career paths; and give employers the opportunity to guide and evaluate talent. (p. 7)

All of the students admitted to the target university in the master's degree program beginning in the summer of 2012 were required to complete 200 hours of administrative experiences before applying to their administrative internships. The administrative internship is equivalent to a three-semester hour course, or 90 hours, and graduates are expected to complete two administrative internships for a total of 180 hours. The economic impact for administrative experiences including internships was

calculated for graduates who earned a master's degree using the mean hourly lowest salary for assistant principals for 380 hours.

Admitted students were also required to provide community service as volunteers as part of their academic activity. Volunteer services, (e.g., donations of time without being paid), occur in schools and school communities. Some of the courses in the educational leadership program at the target institution, including Educational Supervisory Practices I and Educational Leadership, require eight hours of volunteer time on the part of students. Volunteer time was calculated, in terms of economic impact, by multiplying the mean hourly rate of the lowest assistant principal salary by the required eight hours of volunteer time for each person identified.

Mentoring, for the purposes of this research, was an activity in which the graduate students engaged by acting as an advisor, helping teachers reflect on their teaching, and setting appropriate goals for professional learning. Mentors ask questions and give advice and suggestions. Mentors observe, gather data, give useful feedback, and support their teaching professionals. Specifically, in Educational Supervisory Practices II, students were required to complete two mentoring assignments. Each mentoring assignment was comprised of a pre-observation of 30 minutes, an hour observation, a post observation of 30 minutes, a professional write-up of 1.5 hours, developing a professional development plan of 1.5 hours, and 30 minutes of reflection. Thus, each mentoring assignment equated to 5.5 hours, and the two assignments totaled 11 hours (5.5 x 2).

Doctoral dissertation titles for the years 1992-2012 were identified by reviewing commencement programs and College of Education graduate/doctoral dissertation listings to determine the target audience. Of the 370 dissertations, 341 were focused on research topics in education. K-12 educational leadership represented 251 (74%) and higher education accounted for 90 (26%). Although 14 graduates who completed the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey (Appendix B) indicated having earned a doctoral degree, only five shared their response to Item 7 as to the approximate number of hours it took to complete their dissertation. Of the five who responded, three reported a numerical response of 300 hours, and a decision was made to use 300 hours as the mean hours required to complete a dissertation. The mean hours were then multiplied by the target research university's program evaluation and educational research group rate which has been determined based on the scope of work needed. The researcher used the basic rate of hourly salary for a College of Education School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership Assistant Professor plus 40% fringe based on 2012-2013 Faculty Salaries by Department and Rank chart (Appendix C) to arrive at the total value of completed dissertations.

Research Question 2

How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size *rankings?*

The data derived from Internet search engines provided information related to graduates' employment positions. The school district websites of the identified graduates

were utilized to match graduates with administrative positions by school district directories and/or Department of Education websites. A column was added to the spreadsheet created to gather data for Research Question 1 that permitted the identification of graduates' administrative appointments. Once the positions of the 1992-2012 educational leadership program graduates were known, the K-12 educational administrative data were analyzed to determine superintendent, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level directors appointed. After the 71 graduates holding these positions were identified, data were obtained from the National Center for Educational Statistics to derive school district student enrollment size rankings for the 2012-2013 school year. These data were included to show the potential number of students who could be impacted by the educational leader.

Research Question 3

How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal in the selected school districts (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size *rankings)?*

Similar to Research Question 2, the graduates' K-12 public school principal or assistant principal administrative appointments were identified through internet searches of school districts' websites, school district directories, school webpages, reputable newspapers, and/or documents from the Departments of Education. A total of 176 principals and 119 assistant principals, regardless of location, were initially identified. Further analysis used data obtained from the listing of building level school administrators employed in CFBSBC schools, of which 142 (81%) were principals and

105 (88%) were assistant principals. The National Center for Educational Statistics data collected provided school district student enrollment size rankings for the 2012-2013 school year for those school districts that are part of the CFPSBC.

Research Question 4

What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?

Of the total graduates, 154 had held principal positions in CFPSBC schools during the 1998-2012 period and received Florida school grades. In the summer of 2014, only 142 were in principal positions. Twelve had been promoted into positions such as superintendent, superintendent's cabinet, and/or school district director. The Florida Department of Education Master School Identification (MSID) Lists were used to obtain additional data. MSID Lists were matched with the target university's graduates to identify 918 Florida School Grades earned when educational leadership graduates were in principal positions within the CFPSBC. Tables were created to depict trends.

Summary

The methods and procedures used to conduct this research study have been detailed in this chapter. The population was described along with the procedures used. To gather data, an electronic survey, 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey (Appendix B), was utilized. Additional data collection and analysis procedures were described for the data collected in this study. The measures used to respond to the four

research questions were also explained. Finally, the researcher explained how the data in this study were disaggregated. Chapter 4 contains the results of the analysis of the data.

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study intended to investigate the economic impact and program performance outcomes of graduates in K-12 public education from the target research university's educational leadership program from 1992-2012. Economic impact was measured by program activities, projects, and research while in the educational leadership program.

The researcher also investigated educational leadership positions obtained by the target university's educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) in K-12 public education. In addition, performance trends based on Florida's School Accountability system, utilizing school grades were identified for graduates who held the principal position in a specific geographical area from 1999 to 2012. The data were disaggregated based on the research questions posed in this study and are analyzed in this chapter.

Population

For the years 1992-2012, there were 1,187 educational leadership graduates identified through the target university's commencement programs. However, there were six semesters of commencement programs missing from the archives (Summer 1996, Summer 1997, Spring 1998, Summer 1998, Fall 1998, and Fall 2000). The target university provided the researcher with a listing of doctoral dissertation titles and graduates from the years 1994-2000 to aid in the identification of students who graduated from the educational leadership program that were unable to be acknowledged due to the

commencement programs not being located. This list of graduates' names, year and semester of graduation, with doctoral dissertation titles was cross-referenced with the commencement programs, and an additional 29 graduates were identified. Of the 1,187 educational leadership master's degree and doctoral degree graduates listed in commencement programs, there were 107 duplicates which were eliminated. The remaining educational leadership commencement program names combined with those found through the university list of graduates with dissertation titles resulted in 1,109 educational leadership graduates to be considered for inclusion in this study.

The researcher investigated the 1,109 educational leadership graduates further to identify the graduates by professional position. This investigation yielded a total of 789 (71%) graduates who, based on the professional position data available, were eligible to participate in the study. Of the 789 graduates who were identified in the summer of 2014, 366 (46.4%) were K-12 education administrators; 108 (13.7%) were higher education administrators; 278 (35.2%) were teachers; and 37 (4.7%) held positions outside education (4.7%).

In the summer of 2014, the 366 graduates located who held administrative positions in K-12 schools at some time from 1992-2012 were categorized by their positions. Of the total graduates, 71 (19.5%) had been promoted into positions such as superintendent, superintendent's cabinet, and/or school district director. A total of 176 (48%) were in principal positions, and 119 (32.5%) were in assistant positions as of the summer of 2014. Table 4 contains data for all 366 K-12 education administrators, the population that was the focus of the study.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of All Graduates in K-12 Positions (N= 366)

Position	n	%
Superintendent	8	2.2
Superintendent's Executive Staff (in Florida)	16	
Superintendent's Executive Staff (not in Florida)	4	
Total	20	5.5
Director (in Florida)	35	
Director (not in Florida)	8	
Total	43	11.8
Principal (in CFPSBC)	142	
Principal (in Florida Public School other than CFPSBC)	8	
Principal (not in Florida or in Private School)	26	
Total	176	48.0
Assistant Principal (in CFPSBC)	105	
Assistant Principal (in Florida Public School other than CFPSBC)	3	
Assistant Principal (not in Florida or in Private School)	11	
Total	119	32.5
Grand Total	366	100.0

Note. Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC)

Descriptive Statistics

The researcher, in collaboration with the large target university's Educational Leadership Program professors, created a survey for this research. The 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey (Appendix B) included items for use beyond this study. The survey contained 34 items. The first three items requested name, contact information, and gender. Item 4 (title of current or last position, if retired or no longer

working) and item 9 (current employer or last employer, if retired or no longer working) were aligned to determine position of graduates. Data were analyzed related to each position and then categorized in direct response to the research questions. Though there were 48 respondents to the survey, only 26 responses were from graduates in K-12 public education administrator positions and these 26 were included in the data disaggregation. Of the 26 participants 2 were members of the superintendent's staff, 3 were directors, 9 were principals, and 12 were assistant principals. The remaining 22 respondents not included consisted of 16 teachers, 3 private school education positions, and 3 in other types of positions.

Research Question 1

What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992 to 2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?

Calculations to Arrive at In-kind Consulting Totals

Identified graduates from 1992-2012 were listed alphabetically, along with semester and graduation year and degree conferred. Once the data were displayed in tabular form, a monetary value was determined to place a value on the educational leadership program activities, projects, and research to identify economic impact. The mean lowest assistant principal salary from the CFPSBC schools was applied. The CFPSBC is a 10-school district coalition consisting of Brevard Public Schools, Hillsborough County Public Schools, Lake County Schools, Manatee County Public Schools, Marion County Public Schools, Orange County Public Schools, School District

of Osceola County, Polk County Public Schools, Seminole County Public Schools, and Volusia County Schools. All public school districts in the CFPSBC require assistant principals to hold a master's degree in Educational Leadership. The 2013 mean of the lowest assistant principal salaries was used, because all the activities listed in the research are associated with the assistant principal position and the economic impact was based on educational leadership graduates' contributions to the school districts, while graduate students. Because graduate students are working towards their master's degree to be eligible for appointment to an educational administrator position, they were considered as entry level administrators, and the lowest available assistant principal mean salary was utilized.

Economic Impact of In-kind Services: Master's Degree Graduates

Activities and projects used in the calculations were defined, in large part, as school based. While in the educational leadership program these were: (a) volunteering both in schools and the community, (b) mentoring, and (c) administrative field experiences and internships. The economic impact for these activities was calculated for graduates who earned a master's degree using the CFPSBC lowest hourly salary mean of the assistant principal.

The yearly mean of the lowest assistant principal salary was $59,212. This yearly mean salary was divided by 228, the mean number of days worked annually by CFPSBC assistant principals. This resulted in a mean daily assistant principal salary of $260. The

daily rate was further divided by eight to represent an hourly rate per day of $32.50, although assistant principals are not hourly employees.

