STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2013

Senior-level School District Administrators' Perceptions Of The Effectiveness Of A Florida Preparing New Principals Program

Eddie Ruiz
University of Central Florida

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons
Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd
University of Central Florida Libraries http://library.ucf.edu

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Ruiz, Eddie, "Senior-level School District Administrators' Perceptions Of The Effectiveness Of A Florida Preparing New Principals Program" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 2983.
https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/2983

SENIOR-LEVEL SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A FLORIDA PREPARING NEW PRINCIPALS PROGRAM

by

EDDIE A. RUIZ
B. S. University of Central Florida, 2001
M. Ed. University of Phoenix, 2005

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2013

Major Professor: Rosemarye Taylor

© 2013 Eddie Ruiz

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine and measure Preparing New Principals Program completers and their readiness to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. This study was also conducted to identify the Florida Principal Leadership Standards that senior-level school district administrators identified as the most beneficial to future principals in improving student achievement despite increased accountability within the state. A group of 40 senior-level school district administrators who served on the superintendent's cabinet between 2008 and 2011 were sent a perceptual survey regarding the Preparing New Principals Program and the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Survey participants had the opportunity to voluntarily participate in a structured interview to obtain further information regarding the survey. All data from the surveys and interviews were studied and disseminated to the district for redesigning the school district's principal preparation program.

With extreme joy and satisfaction I dedicate this dissertation to my mother, Mayra R. Martinez, my grandparents, Neida and Margarito Ruiz, and my uncle, Eddie Ruiz who all left this world a bit sooner than I ever anticipated. Miss you all very much!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The last three years, while completing this study, have indeed been the toughest professionally and personally. The journey through this program has definitely been one filled with perseverance and sacrifices. Without the help of a group of committed individuals, I would never have made it to the end. Thank you first to my chair, Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, who encouraged me to apply for the program and guided me in the right direction throughout the remarkable journey. Without your scholarly and motherly advice, guidance, and encouragement I would not have been able to achieve this magnificent accomplishment. A special thank you also goes to the rest of my committee, Dr. Walt Doherty, Dr. Mary Patt Kennedy, and Dr. Lee Baldwin, for your continued support and guidance over the last three years.

I was fortunate to begin this new program with a group of educators as cohort one, but at the end of this journey they are now part of my extended family. Thank you to my dear friends, Todd Trimble and Kelly Pelletier, who started with me on this adventure and provided me more than they can ever imagine. Our world is a better place because of educators like these.

Lastly, thank you to my wife, Elizabeth, and my son, Ethan, for your enduring patience and support. You both have sacrificed tremendously through this journey and for that I will eternally be grateful. I love you both very much and look forward to the time we will spend together in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES viii

CHAPTER 1 THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS 1
Introduction 1
Statement of the Problem 5
Purpose of the Study 6
Conceptual Framework 7
Research Questions 8
Definition of Terms 9
Methodology 11
Research Design 11
Participants 11
Instrumentation 12
Procedures 14
Data Analysis 15
Significance of the Study 15
Delimitations of the Study 16
Limitations 17
Assumptions 17
Summary 18

CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE 19
Introduction 19
Effective Principals Characteristics 20
Principal Preparation Programs 25
University-Based Programs 28
District-Based Programs 30
University and District-Based Partnerships 33
Central Office Perceptions of Principal Preparation Programs 35
Florida Principal Leadership Standards 37
Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) 41
Summary 44

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY 46
Introduction 46
Purpose of the Study 46
Research Questions 47
Selection of Participants 48
Instrumentation 49
Data Collection 51
Data Analysis 55

Analysis of Quantitative Data 55
Ancillary Analysis of Qualitative Data 58
Summary 60

CHAPTER 4 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 61
Introduction 61
Research Question 1 61
Qualitative Analysis 88
Open-ended Questions 88
Structured Interviews 95
Summary 107

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 109
Introduction 109
Summary of the Study 109
Discussion of the Findings 111
Research Question 1 111
Research Question 2 114
Research Question 3 118
Ancillary Findings 119
Recommendations for School Leaders 122
Recommendations for Future Research 124

APPENDIX A FLORIDA PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS 127

APPENDIX B PREPARING NEW PRINCIPALS PROGRAM SENIOR-LEVEL SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY 133

APPENDIX C DISTRICT APPROVAL FOR THE RESEARCH 140

APPENDIX D INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL 142

APPENDIX E INFORMED CONSENT LETTERS: SURVEY AND INTERVIEWS 144

APPENDIX F STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND TRANSCRIPTS 147

LIST OF REFERENCES 189

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Constructs and Survey Items 13

Table 2 Florida Principal Leadership Standards and Domains (2011) 40

Table 3 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011): Domains and Survey Items... 56

Table 4 Research Questions, Data Sources, and Statistical Methods 57

Table 5 Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components: Instructional Leadership (N = 23) 64

Table 6 Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components, Instructional Leadership (N = 23) 65

Table 7 Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components: Building Community and Decision Making (N = 23) 67

Table 8 Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components, Building Community and Decision Making, (N = 23) 68

Table 9 Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components: Technical Knowledge (N = 23) 70

Table 10 Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components, Technical Knowledge (N = 23) 70

Table 11 Analysis of Variance Results, Difference in Value Placed on Preparing New Principals Program(PNPP) Components by Construct Category (N = 69) 72

Table 12 Descriptive Statistics, Value Placed on Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Components by Construct Category (N = 23; n = 23 per group) 73

Table 13 Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Student Achievement Construct (N = 23) 76

Table 14 Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Student Achievement, (N = 23) 76

Table 15 Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Instructional Leadership (N = 23) 78

Table 16 Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Instructional Leadership, (N = 23) 79

Table 17 Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Organization Leadership, (N = 23) 81

Table 18 Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Organization Leadership, (N = 23) 82

Table 19 Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Professional and Ethical Behavior, (N = 23) 84

Table 20 Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Professional and Ethical Behavior, (N = 23) 85

Table 21 Analysis of Variance Results: Difference in Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers by Construct (N = 92) 87

Table 22 Descriptive Statistics for Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers: Perceived Preparedness by Construct (N = 92; n = 23 per group) 88

Table 23 Themes and Sample Responses to Open-ended Item 91 (N = 23) 92

Table 24 Themes and Open-ended Responses to Item 92 (N = 17) 94

Table 25 Beneficial PNPP Components: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6) 97

Table 26 Least Beneficial PNPP Components: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6) 99

Table 27 PNPP Components that Should be Added: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6) 101

Table 28 PNPP for the 21st Century: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6) 103

Table 29 Insights to Improving the PNPP: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6) ... 105

Table 30 Reoccurring Themes by PNPP Constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP)..... 107

CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM AND ITS CLARIFYING COMPONENTS

Introduction

It is a known reality that the role and expectations of a principal in the era of high stakes testing and accountability are concentrated on how much a student learns in a given year. According to The Wallace Foundation (2012),

> Education research shows that most school variables, considered separately, have at most small effects on learning. The real payoff comes when individual variables combine to reach critical mass. Creating the conditions under which that can occur is the job of the principal. (p. 2)

The pressure of ensuring that students are meeting state standards makes it essential that school districts create programs that develop and prepare effective school leaders. Effective principals have the responsibility of creating a culture with teachers and staff to ensure that the greatest impact on student learning occurs. According to Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005), second only to the instructional practices provided by a teacher, the leadership of the school has the greatest impact on student achievement. The urgency for effective schools across the United States has placed the role of the principal as a school leader in the spotlight, a place that is not too familiar for education reformers over the last twenty years (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005).