Of the 1,109 educational leadership program graduates for 1992-2012, 690 earned master's degrees. Volunteer services, donations of time without being paid, occur in schools and school communities. Some of the courses in the educational leadership program at the target large urban university required eight hours of volunteer services to be completed as part of typical course assignments. Two such courses were Educational Supervisory Practices I and Educational Leadership. Volunteer time in this study was equated to economic impact using the mean daily rate from the lowest mean assistant principal salary calculated previously ($32.50) multiplied by eight hours of volunteer time for each of the 690 graduate students. The total economic impact of volunteer services of the 690 master's degree graduates from 1992-2012 was $179,400.

In core classes such as Educational Supervisory Practices II of the educational leadership program at the target university, students were required to complete two teacher mentoring assignments. Mentoring is an activity in which graduate students act as advisors, providing services such as observing, helping teachers reflect on their teaching, and setting appropriate goals for professional learning. Mentors ask questions and give advice and suggestions. Mentors observe, gather data, give useful feedback, and support other teaching professionals. Each mentoring assignment was comprised of a pre-observation of 30 minutes, an hour observation, a post observation of 30 minutes, a professional write-up of 1.5 hours, developing a professional development plan of 1.5 hours, and 30 minutes of reflection. Each mentoring assignment was equated to 5.5

hours resulting in a total of 11 hours for the two mentoring assignments. The mean hours (11) were multiplied by the hourly rate ($32.50) for the 690 master's degree program graduates, resulting in an in-kind economic impact dollar amount of $246,675 for mentoring.

Master's Degree candidates were required to complete administrative internships of 200 pre-internship administrative hours and 180 administrative internship hours over two semesters. To calculate the economic impact of the 690 graduates, the hourly rate ($32.50) was multiplied by the required number of hours (380) for each of the 690 graduates. This resulted in a total economic impact of $8,521,500 that could be attributed to administrative internships of educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 from the target university.

Summary of Economic Impact of Master's Degree Program Graduates

The activities and projects that were part of the master's degree program at the target university between 1992 and 2012 were assigned a dollar value. The volunteering impact was $179,400, the mentoring impact was $246,675, and the administrative experiences, including the administrative internship, impact was $8,521,500. In total, the resulting financial impact to school districts for these activities (volunteering, mentoring, and administrative internships) was $8,947,575.

Economic Impact of Dissertations: Doctoral Degree Program Graduates

The 1,109 graduates from the target university consisted of 370 doctoral students who researched and completed dissertations between 1992 and 2012 as identified by commencement programs and college graduate and doctoral dissertation listings. Of the 370 dissertations, 341 were focused on research topics in education. K-12 educational leadership represented 251 (74%) and higher education accounted for 90 (26%). Those titles that pertained to K-12 education were counted (251), and that number of dissertations was multiplied by the mean from the response on the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey (Appendix B) of approximately how many hours it took to complete the dissertation (300).

Based on the target university's 2012-2013 nine-month faculty salaries by department, the mean annual salary for an assistant professor in the College of Education School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership based on 2012-2013 Faculty Salaries by Department and Rank chart (Appendix C) was $54,830. According to the target research university's Program Evaluation and Educational Research (n.d.) Group's "direct labor charges are based on actual salaries and fringe benefits for the staff members and consultants" (para. 1). Utilizing the mean annual salary of $54,830, the researcher divided by 9 to arrive at the monthly mean ($6,092), divided by 20 to determine a daily mean ($304.61), and finally divided by eight to establish an hourly mean assistant professor salary of $38.08. An additional 40% of the salary ($15.23) was added to the hourly salary to account for fringe benefits, for a total of $53.31. The total economic impact of dissertation research for the K-12 education doctoral graduates was calculated

by multiplying the evaluation rate, salary plus fringe, ($53.31) by the mean hours to complete a dissertation (300) resulting in approximately $15,993 per dissertation. This total was then multiplied by the number of applicable dissertations (251) resulting in a total value of in-kind research consulting services through dissertations of $4,014,243.

Overall Economic Impact of In-kind Services: Master's and Doctoral Degree Graduates

The value of in-kind services was calculated for educational leadership master's degree and doctoral degree graduates between 1992 and 2012. In total, the resulting financial impact on school districts of activities and projects that were part of the educational leadership master's degree program at the target university included volunteering ($179,400), mentoring ($246,675), and administrative experiences including internships ($8,521,500), resulting in a total of $8,947,575. The economic impact of research conducted to complete dissertations focused on K-12 educational leadership by doctoral graduates of the educational leadership program between 1992 and 2012 was $4,014,243. As shown in Table 5, the grand total value of the economic impact of program activities, projects, and research performed as in-kind consulting for K-12 education by educational leadership graduates from 1992-2012 was $12,712,575.

Table 5

Overall Economic Impact of In-kind Services: Master's and Doctoral Degree Graduates

Services	Value in Dollars
Master's Degree	
Volunteering	179,400
Mentoring	246,675
Administrative Internship	8,521,500
Total	8,947,575
Doctoral Degree	
Dissertations	4,014,243
Total	12,961,768

Research Question 2

How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size *rankings)?*

Data to respond to this question were collected with the assistance of Internet search engines. Once a possible affiliation between the graduate's name and possible position was made, further searches were conducted through school districts' websites, reputable newspapers, and/or documents from the Florida Department of Education. The spreadsheet used in analyzing the data to respond to Research Question 1 was expanded to permit the classification and calculation of graduates' K-12 administrative appointments that were found in the summer of 2014. Once the positions were known, the data for K-12 administrators were further analyzed using 2012-2013 data obtained from the National Center for Educational Statistics to arrive at school district student

enrollment size rankings out of 67 school districts in the state of Florida, and the largest 500 school districts throughout the United States.

School District Level Educational Leadership Positions of Program Graduates

A total of 71 educational leadership graduates from 1992-2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions were identified in the summer of 2014. Of the 71, educational leadership program graduates of the target institution filled 56 positions in the state of Florida and 15 out of the state of Florida positions. Table 6 displays these data.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics: School District Level Educational Leadership Positions 2012-2013 (N = 71)

Position	n	%
Florida		
Superintendent	5	8.9
Superintendent's Executive Cabinet/Staff	16	28.6
Director	35	62.5
Total	56	100.0
Out-of-Florida		
Superintendent	3	20.0
Superintendent's Executive Cabinet/Staff	4	26.7
Director	8	53.3
Total	15	100.0
Total Florida and Out-of-Florida	71	100.0

Superintendent Positions

As shown in Table 6, as of the 2012-2013 school year there were eight superintendents identified as graduates of the target university's educational leadership program. Five superintendents were located in Florida as having been superintendent sometime between 1992-2012 in the following school districts: School District of DeSoto County (1), elected; St. Johns County School District (1), appointed; Lake County Schools (1) appointed; and Orange County Public Schools (2), appointed.

Three program graduates held superintendent positions out of state. They served as superintendents in school districts in New Jersey, Georgia, and North Carolina.

Superintendent Positions: U. S. and Florida School District Size Ranks

Superintendents in Florida

The National Center for Educational Statistics was utilized to determine the school district size ranking based on student enrollment for the 2012-2013 school year data. One graduate from the educational leadership program between 1992 and 2012 was superintendent by 2014 in the School District of DeSoto County. The School District of DeSoto County enrolled the least number of students in Florida where a graduate became superintendent with 4,730 students. Although the low student enrollment made the U.S. size ranking undeterminable, the Florida size ranking was 51st largest of 67 school districts based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools.

St. Johns Public School District had a student enrollment of 32,447 in 2012-2013, resulting in a ranking of 25th largest of the 67 Florida school districts and 242nd largest out of 500 in the U.S. based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools. One graduate from the target university's educational leadership program (1992-2012) was superintendent as of 2014 in St. Johns Public School District.

A graduate from the educational leadership program from 1992 to 2012 was identified in the summer of 2014 of being superintendent in Lake County Schools. Lake County Schools had a student enrollment of 41,495 in 2012-2013. This school district's size based on student enrollment was ranked 19th largest of 67 in Florida and 131st largest of 500 in the U.S. based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools.

Orange County Public Schools was the school district that employed two graduates: the superintendent at the time of this study in the summer of 2014 and a previous superintendent both graduated from the target university. Orange County Public Schools was the fourth largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida based on student enrollment and ranked 12th largest out of 500 in the U.S. with a student enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year of 183,066.

Superintendents Out-of-Florida

One graduate from the educational leadership program between 1992 and 2012 was superintendent by 2014 in the Pineland Regional School District, New Jersey. Pineland Regional School District serves approximately 1,750 students. Due to the low student enrollment, the researcher was unable to determine the U.S. size ranking out of

500 school districts based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

The City Schools of Decatur, Georgia, is a school district that served approximately 4,300 students in Decatur, Georgia, within DeKalb County in metropolitan Atlanta. Due to the low student enrollment, the researcher was unable to determine the U.S. school district size ranking out of 500 school districts based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year. One graduate from the target university's educational leadership program (1992-2012) was superintendent as of 2014 in the City Schools of Decatur.

A graduate from the educational leadership program from 1992 to 2012 was identified in the summer of 2014 of being superintendent in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, North Carolina. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools had a student enrollment of 137,913 and was ranked 18th largest in school district size in the United States out of 500 in the 2012-2013 school year based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools.

Table 7 contains detailed information for the superintendents that includes the school district, state, student enrollment, and U.S. size ranking as of 2012-2013.

Table 7

2012-2013 Superintendents' School Districts by State, Student Enrollment, and U.S. Ranking (N = 8)

School District	State	Student Enrollment	U.S. Ranking
The School District of DeSoto County	Florida	4,730	Not available
City Schools of Decatur	Georgia	4,300	Not available
Lake County Schools	Florida	41,495	131
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools	North Carolina	137,913	18
Pinelands Regional School District	New Jersey	1,750	Not available
Orange County Public Schools	Florida	183,066	12
Orange County Public Schools	Florida	183,066	12
St. Johns County School District	Florida	32,477	242

Note. U.S. ranking based on largest student enrollment size of the top 500 largest school districts.

Senior Staff and Superintendent's Cabinet Positions by School District

Based on data retrieved in the summer of 2014, a total of 20 graduates from the target university were in senior staff or superintendent's cabinet positions at some time from 1992 to 2012. Included in the school district's senior staff or cabinet level positions were the following: area superintendents (9), associate superintendents (3), deputy superintendents (3), assistant superintendents (2), area assistant superintendents (1), chief of staff (1), and chief academic officer (1), as shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Superintendents' Staff Positions by School District as of 2012-2013 (N = 20)

School District	Position
Florida	
Brevard Public Schools	Area Superintendent (2)
Brevard Public Schools	Assistant Superintendent
Lee County School District	Assistant Superintendent Operations
Orange County Public Schools	Associate Superintendent School Choice
Orange County Public Schools	Area Superintendent (4)
Orange County Public Schools	Chief of Staff
Orange County Public Schools	Deputy Superintendent
Orange County Public Schools	Associate Superintendent Curriculum & Instruction
Polk County Public Schools	Area Assistant Superintendent
St. Lucie Public Schools	Deputy Superintendent
Volusia County Schools	Area Superintendent
Volusia County Schools	Deputy Superintendent
Out-of-Florida	
Georgia	Area Superintendent (2)
Georgia	Associate Superintendent Special Student Services
California	Chief Academic Officer

Senior Staff and Superintendent's Cabinet Positions in Florida

There were 16 graduates from the target university educational leadership program (199-2012) who occupied senior staff or superintendent's cabinet positions in Florida as of 2014. Eight of these graduates (50%) served as superintendent staff members in Orange County Public Schools (OCPS), the fourth largest school district in the state of Florida of 67 based on student enrollment. OCPS ranked 12th largest out of 500 school districts in size in the U.S. with a student enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year of 183,066.

Three superintendent staff members (18.8%) who graduated from the educational leadership program (1992-2012) were located in Brevard Public Schools, Florida in the summer of 2014. Brevard Public Schools is the 10th largest school district in Florida and ranked 44th largest in the United States out of 500 school districts based on student enrollment. Its K-12 public school student enrollment was 71,288 in the 2012-2013 school year.

Volusia County Schools had two (6.3%) target university graduates (1992-2012) in senior staff/superintendent's cabinet positions in the summer of 2014. Volusia County Schools, with an enrollment of 61,064 in 2012-2013, was the 13th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida and was ranked 56th largest out of 500 school districts in size in the U.S. based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools.

One superintendent cabinet member (6.3%) who graduated from the educational leadership program (1992-2012) was employed by The School District of Lee County by the summer of 2014. Based on student enrollment, the School District of Lee County is the ninth-largest school district in Florida out of 67 and 41st largest school district in the United States out of 500 with a student enrollment of approximately 85,000 in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

Polk County Public Schools had one Area Assistant Superintendent (6.3%) identified in the summer of 2014 who graduated from the target university educational leadership program during the 1992-2012 time period. Polk County Public Schools is the eighth largest school district out of 67 based on student enrollment in the state of Florida

and was ranked 30th largest out of 500 in the U.S. with a student enrollment of 96,937 in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

One graduate (6.3%) from the target university (1992-2012) held the position of Deputy Superintendent with St. Lucie Public Schools by the summer of 2014. St. Lucie Public Schools has a student enrollment of approximately 39,500, ranking it the 21st largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida with a U.S. ranking of 139th out of 500 school districts based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

Table 9 reflects the school district student population for the target university's graduates (N=16) who occupied senior staff or superintendent's cabinet positions in Florida. The table also contains Florida and U.S. student enrollment size rankings for the 16 senior staff or superintendent's cabinet held by graduates of the target institution in Florida in order of largest to smallest number of educational leadership graduates who held the position.

Table 9

Superintendents' Staff by Florida School District, Based on 2012-2013 Student Enrollment and Size Rankings (N = 16)

School District	n	%	Student Enrollment	Florida Ranking	U.S. Ranking
Orange County Public Schools	8	50	183,066	4	12
Brevard Public Schools	3	18.8	71,288	10	44
Volusia County Schools	2	12.5	61,064	13	56
The School District of Lee County	1	6.3	85,000	9	41
Polk County Public Schools	1	6.3	96,937	8	30
St. Lucie Public Schools	1	6.3	39,500	21	139
Total	16	100.0			

Note. Out-of-state positions (4) were not included in the data analysis. Size rankings are based on largest student enrollment out of 67 school districts in the state of Florida, and the largest student enrollment out of the largest 500 school districts throughout the United States.

School District Level Director or Staff Positions: U.S. and Florida School District Size Rankings

A total of 43 graduates of the target university's educational leadership programs between 1992 and 2012 were located and found to have been appointed to positions as school district level directors or staff by the summer of 2014. Eight of the graduates who were directors were not employed in a public school in Florida. Rather, they were practicing in private school settings. There are 35 graduates who were school district level directors employed in public school districts in Florida.

A total of 17 (49%) educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) from the target university held school district staff level positions in the Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) by the summer of 2014. Based on student enrollment, OCPS was the fourth largest school district in the state of Florida out of 67 and 12th largest in the U.S. out of

500 with a student enrollment of 183,066 in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

Four (11.4%) educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) from the target university were employed at the school district level in the Seminole County Public Schools by the summer of 2014. Seminole County Public Schools was the 12th largest school district in the state of Florida out of 67 and 55th largest in the U.S. out of 500 school districts based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools. The student enrollment of Seminole County Public Schools in 2012-2013 was 64,463.

Three (8.6%) educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) from the target university served as school district level directors in Brevard Public Schools by the summer of 2014. Brevard Public Schools was the 10th largest school district out of 67 in Florida and ranked 44th largest school district out of 500 in the United States based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools. Its student enrollment was 71, 288 in the 2012-2013 school year.

Three (8.6%) educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) from the target university were school district level staffers in the School District of Osceola County by the summer of 2014. The School District of Osceola County was the 14th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida with a student enrollment of 56,411 in 2012-2013 and ranked 82nd largest out of 500 in the U.S. based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools

Two (5.7%) educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) from the target university held school district staff level positions by the summer of 2014 in the Flagler

County Public Schools with a student enrollment of 13,000, size ranking 34th largest out of 67 school districts in the state of Florida based on student enrollment. They were not, however, included in the top largest 500 school districts in U.S. rankings based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

Two (5.7%) educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) from the target university held director positions by the summer of 2014 in Volusia County Schools, the 13th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida based on student enrollment. Volusia County Schools enrolled 61,064 students in 2012-2013 and ranked 56th largest out of 500 in size in the U.S. in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

One (2.9%) educational leadership graduate (1992-2012) from the target university was employed as a school district staff member in Citrus County Schools by the summer of 2014. With a student enrollment of 15,300, Citrus County Schools was ranked 495th largest out of 500 school districts in the United States and 33rd largest of the 67 school districts in the state of Florida based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

One (2.9%) educational leadership graduate (1992-2012) from the target university was employed by the summer of 2014 in the Collier County Public Schools which had a student enrollment of 46,165 students in 2012-2013. In terms of student enrollment, it was ranked 112th largest of 500 school districts in the U.S. and 15th largest of 67 school districts in the state of Florida based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

One (2.9%) of the educational leadership graduates (1992-2012) from the target university was employed in Lake County Schools by the summer of 2014. Lake County Schools was the 19th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida with a student enrollment in 2012-2013 of 41,495. It was ranked the 131st largest school district in the United States based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools.

One (2.9%) of the educational leadership graduate (1992-2012) from the target university was a school district level staff member in the Marion County Public Schools by the summer of 2014. Marion County Public Schools was a school district slightly larger than Lake County Schools in 2012-2013, with 41,990 students. Its student enrollment size ranking was 17th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida and 115th largest school district out of 500 in the U.S. rankings based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools.

Table 10 presents descriptive data for the 35 graduates who were school district level directors employed in public school districts in Florida. Data are displayed in order of largest to smallest number of educational leadership graduates who held a director or staff position in the school district.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for School District Level Directors by Florida School District Based on 2012-2013 Student Enrollment and Size Rankings (N = 35)

School District	n	%	Student Enrollment	Florida Ranking	U.S. Ranking
Orange County Public Schools	17	49.0	183,066	4	12
Seminole County Public Schools	4	11.4	64,463	12	55
Brevard Public Schools	3	8.6	71,288	10	44
School District of Osceola County	3	8.6	56,411	14	82
Flagler County Public Schools	2	5.7	13,000	34	Not available
Volusia County Schools	2	5.7	61,064	13	56
Citrus County Schools	1	2.9	15,300	33	495
Collier County Public Schools	1	2.9	46,165	15	112
Lake County Schools	1	2.9	41,495	19	131
Marion County Public Schools	1	2.9	41,990	17	115
Total	35	100.0			

Note. Out-of-state positions (8) were not included in the data analysis. Size rankings are based on largest student enrollment of 67 school districts in the state of Florida, and the largest student enrollment of the largest 500 school districts throughout the United States.

Research Question 3

How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal in the selected school districts (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size *rankings)?*

Once the educational leadership graduates' administrative appointments were identified in the summer of 2014, the principal or assistant principal K-12 data were analyzed. In addition, the data obtained from the National Center for Educational Statistics to arrive at the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size rankings were applied to 1992-2012 educational leadership graduates employed in the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC).

Principal and Assistant Principal Positions

A total of 176 educational leadership program graduates of the targeted university between 1992 and 2012 had been appointed to positions as principals, and 119 graduates had been appointed to assistant principal positions for a total of 295 graduates being appointed to building level administrative positions by the summer of 2014. Of the 176 principals and 119 assistant principals located, 48 did not work in schools in the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) and were excluded from the data analysis. It was the remaining 142 principals and 105 assistant principals who did work in the Coalition for whom data were analyzed all the data are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for Principal (N=176) and Assistant Principal Positions (N=119)

Position	n	%
Principals		
CFPSBC	142	80.7
Florida public schools (not in CFPSBC)	8	4.5
Out-of-Florida and private schools	26	14.8
Total	176	100.0
Assistant Principals		
CFPSBC	105	88.2
Florida public schools (not in CFPSBC)	3	2.5
Out-of-Florida and private schools	11	9.2
Total	119	100.0

Note. Only Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) data were used in the analysis.

Principal Positions: U. S. and Florida School District Size Rankings

By the summer of 2014, Orange County Public Schools had the most (69 or 48.6%) of the 142 principals who graduated from the educational leadership program at the target institution (1992-2012). Orange County Public Schools was the fourth largest school district in the state of Florida out of 67 and ranked 12th largest school district out of 500 based on student enrollment in the U.S. with a 2012-2013 student enrollment of 183,066 in K-12 public schools.

The second highest number of principals (28 or 19.7%) in the summer of 2014 who graduated from the educational leadership program between 1992 and 2012 were found in Seminole County Public Schools, the 12th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida and a U.S. size rank of 55th largest out of 500 school districts based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools. The student enrollment of Seminole County Public Schools in 2012-2013 was 64,463.