District leaders have focused their efforts on principal preparation programs that recruit and retain top quality candidates, provide quality internship experiences, and

provide coaching to newly appointed principals (Boyd et al., 2011; Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009; Corcoran, Schwartz, & Weinstein, 2009; Simmons et al., 2007; Vanderhaar, Munoz, & Rodosky, 2006). In their research, Vanderhaar et al. (2006) stated that principals need to be prepared differently, depending on the socio-economic setting in which they are placed. Simmons et al. (2007) concurred, discussing the different obstacles that principals encounter when immersed in different types of schools with varying demographics. They also urged school leaders to assess the method of placing principal candidates when developing preparation programs. They advocated for internships focused on relationship building and providing principal candidates with leadership opportunities in which they can begin to turn theory into practice prior to assuming a full-time role as an administrator. The Leadership Academy, located in New York City, was formed with the sole purpose of creating a strong base of principals from high poverty schools with a record of low achievement scores (Corcoran et al., 2009). The Leadership Academy's Aspiring Principals Program consisted of a principal preparation program that lasted 14 months and included several components including an intensive summer program focused on principal scenarios, an apprenticeship with an experienced principal and a summer devoted to planning that focused on the transition to the principalship (Corcoran et al., 2009).

The work outlined in The Wallace Foundation (2012) provided a logical sequence for creating a system that produced effective principals. The first step of the process involved the school district leadership defining the role, job description, and requirements of the school principal and assistant principal and ensuring that research was the

prominent force behind the descriptors that principals needed to drive student achievement. The second step was related to principal preparation programs and providing the most rigorous coursework with meaningful internships and real-world training. Selecting the most qualified candidates from the process was the third step in the process of creating a pipeline of effective principals. The final step in the process consisted of aligning evaluations to key indicators that improved student achievement and then supporting the principals with professional development (The Wallace Foundation, 2012).

Kowal, Hassel, and Hassel (2009) provided through their research seven steps that district leaders should follow for supporting turnaround principals. One particular step involved developing a pipeline of turnaround leaders. Kowal et al. (2009) stated that "Districts can actively build their supply of turnaround principals by seeking out, training, and placing candidates who have characteristics specific to turnaround leaders" (p. 2). Furthermore, SREB (2009) developed 13 critical success factors required of by an effective principal and included: (a) focus on student outcomes; (b) the ability to develop and/or sustain a culture of high expectations; (c) the skills to recognize and encourage good instructional practices; (d) the development of an environment which adults care for students; (e) use of data to drive and improve instruction; (f) effective communication; (g) parental involvement; (h) understanding the change process and managing it effectively; (i) productive professional development; (j) innovation to meet goals; (k) maximize resources; (l) obtainment of external support; and (m) staying current on research focused on effective practices.

Anderson and Louh (2005) declared, that for there to be an improvement in student achievement, the following six practices must be evident in the principal: (a) a focus on high-quality teaching through effective observation and supervision; (b) the use of multiple forms of data to align curriculum, standards, and assessment; (c) leading learning communities focused on high expectations for all students; (d) nurturing faculty, staff, and student efficacy; (e) a positive building culture that builds community; and (f) the skills needed to manage the fiscal, operational, and organizational aspects of the school. The Wallace Foundation (2012) provided research on the five lessons that should guide the development of principal preparation programs. One particular lesson discussed was the urgency for school districts to increase the quality and rigor of their principal preparation programs (The Wallace Foundation, 2012). New York City was one of the first pioneers in creating the NYC Leadership Academy, a model for principal training. The Academy has gained national recognition and currently provides intense training to aspiring principals, mentoring and coaching to new and existing principals, and professional development to principals throughout the city (The Wallace Foundation, 2012).

On January 19, 2010, the Florida Department of Education submitted its first phase of the application for initial funding for the Race To The Top (RttT) grant to the United States Department of Education. Florida's RttT application (2010) stated,

> To address the gap that exists in recruiting and effectively training high-performing individuals in the principalship, the FLDOW will seek to award two to three entities that have proven records in improving leadership in schools to

> implement streamlined, intensive, job-embedded school leadership preparation programs that will result in dual level I and level II school leadership certifications for the completers. (p. 268)

In a 2009 address to the National Education Association, Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, stated,

> Great principals lead talented instructional teams that drive student performance and close achievement gaps. They deserve to be recognized and rewarded. But if they're not up to the job, they need to go. (p. 4)

Statement of the Problem

Florida is unique in its methods of preparing and certifying school leaders to take on the ever-changing role of the principalship. Currently, in the state of Florida, the road to becoming a school principal requires two levels of school leadership programs as recognized by the Florida Legislature and the State Board of Education and delineated in Florida Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081 (Florida Board of Education, 2007). Level one programs provide the initial step for certification in educational leadership for those aspiring to become principals and serves the role of preparing future school leaders. Level two programs build upon the training obtained in level one. Once successfully completed, they lead to certification in School Principal (Florida Board of Education, 2007). The Florida State Board of Education, in November of 2011, adopted new standards for principal leadership (SBE Rule 6A-5.080). The adoption of these new standards was the catalyst for school districts across the state of Florida to reexamine,

update, delete, and add components to their existing principal preparation programs that aligned with the newly adopted standards and effectively prepared school leaders.