A total of 18 (12.7%) graduates from 1992-2012 had been appointed to principalships in Brevard Public Schools as of the summer of 2014. Brevard Public Schools was the 10th largest school district out of 67 in Florida and 44th largest school district out of 500 in the United States based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools with a student enrollment of 71,288 in the 2012-2013 school year.

Volusia County Schools had 12 (8.5%) principals who graduated from the educational leadership program between 1992-2012 appointed to principal positions by the summer of 2014. Based on student enrollment, Volusia County Schools was the 13th

largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida and was ranked the 56th largest school district out of 500 with a student enrollment in 2012-2013 of 61,064.

Eight graduates (5.6%) from the educational leadership program (1992-2012) became principals in the School District of Osceola County by the summer of 2014. The School District of Osceola County was the 14th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida and a U.S. size rank of 82nd largest school district out of 500 based on student enrollment. The student enrollment for the 2012-2013 school year was 56,411.

Five principals (3.5%) who graduated from the educational leadership program (1992-2012) were employed in the Lake County Schools by the summer of 2014. Lake County Schools, the 19th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida had a student enrollment in 2012-2013 of 41,495 and a U.S. size ranking of 131st out of 500 based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools.

One graduate (0.7%) from the educational leadership program (1992-2012) was a principal in the Marion County Public Schools by the summer of 2014. Marion County Public Schools had 41,990 students enrolled in 2012-2013. It ranked, by size, 17th largest in the state of Florida out of 67 school districts and 115th largest in the U.S. out of 500 school districts based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

One graduate (0.7%) served as a principal in the Polk County Public Schools, the eighth largest school district in the state of Florida out of 67, holding a U.S. size ranking of 30th largest school district out of 500 based on student enrollment. The total student

enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year was 96,937. These data are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for CFPSBC Principals by School District, Based on 2012-2013 Student Enrollment, and size Rankings (N = 142)

School District	n	%	Student Enrollment	Florida Ranking	U.S. Ranking
Brevard Public Schools	18	12.7	71,288	10	44
Volusia County Schools	12	8.5	61,064	13	56
School District of Osceola County	8	5.6	56,411	14	82
Lake County Schools	5	3.5	41,495	19	131
Marion County Public Schools	1	0.7	41,990	17	115
Polk County Public Schools	1	0.7	96,937	8	30
Orange County Public Schools	69	48.6	183,066	4	12
Total	142	100.0			
Florida Public Schools[a]	8				
Out of Florida or Private[a]	26				

Note. Size rankings are based on largest student enrollment out of 67 school districts in the state of Florida, and the largest student enrollment out of the largest 500 school districts throughout the United States.
[a]Only Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) data were used in the analysis.

Assistant Principal Positions: U.S. and Florida School District Size Rankings

A total of 119 graduates from the target university's educational leadership program (1992-2012) were identified as assistant principals as of the summer of 2014. A total of 14 of the assistant principals were not assigned to schools within the CFPSBC and were not included in the data analysis other than to note that three assistant principals

were employed in other Florida school districts and 11 assistant principals held positions out of the state of Florida or in private schools. The remaining 105 assistant principals represented seven different school districts in the CFPSBC.

Once again, Orange County Public Schools had the highest number (52 or 49.5%) of graduates (1992-2012) from the target university's educational leadership program in the assistant principal category by the summer of 2014. Based on student enrollment Orange County Public Schools was the fourth largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida and ranked the 12th largest school district size out of 500 in the U.S. with a student enrollment of 183,066 in K-12 public schools for the 2012-2013 school year.

A total of 29 (27.6%) graduates (1992-2012) from the target university's educational leadership program were identified as assistant principals in Seminole County Public Schools by the summer of 2014. Seminole County Public Schools was the 12th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida with a U.S. size ranking of 55th out of 500 largest school districts based on student enrollment. The student enrollment of Seminole County Public Schools in 2012-2013 was 64,463.

Eleven (10.5%) graduates (1992-2012) from the target university's educational leadership program were assistant principals that worked in Brevard Public Schools by the summer of 2014. Brevard Public Schools was the 10th largest school district in Florida out of 67 and had a U.S. size ranking of 44th largest school district out of 500 based on total student enrollment in K-12 public schools during the 2012-2013 school year. Its student enrollment was 71, 288 in the 2012-2013 school year.

Volusia County Schools had six (5.7%) assistant principals identified in the summer of 2014 who graduated from the target institution in educational leadership during the years 1992-2012. Based on student enrollment, it was the 13th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida and held a U.S. size rank of 56th largest out of 500 with a student enrollment in 2012-2013 of 61,064.

Four (3.8%) assistant principals worked in the Lake County Schools, the 18th largest school district in the state of Florida, ranked 116 in the U.S. based on student enrollment. It had a student enrollment of 41,495 during the 2012-2013 school year.

Two (1.9%) assistant principals who had graduated from the educational leadership program at the target institution from 1992-2012 were identified in the School District of Osceola County by the summer of 2014. The School District of Osceola County was the 14th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida with a U.S. ranking of 82nd largest school district out of 500 based on student enrollment. The school district had a student enrollment of 56,411 during the 2012-2013 school year.

One (0.9%) graduate (1992-2012) from the educational leadership program was an assistant principal in the Polk County Public Schools by the summer of 2014. Polk County Public Schools was the 8th largest school district out of 67 in the state of Florida based on student enrollment. It was ranked 30th largest school district out of 500 in the U.S. with a student enrollment of 96,937. These data are reflected in Table 13.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for CFPSBC Assistant Principals by School District, Based on 2012-2013 Student Enrollment, and Size Rankings (N = 105)

School District	n	%	Student Enrollment	Florida Ranking	U.S. Ranking
Orange County Public Schools	52	49.5	183,066	4	12
Seminole County Public Schools	29	27.6	64,463	12	55
Brevard Public Schools	11	10.5	71,288	10	44
Volusia County Schools	6	5.7	61,064	13	56
Lake County Schools	4	3.8	41,495	19	131
School District of Osceola County	2	1.9	56,411	14	82
Polk County Public Schools	1	0.9	96,937	8	30
Total	105	100.0			
Florida Public Schools[a]	3				
Out of Florida or/Private[a]	11				

Note. Size rankings are based on largest student enrollment out of 67 school districts in the state of Florida, and the largest student enrollment out of the largest 500 school districts throughout the United States.
[a]Only Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) data were used in the analysis.

Research Question 4

What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?

The Florida Department of Education Master School Identification (MSID) Lists beginning with school year 1998-1999 through 2011-2012 were used to gather data to respond to Research Question 4. MSID Lists were matched with the target university's 1992-2012 educational leadership program graduates to identify Florida School Grade trends through the Florida A+ Accountability Plan. Data were analyzed for the

educational leadership program graduates who were principals in the CFPSBC school districts and whose schools received school grades.

Although 142 principals were identified in the CFPSBC to respond to Research Question 3, the number was larger when analyzing the 14 years of school grades. A total of 154 graduates were identified who were or had been principals during the 14-year period. The discrepancy can be accounted for due to a number of principals were promoted into positions such as superintendent, superintendent's cabinet, and/or school district director and/or retired.

The 154 principals generated 918 grades over the 14 years of grades. Of the 918 grades, 492 (53.6%) were grades of A, 191 (20.8%) were grades of B, 182 (19.8%) were grades of C, 43 (4.7%) were grades of D, and 10 (1.1%) were grades of F. The resulting analysis is displayed in Table 14. In sum, 74.4% of the schools to which the target university's graduates were assigned as principals earned grades of 'A' or 'B' as compared to 64% statewide. Similarly, 94.2% of the schools earned grades of 'A', 'B', or 'C' over the 14-year period, as compared to 90% statewide.

K-12 public schools in the CFPSBC accounted for 492 'A' grades from the Florida A+ Accountability Plan. In addition, when reviewing the criteria for schools that receive monetary incentives there were 51 schools in the CFPSBC that improved at least one letter grade. These data are reflected in Table 14.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics of School Grades: CFPSBC *1998-1999 through 2011-2012* (N=918)

	School Grades					
School Year	A n (%)	B n (%)	C n (%)	D n (%)	F n (%)	Totals by Year n (%)
1998-1999	2 (5)	7 (18)	20 (51)	7 (18)	3 (8)	39 (100)
1999-2000	5 (14)	5 (14)	19 (53)	7 (19)	0 (0)	36 (100)
2000-2001	5 (12)	11 (26)	20 (47)	7 (16)	0 (0)	43 (100)
2001-2002	16 (35)	13 (28)	13 (28)	2 (4)	2 (4)	46 (100)
2002-2003	25 (57)	10 (23)	8 (18)	1 (2)	0 (0)	44 (100)
2003-2004	29 (52)	13 (23)	9 (16)	4 (7)	1 (2)	56 (100)
2004-2005	34 (53)	15 (23)	15 (23)	0 (0)	0 (0)	64 (100)
2005-2006	46 (63)	13 (18)	13 (18)	1 (1)	0 (0)	73 (100)
2006-2007	50 (62)	13 (16)	15 (19)	2 (3)	1 (1)	81 (100)
2007-2008	54 (64)	17 (20)	12 (14)	1 (1)	0 (0)	84 (100)
2008-2009	64 (77)	12 (15)	5 (6)	2 (2)	0 (0)	83 (100)
2009-2010	58 (67)	21 (24)	8 (9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	87 (100)
2010-2011	57 (66)	14 (16)	13 (15)	3 (3)	0 (0)	87 (100)
2011-2012	47 (50)	27 (28)	12 (13)	6 (6)	3 (3)	95 (100)
Totals	492 (53.6)	191 (20.8)	182 (19.8)	43 (4.7)	10 (1.1)	918 (100)

Note. Some figures may not total 100% due to rounding

Summary

Descriptive statistics for the study population and for each question were discussed within the context of Chapter 4 along with interpretation of the results that were conducted for the study. According to the descriptive statistics reported, 789 (71.2%) of the 1,109 educational leadership program graduates from the target university were located. Of the 789 graduates, 366 (46.38 %) in the population were in assistant

principal, principal, school district director, superintendent's staff or superintendent positions and were included in the research for the study.

The intention of Research Question 1 was to examine the economic impact that students in the graduate Educational Leadership Program at the target university provides to surrounding school districts. Research Question 2 considered the number of graduates in the Educational Leadership Program who obtained positions in a K-12 public school system at the school district level. These positions were considered to be at the highest levels in the hierarchy of school district organizations. The descriptive data analysis revealed that of the 366 graduates in positions for this study, 71, or 19.4% were identified.

Research Question 3 required analyzing the data to determine the remaining 295 graduates (80.6%) who were appointed to principal or assistant principal positions and their school district location. Again, descriptive statistics were used, and the researcher found that 247 (83.73%) of these graduates were located in schools that comprised the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition.

Examination of Research Question 4 required identifying graduates of the educational leadership program of the target university and determining if they were in principal positions at any time over a 14-year period. The question under study referred to performance trends of the schools of graduates of the target university's educational leadership program and the determination of whether schools in which graduates held principalships had earned grades of A, B, and/or C grades over D and/or F grades.

CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The Florida State Board of Education has recognized the link between having well prepared school leaders and effective schools (Florida Principal Leadership Standards, 2011). The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of graduates from a target university's educational leadership programs and add to the body of knowledge on promoting higher education programs. The desired outcome of the study was to provide information for K-20 stakeholders, including college professors and administrators regarding providing high-quality programs for educational leaders and their role and impact on student achievement in public school education.

This study addressed the problem of insufficient information concerning the impact of a target university's economic contributions while graduate students are enrolled in the Educational Leadership program and when they are appointed to administrative positions. This study played a role in filling a gap in the research related specifically to the impact of graduate preparation programs and performance trends based on Florida's School Accountability system, utilizing school grades.

The research was conducted by examining the educational leadership program graduates from the target university for the years 1992-2012. A sample of 789 out of the population of 1,109 (71.15%) was used to determine graduates' impact for each research question based on the variable being studied. This study included four research questions:

1. What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992 to 2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?
2. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment rankings)?
3. How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal positions in the selected school districts (using the 2012-2013 enrollment size rankings)?
4. What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?

Summary of Results

The findings of this study centered on whether the researcher was able to determine for each research question an amount of professional and economic impact of the educational leadership graduates from a target university. The indicators based on descriptive statistics were reported for economic benefit as a graduate student, professional impact based on position in K-12 public education, and performance trends established by school grades in Florida's School Accountability system.

Research Question 1

What is the economic impact of activities, projects, and research performed by 1992 to 2012 graduates while enrolled in the educational leadership program?

The lowest assistant principal salaries for the school districts in the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC) were reviewed and the mean salary was equal to $70,429 for the 690 students who earned master's degrees between 1992 and 2012 from the target university. Volunteer services calculated at eight hours for each master's degree student generated $179,400. Mentoring, calculated at 11 hours per master's degree student yielded $246,675. Administrative experiences, including internships, calculated over 380 hours generated $8,521,500. The total economic impact generated from in-kind services from students who earned master's degrees between 1992 and 2012 was total of $8,947,575. Doctoral students' dissertation writing added another $4,014,243 in economic impact from educational leadership graduates. As shown in Table 15, the combined total of research consulting services generated for school districts from educational leadership graduate students 1992-2012 was $12,961,768.

Table 15

Overall Economic Impact of In-kind Services: Master's and Doctoral Degree Graduates

Services	Value in Dollars
Master's Degree	
Volunteering	179,400
Mentoring	246,675
Administrative Internship	8,521,500
Total	8,947,575
Doctoral Degree	
Dissertations	4,014,243
Total	12,961,768

Research Question 2

How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed or elected to superintendent positions, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or school district level director positions (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size *rankings)?*

The findings resulting from Research Question 2 identified graduate administrative appointments in superintendent, senior staff or superintendent's cabinet, or public school district director positions. Once the positions were known, the K-12 data were analyzed along with the data obtained from the National Center for Educational Statistics to get school district student enrollments and rankings. A total of 71 of the 366 graduates between 1992 and 2012 from the target university's educational leadership program selected for data analysis were appointed to varying administrative positions. Eight were identified as superintendents, 20 graduates were in senior

staff/superintendent's cabinet positions, and 43 were located and the research showed they were employed as school district level directors.

The 71 positions disaggregate to 56 appointments in the state of Florida and 15 out of the state of Florida and/or private organizations. School district size rankings based on student enrollment in the state of Florida ranged from 4th to 51st largest out of 67. The range of U.S. rankings could only be identified for school districts in the top 500 largest student enrollment in K-12 public schools in the United States. The range for those rankings was 12th to 495th.

Research Question 3

How many educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012 were appointed to principal or assistant principal positions in the selected school districts (using the 2012-2013 school district student enrollment size *rankings)?*

Research Question 3 required the classification of graduates based on appointments to principal and/or assistant principal positions. The National Center for Educational Statistics database was utilized for student enrollment size rankings of identified school districts, and the K-12 data were analyzed for the 10 school districts that were part of the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC). The CFPSBC consists of Brevard Public Schools, Hillsborough County Public Schools, Lake County Schools, Manatee County Public Schools, Marion County Public Schools, Orange County Public Schools, School District of Osceola County, Polk County Public Schools, Seminole County Public Schools, and Volusia County Schools.

A total of 295 (80.6%) of the 366 graduates from the target university's educational leadership program between 1992 and 2012 were appointed to principal/assistant principal positions in CFBSBC schools by the summer of 2014. Of the 295 appointed, 176 were identified as principals and 119 were employed as assistant principals.

Of the 295 building level appointments, 248 (83.7%) were in CFPSBC school districts in Florida, and 37 were to out of the state of Florida and/or private schools. The positions held by graduates in the CFBSBC school districts were in schools of varying school size (ranging from 4th to 19th largest out of 67 in Florida and 12th to 131st largest out of 500 in the U.S.).

Research Question 4

What are the Florida School Grade trends among educational leadership program graduates from 1992 to 2012l of a large urban research university in Florida who were school principals?

The findings resulting from the data analysis to respond to Research Question 4 revealed that educational leadership program graduates from the target university who obtained principal positions in the CFPSBC of school districts maintained grades of A, B, or C. The 1998-1999 school year had the highest percentage of schools with grades of D and/or F at 25%. The following year, the percentage dropped to 19, and in 2000-2001 the percentage of D and/or F grades declined further to 16%. Each year thereafter, for the remaining years included in this research, the school grades of D and/or F were always under 10%.

Explaining this from a positive perspective, over 90% of school grades received were A, B, or C. Furthermore, since 2002-2003, there were more A grades earned each year than B and C grades combined in the schools in which graduates of the target institution were assigned as principals.

Discussion of the Findings

The findings of this study were consistent with the reviewed research on the link between college degrees and benefits. Investing in higher education may have a plethora of benefits including higher wages, more employment opportunities, better health, social mobility, and increased human capital. With increased human capital, a community can attract a higher quality workforce that in turn will be able to offer quality education for K-12 schools and school districts (Baldwin & McCracken, 2013). Although graduates are enrolled in educational leadership programs at research universities, communities may benefit from the economic impact of projects, activities, and research that are components of these programs. In this study, it was found that the potential impact of $12,961,768 from educational leadership preparation program components would go back into local communities through schools and school districts.

Findings of this study based on the literature review indicated the need for increased accountability from quality preparation programs. This includes programs that are more accurately aligned with the instructional leadership standards and duties. Orr and Orphanos (2011) explained how "leadership candidates who complete an exemplary leadership preparation program increase the likelihood that they will have superior

preparation, thereby increasing the scope and quality of what they learned about leadership" (p. 48). In the summer of 2014, the research findings of the target university's graduates from the educational leadership program (1992-2012), identified 789 out of 1,109 (71%) by professional position. Of the 789 graduates found, 474 (60%) were in educational leadership positions. From these 474 located graduates, 366 (77%) obtained educational administrative positions in K-12 public schools and/or public school districts. These educational administrative positions are further disaggregated in Table 16.

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics of all Graduates in K-12 Positions (N = 366)

Position	n	%
Superintendent	8	2.2
Superintendent's Executive Staff	20	5.5
Director	43	11.8
Principal	176	48.0
Assistant Principal	119	32.5
Total	366	100.0

Another one of the results of Orr and Orphanos' (2011) study implied that "quality preparation matters and contributes significantly to what graduates learn, and ultimately how they practice leadership and work to improve their schools" (p. 50). Once the leadership components are in place, student achievement increases. The research of 1992-2012 graduates from the target university's educational leadership program was further divided into those who held principal positions between 1998-2012 and earned

school grades based on the Florida A+ Accountability Plan in the Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition (CFPSBC). The findings revealed that over the 14-year period (1992-2012), the target university's educational leadership graduates that were appointed to principal positions in the CFPSBC outperformed the state average when reviewing school grades. When reviewing low school grades, the mean state percentage of schools that earned the school grade of 'F' was 1.8%, as compared to 1.1% for graduates from the target university in the CFPSBC. Similarly, the overall state mean of schools that earned a 'D' was 8.6%, compared to 4.7% for target university educational leadership program graduates in the CFPSBC. Statewide 'D' and 'F' schools accounted for 10.4% of school grades, yet graduates from the target university in the CFPSBC accounted for 5.8%. Likewise, when reviewing higher school grades, the mean state percentage of schools that earned the school grade of 'A' was 44%, as compared to 53.6% for graduates from the target university in the CFPSBC. Similarly, the overall state mean of schools that earned a 'B' was 20.1%, compared to 20.8% for target university educational leadership program graduates in the CFPSBC. Statewide 'A' and 'B' schools accounted for 64% of school grades, yet graduates from the target university in the CFPSBC accounted for 74.4%. This is depicted in Table 17.

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics of School Grades: State compared to CFPSBC *1998-1999 through 2011-2012*

	Percentages					
Units	A	B	C	D	D	Total
State	44	20.1	25.7	8.6	1.8	100.2
CFPSBC	53.6	20.8	19.8	4.7	1.1	100

Note. CFPSBC = Central Florida Public School Boards Coalition. Some figures may not total 100% due to rounding

Implications

The findings of this study have implications for various stakeholders interested in providing high quality programs for educational leaders. An undergraduate baccalaureate degree offers a better chance at gaining full time employment, higher wages, and maintaining economic stability. An advanced degree in educational leadership provides educators with the same opportunities for leadership in school districts. Graduates may also gain individual economic benefits including better health care, pensions, and more challenging and rewarding personal and professional growth. The requirement of a master's degree for all educational administrators has been defined in Florida law (Florida Department of Education, 2007, Florida State Rule 6A-5.081). The collection of evidence presented in this study indicates that the state of Florida should continue to pursue the expectation of a graduate degree in educational leadership as educational leaders at that level have acquired more knowledge and skills and are more productive (Fatima, 2009). Community benefits occur through enhancing human capital and providing schools that support student achievement.

This research provides information for guiding the practices of educators and the decision-making of policymakers involved in establishing the guidelines for school leadership programs and principal leadership standards. Some of these guidelines include promoting the preparation program's component benefits. These benefits provide the community a possible economic impact from graduate students while enrolled in the educational leadership program. The economic impact prospect gives research universities an opening to reach out to local school districts to offer support with activities, projects, and research that could be mutually beneficial to the university and school district. For education practitioners and policymakers, this study offers insight into the importance of program preparation for university educational leadership programs. Professional practices promote the use of practical experiences that include project based learning, real world simulations, administrative internships, and partnerships with local school districts in an effort to transfer learning from theory to practice in order to prepare school administrators who are ready to lead schools and increase student achievement. Public relations in the community and among K-20 educational leadership could build relationships that support (a) graduate students as they have opportunities for practical application of skills they are learning and (b) K-12 students as they will have additional educational leaders supporting their growth and achievement.

Maintaining these practices in preparation programs and sharing the results of student performance trends from educational leaders who graduated from the target university could strengthen the employability of future educational leadership graduates from the university as well as potentially increase the enrollment of future degree seeking

educational leaders. The target university could promote that the data show that its educational leadership graduates under the Florida A+ Accountability Plan in the CFPSBC outperformed the state mean when reviewing school grades as indicated by more 'A' and 'B' grades and less 'D' and 'F' grades overall.

Recommendations for Future Research

The purpose of this study was to investigate the economic and professional impact of graduates from the target research university's educational leadership program and add to the body of knowledge on promoting quality preparation programs. A desired outcome of the study was to provide information for stakeholders regarding the role of university programs on economic impact while graduates were in the educational leadership program at a target university as well as the professional impact once appointed to an educational leadership position in K-12 public schools and school districts.

Although the use of the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey as a method to gather qualitative information had a small response rate and did not capture the data needed to support this study, it may have potential. It is recommended that the current research be replicated using better methods to increase the response rate such as personalizing e-mail, sending reminder emails, and offering incentives in order to reach the target population for this study beyond the single administration at one moment in time. A further recommendation would be a longitudinal study utilizing an annual administration of the survey through the educational leadership program rather than the

university's alumni association, starting with a requirement at graduation. If the survey is administered several times over several years, it would provide opportunities to measure professional employment, community impact, and student achievement over the course of an educational leadership graduates' career. Another prospect is to have college-school district liaisons who keep records of alumni positions. The data could be used to maintain communication with graduates and follow the career paths for those who stay in the field of education as well as graduates who earn their degree in educational leadership but leave the field of education. Results could lead to improved understanding of the factors contributing to career changes that have occurred. In addition, the database could be used to gather information about graduate students' perceptions of the various aspects of program preparation and alignment of job expectations. Furthermore, data from this instrument could perhaps provide the opportunity for an improved study of other university programs by adapting the survey and the methods utilized.

A recommendation for future research to add to the study's results would be to address other measures of the program such as qualitative data on participation, school grades outside of the CFPSBC, or individual student achievement. A recommendation for future research includes having data from all sites, public and private, in and beyond the state of Florida. Another recommendation would be to replicate the study in other university educational leadership programs across the state of Florida. Further, because school grade calculations change often, making it difficult to measure the impact of each individual school administrator consistently, a recommendation would be to include qualitative data.

Summary

Four research questions were answered utilizing existing data that included the education level, educational leadership position attained, and accountability based on Florida School Grades in the CFPSBC of 10-school district systems. The resulting implications showed that educational leadership graduates from the target university did have an economic impact while enrolled. The data further showed that when appointed to K-12 public schools and school districts educational leadership positions, the target university's graduates have had a professional impact on a large number of students based on the percentage of graduates employed, student enrollment in the school districts of which they are employed, and the Florida A+ Accountability Plan school grades. It is recommended that the current research be replicated using better methods to increase the response rate on the 2012 Educational Leadership Effectiveness Survey, longitudinally. Maintenance of communication with all graduates is also recommended. Qualitative data is suggested to be captured to support results and improve the ability to generalize the findings to other programs and/or universities. Further recommendations for future research would be gathering data on student performance outcomes from all schools and/or school districts.

APPENDIX A
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-882-2012, 407-882-0889 or 407-823-2508
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board**
FWA00000351, Exp. 7/24/2019, IRB00001138
To: **Roseann Bennett**
Date: **November 1st, 2016**
Study Title: An Analysis of the Impact of K-12 Educational Leadership Program Graduates: 1992-2012

Thank you for contacting the IRB office regarding your Dissertation Project, as requested by Dr. Taylor, your advisor. As you know, the IRB cannot provide an official determination letter for your research because it was not submitted into our iRIS electronic submission system prior to you completing the research.

However, if you had completed an iRIS submission, the IRB could make one of the following research determinations: "Not Human Subjects' Research," "Exempt," "Expedited" or "Full Board."

Based on the proposal document that you emailed us, the IRB determination most likely would have been Exempt.

If you have questions, please phone the IRB office at 407-882-2012.

Sincerely,

Patria N. Davis, M.S.P, CIP
IRB Coordinator
University of Central Florida
Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, FL 32826-3246
Campus mail: Office of Research
32826-0150
Phone: 407-882-2012, 407-882-0889, 407-823-2508
Fax: 407-823-3299
Webmail: Patria.Davis@ucf.edu
or irb@ucf.edu
UCF IRB Web- http://www.research.ucf.edu/

cc: IRB file, Faculty Advisor, College of Sciences

APPENDIX B
2012 EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

University of Central Florida
2012 Educational Leadership Impact Survey

THIS SURVEY HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY:
The University of Central Florida
Dr. Barbara A. Murray
Dr. Kenneth Murray
Dr. Rosemarye Taylor
Dr. Elizabeth Thedy

Informed Consent

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IMPACT Survey

Dear Advanced Degree Educational Leadership Graduate UCF Graduate,

The University of Central Florida 2012 Educational Leadership Impact Survey is a new survey. Your participation and honest answers are important.

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about graduates from the University of Central Florida Educational Leadership Programs, their public school administrative positions, and/or activities, projects, and/or dissertations. A doctoral student in the University of Central Florida Educational Leadership program is conducting this survey in response for a request of impact data from UCF Educational Leadership graduates, which is a component of a dissertation.

Your responses, privacy, and research records will be kept confidential. All responses that relate to or describe identifiable characteristics of individuals may be used only for statistical purposes and may not be disclosed, or used, in identifiable form for any other purpose, unless otherwise compelled by law. Authorized research personnel, employees of the Department of Educational Leadership, the UCF Institutional Review Board and its staff, and other individuals, acting on behalf of UCF, may inspect the records from this research project

The following link will take you to the online survey. It will take approximately ten minutes to complete. The survey is located at **www.ucfelp.com**. **By clicking on the survey link you are providing your informed consent.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please call Roseann Bennett (321-751-3925) or e-mail her at **roseannbennettucf@knights.ucf.edu**

Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to UCF Institutional Review Board Office at the University of Central Florida, Office of Research and Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246. The phone numbers are 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276.

Thank you for taking the time and thought to complete this survey. Your participation, time, and effort in helping gather information is greatly appreciated and will ultimately help professionals in higher education meet programming needs.

Sincerely,

Roseann Bennett
Principal, Croton Elementary School, Brevard Public Schools
Doctoral Student in Educational Leadership, University of Central Florida

University of Central Florida
2012 Educational Leadership Impact Survey

A. Background Information

1. Gender ○ Male ○ Female

2. Please indicate your graduation date(s) and degree(s) conferred from University of Central Florida Educational Leadership programs.

Year (s)	Program
2012 (Example)	*Ed. D.*

B. Professional Positions/Impact

3. List your administrative positions beginning with the highest position earned in reverse order (begin with current year). (Complete all that apply)

Year (s)	Position	School	School District
2012 (Example)	*Principal*	*ABC Elementary*	*Orange*

4. For each year you held the position of principal, please indicate the school grade.

Year (s)	**Florida School Grade**					
2011-2012 (Example)	●*A*	○*B*	○*C*	○*D*	○*F*	○*N/A*
2010-2011	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2009-2010	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2008-2009	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2007-2008	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2006-2007	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2005-2006	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2004-2005	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2003-2004	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2002-2003	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2001-2002	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
2000-2001	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
1999-2000	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A
1998-1999	○A	○B	○C	○D	○F	○N/A

5. **List all <u>activities</u> you completed based on being enrolled as a University of Central Florida Educational Leadership graduate student.**

Title	Approximate Number of Hours Yearly
*(Example)**Observing and Supervising and Documenting Teacher***	*40*

6. **List all <u>projects</u> you completed based on being enrolled as a University of Central Florida Educational Leadership graduate student.**

Title	**Approximate Number of Hours Yearly**
*(Example)**Mentor Children in Homeless shelter (Community Service)***	*20*

7. List your <u>dissertation</u>(s) completed based on being enrolled as a University of Central Florida Educational Leadership graduate student.

Title	Approximate Number of Hours Yearly
*(Example)**An Investigation Into the Use of Retention as an Intervention Strategy for Struggling Students as Measured by Student Success on FCAT in Seminole County***	*800*

8. List all <u>internships</u> you completed based on being enrolled as a University of Central Florida Educational Leadership graduate student.

School	School District	Approximate Number of Hours Yearly
*(Example)**ABC High***	*(Example) XYZ Public Schools*	*360*

C. Open-Ended Questions

9. What do you believe were the most effective outreach activities, projects, and research from your enrollment in the University of Central Florida Educational Leadership Program(s)?

10. What do you believe were the most effective utilizations of activities and classes in the University of Central Florida Educational Leadership Program(s)?

11. Do you have any further comments regarding your economic and professional impact as a result of graduating from the University of Central Florida Educational Leadership Program(s)?

APPENDIX C
2012-2013 FACULTY SALARY BY DEPARTMENT AND RANK

University of Central Florida

Faculty Salaries by Department and Rank

Faculty: Regular 9 Month

			1-Professor			2-Associate Professor			3-Assistant Professor			4-Instructor / Lecturer			All Ranks		
			Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary
Year	College	Department															
2012		CREOL-PAYROLL	12	$1,681,730	$140,144	2	$188,922	$94,461	4	$330,100	$82,525	.	.	.	18	$2,200,752	$122,264
		Department Total	12	$1,681,730	$140,144	2	$188,922	$94,461	4	$330,100	$82,525	.	.	.	18	$2,200,752	$122,264
	COLLEGE OF ARTS & HUMANITIES	Department															
		CAH DN-PAYROLL	1	$98,936	$98,936	3	$212,718	$70,906	.	.	.	2	$72,436	$36,218	6	$384,090	$64,015
		ENGL-PAYROLL	9	$866,875	$96,319	15	$977,341	$65,156	4	$217,981	$54,495	9	$343,663	$38,185	37	$2,405,859	$65,023
		HIST-PAYROLL	3	$294,809	$98,270	10	$654,761	$65,476	6	$340,026	$56,671	8	$281,032	$35,129	27	$1,570,627	$58,171
		MOD LANG-PAYROLL	2	$197,679	$98,839	7	$445,921	$63,703	4	$195,788	$48,947	11	$424,140	$38,558	24	$1,263,528	$52,647
		MUSIC-PAYROLL	5	$443,902	$88,780	9	$537,959	$59,773	5	$247,240	$49,448	4	$161,286	$40,322	23	$1,390,387	$60,452
		PHIL-PAYROLL	.	.	.	7	$488,003	$69,715	3	$169,517	$56,506	4	$166,399	$41,600	14	$823,919	$58,851
		SCH VIS ARTS & DES -PAYROLL	6	$564,805	$94,134	18	$1,245,261	$69,181	9	$535,980	$59,553	12	$649,425	$54,119	45	$2,995,472	$66,566
		THEATER-PAYROLL	5	$386,515	$77,303	9	$559,053	$62,117	3	$137,000	$45,667	4	$192,620	$48,155	21	$1,275,188	$60,723
		WRITING & RHETORIC-PAYROLL	1	$110,820	$110,820	4	$312,451	$78,113	4	$240,000	$60,000	17	$623,316	$36,666	26	$1,286,587	$49,484
		Department Total	32	$2,964,341	$92,636	82	$5,433,469	$66,262	38	$2,083,531	$54,830	71	$2,914,318	$41,047	223	$13,395,658	$60,070
	COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	Department															
		ACCTG-PAYROLL	3	$703,207	$234,402	7	$811,414	$115,916	2	$314,500	$157,250	9	$697,751	$77,528	21	$2,526,872	$120,327
		ECON-PAYROLL	4	$643,727	$160,932	6	$543,779	$90,630	2	$210,000	$105,000	6	$367,661	$61,277	18	$1,765,167	$98,065
		FIN-PAYROLL	3	$541,574	$180,525	11	$1,503,541	$136,686	.	.	.	5	$470,088	$94,018	19	$2,515,203	$132,379
		MGMT-PAYROLL	2	$388,462	$194,231	2	$311,335	$155,668	3	$402,000	$134,000	12	$760,735	$63,395	19	$1,862,531	$98,028
		MKTG-PAYROLL	1	$136,148	$136,148	7	$995,175	$142,168	3	$402,000	$134,000	9	$771,594	$85,733	20	$2,304,916	$115,246
		Department Total	13	$2,413,117	$185,624	33	$4,165,244	$126,220	10	$1,328,500	$132,850	41	$3,067,828	$74,825	97	$10,974,689	$113,141
	COLLEGE OF EDUCATION	Department															
		CFCS-PAYROLL	7	$703,853	$100,550	6	$440,100	$73,350	2	$120,180	$60,090	11	$521,079	$47,371	26	$1,785,211	$68,662
		EHS-PAYROLL	2	$184,943	$92,472	12	$939,713	$78,309	3	$178,437	$59,479	1	$44,002	$44,002	18	$1,347,096	$74,839
		STLL-PAYROLL	6	$543,252	$90,542	23	$1,695,132	$73,701	3	$164,489	$54,830	20	$937,867	$46,893	52	$3,340,739	$64,245
		Department Total	15	$1,432,047	$95,470	41	$3,074,945	$74,999	8	$463,107	$57,888	32	$1,502,948	$46,967	96	$6,473,046	$67,428
	COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING/COMPUTER SCIENCE	Department															
		CE-PAYROLL	5	$591,106	$118,221	5	$449,627	$89,925	6	$436,200	$72,700	1	$50,000	$50,000	17	$1,526,934	$89,820
		ECE-PAYROLL	9	$1,329,614	$147,735	6	$563,673	$93,945	4	$317,679	$79,420	4	$227,024	$56,756	23	$2,437,990	$106,000
		EECS-PAYROLL	8	$1,264,236	$158,030	14	$1,433,494	$102,392	5	$434,866	$86,973	6	$327,050	$54,508	33	$3,459,646	$104,838
		IEMS-PAYROLL	2	$203,272	$101,636	9	$774,431	$86,048	2	$146,000	$73,000	1	$75,285	$75,285	14	$1,198,988	$85,642
		MMAE-PAYROLL	7	$857,909	$122,558	7	$592,024	$84,575	10	$787,030	$78,703	3	$159,000	$53,000	27	$2,395,963	$88,739
		MSE-PAYROLL	1	$126,000	$126,000	2	$183,060	$91,530	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	$309,060	$103,020
		Department Total	32	$4,372,137	$136,629	43	$3,996,309	$92,937	27	$2,121,775	$78,584	15	$838,359	$55,891	117	$11,328,580	$96,825
	COLLEGE OF HEALTH & PUBLIC AFFAIRS	Department															
		CHP DN-PAYROLL	1	$96,604	$96,604	1	$79,023	$79,023	.	.	.	.	.	.	2	$175,627	$87,814
		CJ-PAYROLL	4	$391,875	$97,969	6	$444,770	$74,128	4	$244,000	$61,000	10	$483,587	$48,359	24	$1,564,232	$65,176
		COM DIS-PAYROLL	4	$370,902	$92,726	6	$467,239	$77,873	2	$136,454	$68,227	1	$70,569	$70,569	13	$1,045,165	$80,397
		HMI-PAYROLL	3	$294,359	$98,120	4	$337,510	$84,378	6	$429,531	$71,589	6	$300,000	$50,000	19	$1,361,400	$71,653
		HP-PAYROLL	1	$114,952	$114,952	2	$174,903	$87,452	2	$140,000	$70,000	9	$569,405	$63,267	14	$999,260	$71,376

Source: EEO Fall Staff file

IR22748 Office of Institutional Research

University of Central Florida

Faculty Salaries by Department and Rank

Faculty: Regular 9 Month

			1-Professor			2-Associate Professor			3-Assistant Professor			4-Instructor / Lecturer			All Ranks		
			Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary	Number	Total Salary	Average Salary
2012	COLLEGE OF HEALTH & PUBLIC AFFAIRS	LS-PAYROLL	.	.	.	2	$142,558	$71,279	1	$78,068	$78,068	9	$463,175	$51,464	12	$683,801	$56,983
		PA-PAYROLL	3	$300,477	$100,159	3	$217,796	$72,599	7	$406,924	$58,132	3	$151,500	$50,500	16	$1,076,697	$67,294
		SOC WK-PAYROLL	2	$186,810	$93,405	5	$340,131	$68,026	2	$110,689	$55,344	9	$451,855	$50,206	18	$1,089,486	$60,527
		Department Total	18	$1,755,979	$97,554	29	$2,203,931	$75,998	24	$1,545,666	$64,403	47	$2,490,091	$52,981	118	$7,995,667	$67,760
	COLLEGE OF HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT	Department															
		CHM-PAYROLL	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	$210,000	$70,000	2	$105,000	$52,500	5	$315,000	$63,000
		FD SVC LODGE MGT-PAYROLL	.	.	.	3	$233,323	$77,774	2	$138,686	$69,343	2	$101,622	$50,811	7	$473,631	$67,662
		HOSP SVCS-PAYROLL	1	$107,345	$107,345	5	$409,230	$81,846	5	$350,000	$70,000	2	$114,207	$57,104	13	$980,782	$75,445
		TOUR EVNT ATTR-PAYROLL	2	$228,593	$114,297	2	$153,991	$76,995	2	$141,436	$70,718	3	$146,740	$48,913	9	$670,761	$74,529
		Department Total	3	$335,938	$111,979	10	$796,543	$79,654	12	$840,122	$70,010	9	$467,570	$51,952	34	$2,440,173	$71,770
	COLLEGE OF MEDICINE	Department															
		COM MOL-OPERATIONS	1	$178,562	$178,562	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	$178,562	$178,562
		COM SBS DN-OPERATIONS	10	$1,401,031	$140,103	13	$1,201,597	$92,431	15	$997,242	$66,483	1	$41,402	$41,402	39	$3,641,271	$93,366
		Department Total	11	$1,579,593	$143,599	13	$1,201,597	$92,431	15	$997,242	$66,483	1	$41,402	$41,402	40	$3,819,834	$95,496
	COLLEGE OF NURSING	Department															
		NURSING-PAYROLL	4	$466,939	$116,735	4	$293,984	$73,496	9	$593,953	$65,995	10	$569,998	$57,000	27	$1,924,874	$71,292
		Department Total	4	$466,939	$116,735	4	$293,984	$73,496	9	$593,953	$65,995	10	$569,998	$57,000	27	$1,924,874	$71,292
	COLLEGE OF SCIENCES	Department															
		ANTH-PAYROLL OPERATIONS	.	.	.	4	$258,205	$64,551	5	$282,528	$56,506	5	$205,465	$41,093	14	$746,199	$53,300
		BIO SCI-PAYROLL	4	$450,940	$112,735	7	$544,741	$77,820	3	$185,688	$61,896	5	$272,041	$54,408	19	$1,453,409	$76,495
		CHEM-PAYROLL	4	$449,632	$112,408	4	$295,593	$73,898	8	$534,885	$66,861	7	$389,756	$55,679	23	$1,669,866	$72,603
		MATH-PAYROLL	17	$1,698,528	$99,913	6	$431,528	$71,921	4	$253,154	$63,289	4	$172,769	$43,192	31	$2,555,980	$82,451
		PHYSICS-PAYROLL	12	$1,185,996	$98,833	9	$709,095	$78,788	4	$215,116	$53,779	8	$395,002	$49,375	33	$2,505,210	$75,915
		POL SCI-PAYROLL	6	$611,972	$101,995	10	$645,609	$64,561	5	$260,658	$52,132	5	$235,641	$47,128	26	$1,753,880	$67,457
		PSYCH-PAYROLL	9	$1,222,306	$135,812	13	$1,027,805	$79,062	6	$413,500	$68,917	17	$817,211	$48,071	45	$3,480,823	$77,352
		SCH COMM-PAYROLL	2	$160,000	$80,000	14	$912,744	$65,196	5	$284,228	$56,846	13	$611,513	$47,039	34	$1,968,485	$57,897
		SOC-PAYROLL	6	$655,810	$109,302	7	$448,123	$64,018	5	$300,181	$60,036	2	$81,050	$40,525	20	$1,485,164	$74,258
		STAT-PAYROLL	4	$392,296	$98,074	1	$77,358	$77,358	1	$70,000	$70,000	3	$150,307	$50,102	9	$689,962	$76,662
		Department Total	64	$6,827,481	$106,679	75	$5,350,802	$71,344	46	$2,799,938	$60,868	69	$3,330,755	$48,272	254	$18,308,977	$72,083
	Total (ALL)		204	$23829302	$116,810	332	$26705746	$80,439	193	$13103934	$67,896	295	$15223269	$51,604	1024	$78,862,250	$77,014

Source: EEO Fall Staff file

IR22748 Office of Institutional Research

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D., & Autor, D.H. (2011). Skills, tasks, and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings. *Handbook of labor economics*, *4b*, 1044-1171.

Baldwin, J. N., & McCracken, W. I. (2013). Justifying the ivory tower: Higher education and state economic growth. *Journal of Education Finance, 38*(3), 181-209.

Becker, G. (2008). Human Capital. *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics.* Library of Economics and Liberty. Retrieved July 14, 2015 from the World Wide Web: http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/HumanCapital.html

Brand, J. E., & Xie,. (2010). Who benefits most from college? Evidence for negative selection in heterogeneous economic returns to higher education. *American Sociological Review*, *75*(2), 273-302.

Brazer, S. D., & Bauer, S. C. (2013). Preparing instructional leaders: A model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *49*(4), 645-684.

Carver, C. L. (2012). Developing leadership content knowledge during school leader reparation. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *7*(3), 1-12.

Chappelear, T. C., & Price, T. (2012). Teachers' perceptions of high school principal's monitoring of student progress and the relationship to student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *7*(2), 1-16.

Chell, J. (1995). Introducing principals to the role of instructional leadership. *Saskatchewan School Trustees Association (SSTA) Research in Brief.*

Choudhury, A., & Jones, J. (2010). Effect of job level on the performance of human capital attainment: an exploratory analysis. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 9*(2), 89-103. Retrieved from https://login.ezproxy.net.ucf.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/763161587?accountid=10003

Clark, C., Feng, L., & Stromsdorfer, E. (1998). WSU has a $730 million annual impact on economy. Retrieved from http://wsunews. wsu.edu/pages/publications.asp?Action=Detail &PublicationID=7436

Clark, D., Martorell, P., & Rockoff, J. (2009). *School principals and school performance*. Working Paper No. 38. Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

Clifford, M. (2010). Hiring quality school leaders: Challenges and emerging practices. Learning Point Associates. Retrieved from www.air.org

Conrad, C. F., Duren, K. M., & Haworth, J. G. (1998). Students' perspectives on their master's degree experiences: Disturbing the conventional wisdom. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 101, 65-76.

D'Allegro, M., & Paff, L. A. (2010). Estimating the economic impact of higher education: A case study of the five colleges in Berks County, Pennsylvania. *Association for Institutional Research,* Professional File Number 117, Summer 2010.

Danziger, S., & Ratner, D. (2010). Labor market outcomes and the transition to adulthood. *Future of Children*, *20*(1), 133-158.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr. M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Davis, J. (2012). School Enrollment and work status: 2011. *American Community Survey Briefs.*

Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *Developing successful principals. School leadership study. Review of research*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Department of the Treasury & Department of Education (2012). *The economics of higher education: A report prepared by the Department of the Treasury with the Department of Education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Donmoyer, R., Yennie-Donmoyer, J., & Galloway, F. (2012). The search for connections across principal preparation, principal performance, and student achievement in an exemplary principal preparation program. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, *7*(1), 5-43.

Duvall, B. (2003). Role of universities in leadership development. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 123, 63-71.

Eadens, D., Bruner, D., & Black, W. (2012). The intentions of Florida educational leadership graduate students to pursue administrative positions. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *7*(1).

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A. & Foleno, T (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.

Fatima, N. (2009). Investment in graduate and professional degree education: Evidence of state workforce productivity growth. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, *3*(1), 9-35.

Florida approval of school leadership programs. (2007). Florida Rules 6A-5.081.

Florida Department of Education (2002). *Competencies and skills required for certification in educational leadership in Florida* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/3/urlt/2nd-ed-fele-c-s.pdf

Florida Department of Education (2007). *The Florida principal leadership standards*. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/teaching/professional-dev/the-fl-principal-leadership-stards/

Florida Department of Education (2008). *Competencies and skills required for certification in educational leadership in Florida* (3rd ed.). Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/asp/fele/

Florida Department of Education (2014). *Test information guide for the Florida educational leadership examination* (7th ed.). Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/postsecondary-assessment/fele/index.stml

Florida principal leadership standards. (2011). Florida Rules 6A-5.080 (2011).

Florida State Statute, Personnel: Title XLVIII K-20 Education Code, § 1012.56 (2002).

Florida State Statute, Personnel of School System: Title XVI Education, § 231.087 (1997).

Flumerfelt, S., Ingram, I., Brockberg, K., & Smith, J. (2007). A study of higher education student achievement based on transformative and lifelong learning processes. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 15*(1), 107-118.

Fogg, N. P., & Harrington, P. E. (2009). From labor shortage to labor surplus: The changing labor market context and its meaning for higher education. *Continuing Higher Education Review, 73*, 11-31.

Gieselmann, S. (2009). Principals and school factors that impact elementary school student achievement. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, *22*(2), 16-22.

Goldring, E., Huff, J., May, H., & Camburn, E. (2008). School context and individual characteristics: What influences principal practice? *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(3), 332–352.

Gray, C., Fry, B., Bottoms, G. & O'Neill, K. (2007). *Good principals aren't born — they're mentored: Are we investing enough to get the school leaders we need?* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Gray, D., & Lewis, J. (2011). Preparing instructional leaders. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *6*(3), 140-143.

Hale, E. L., Moorman, H. N., (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership and the Illinois Education Research Council

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *33*(3), 329-351.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *9*(2), 157-91.

Hess, F. M. (2003). *A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.

Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005). *Learning to lead? What gets taught in principal preparation programs*. Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government: Program On Education Policy and Governance

Hessel, K., & Holloway, J. (2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC standards to practice.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Keaster, R., & Schlinker, W. (2009). What good are educational administration certification programmes? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *12*(1), 85-94.

Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, *126*(1), 17-25.

Korach, S. (2011). Keeping the fire burning: The evolution of a university-district collaboration to develop leaders for second-order change. *Journal of School Leadership*, *21*(5), 659-683.

Lashway, L. (2003). Transforming principal preparation. *ERIC Digest, 165,* 1-6.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *10*(4), 451-79.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management, 28*(1), 27-42.

Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning: A review of research for the learning from leadership project*. New York: The Wallace Foundation.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Princeton, NJ: The Education Schools Project.

Lyons, J. E., & Algozzine, B. (2006). Perceptions of the impact of accountability on the role of principals. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *14*(16), 1-19.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*, 176-191.

Murphy, J., Moorman, H. N., & McCarthy, M. (2008). A framework for rebuilding initial certification and preparation programs in educational leadership: Lessons from whole state reform initiatives. *Teachers College Record, 110*(10), 2172-2203.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2012). *About NPBEA*. Retrieved from http://www.npbea.org/about-npbea/

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2002). *Standards for advanced programs in educational leadership for principals, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors*. Retrieved, from http://www.npbea.org/ELCC.

Nettles, S. M., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *82*(4), 724-736.

New Leaders for New Schools. (2010). *Evaluating principals: Balancing accountability with professional growth*. New York, NY.

Orphanos, S., & Orr, M. T. (2014). Learning leadership matters: The influence of innovative school leadership preparation on teachers' experiences and outcomes. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 42*(5), 680-700.

Orr, M.T. & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *47*(1), 18-70.

Psacharopoulos, G., & Patrinos, H. (2004). Returns to investment in education: A further update. *Education Economics*, *12*(2), 111-134.

Program Evaluation and Educational Research Group (PEER). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://education.ucf.edu/peer/eval.cfm.

Qenani, E., MacDougall, N., & Sexton, C. (2014). An empirical study of self-perceived employability: Improving the prospects for student employment success in an uncertain environment. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *15*(3), 199-213.

Rigby, J. G. (2014). Three logics of instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(4), 610-644.

Ringler, M.C., & Rouse, W.A. (2007). Evaluation of a doctoral program in educational leadership. *NCPEA Connexions.* Retrieved from http://cnx.org/content/m15547/1.1/.

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(5), 635-674.

Sanchez, J. R., & Laanan, F. S. (1998). Determining the economic benefits of attending community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* 104, 5-15.

Schejbal, D., & Wilson, D. (2008). The value of continuing education. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, *72*32-43.

Subedi, B. (2004). Emerging trends of research on transfer of learning. *International Education Journal*, *5*(4), 591-599.

Thomas, M. D., & Bainbridge, W. L. (2000). Global perspective on school leadership. Opinion Paper. (EDRS Publication No. ED 448 497 EA 030 710).

University of Central Florida (UCF) (2012). College of Education and Human Performance. *Graduate Studies Catalog*. Retrieved from: http://education.ucf.edu/academics_programs.cfm

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1992).

Varner, L. W. (2007). Preparation of future school leaders. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, *4*(11), 31-40.

The Wallace Foundation. (2009). *Assessing the effectiveness of school leaders: New directions and new processes. Perspective*. New York: Author.

The Wallace Foundation. (2012). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. New York: Author. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org.

Ward, C. J. (2013). Why leadership matters: One school's journey to success. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development, 24*, 62-74.

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

Winograd, P. (2011). *How to use state policy to drive principal preparation reform*. National Governors' Association, National Governor's Conference, Salt Lake City, UT.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Krüger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(3), 398-425.

Young, M. D., O'Doherty, A., Gooden, M. A., & Goodnow, E. (2011). Measuring change in leadership identity and problem framing. *Journal of School Leadership, 21*(5), 704-734.

Young, M. D., Tucker, P. D., Mawhinney, H., Reed, C. J., Anderson, E., Crow, G., & Whiteman, R. (2013). Leveraging what works in preparing educational leaders. University Council for Educational Administration. Retrieved from www.ucea.org