The problem studied in this research was the effectiveness of a Florida Preparing New Principals Program as perceived by senior-level school district administrators. The investment in a quality principal preparation program is vital, and the cost of inadequately preparing future leaders can be astronomical. Hence the problem to be studied was the extent to which principal candidates were ready to be school leaders. The professional development services designee in Orange County Public Schools requested that the research be conducted prior to the restructuring of a new principal preparation program. At the time of this study, no research had been conducted on the perceptions of senior-level school district administrators on the effectiveness of the current Preparing New Principals Program.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of senior-level school district administrators in the Orange County Public School District as to the value of each component within the Preparing New Principals Program. This study was also used to measure the perceptions of senior-level school district administrators as to the level of preparation principal candidates received in the Preparing New Principal Program and their ability to successfully demonstrate the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Additionally, the Florida Principal Leadership Standards were analyzed to identify which standards and constructs were the least and most beneficial to the future success of

principal candidates in moving student scores upward. Findings may be useful in informing the redesign of a principal preparation program aligned with the new standards.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study was based on the influence of principal preparation programs on leadership practices and student achievement. Principals have the critical task of nurturing students in high-quality schools. The Southern Regional Education Board [SREB] (2007) ascertained that effective principals have a great effect on student achievement and are second in importance only to the presence of an effective teacher. In their meta-analysis, Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) went beyond the SREB claims, stating the principals had the ability to impact a child for eternity.

Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) identified three fundamental practices in which principals impact student achievement through their influence on school operations and personnel. First, principals have to set a direction for the organization that includes developing shared goals, monitoring the performance of the organization, and promoting effective communication. Second, principals need to provide a conducive learning environment that focuses on collaborative processes. Lastly, principals have the ultimate task of developing teachers and staff toward maximum productivity, providing intellectual opportunities to improve work, and supporting teachers through effective models of practice.

Principal preparation has been viewed as critical in fostering high quality leadership for schools, combining elements of good leadership and successful design of leadership programs. LaPointe, Meyerson, and Darling-Hammond (2006) offered four key findings in their research on principal preparation. First, they indicated that effective school principals influence student achievement through the support and development of effective teachers. Second, they found that certain program features are necessary to develop effective principals. Third, they discussed the value of multiple pathways to high quality leadership development. Finally, they addressed the need for policy reform to align with knowledge of program components and the systems that support the implementation and sustainability of principal preparation programs.

A large body of research (Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2009) has been focused on the principal's effect on school culture by motivating students, parents, teachers, and staff as well as identifying the vision, mission, and goals for the school. Additionally, developing high expectations, fostering communication, managing resources, and creating organizational structure are all actions which principals should be able to accomplish in setting the school on a path to success (Horng et al., 2009).

Research Questions

The following research questions will guide this study:

1. To what extent, if any, do perceptions in value of the Preparing New Principals Program components differ among senior level school district administrators?

2. To what extent, if any, do senior-level school district administrators perceive that Preparing New Principals Program completers are prepared to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards?
3. Which of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards do senior level school district administrators identify as the most beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement?

Definition of Terms

Senior-level district administrator: An employee of Orange County Public Schools who served on the Superintendent's cabinet during the 2008-2011 period.

Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) 2011: Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. There are ten standards grouped into four domains.

Orange County Public Schools (OCPS): A large urban school district in the central Florida area where this research was conducted. OCPS included 900 administrators (school and non-school based), 12,747 instructional staff and 180,307 students. Student racial distribution was: 41% white; 30% black; 21% Hispanic; 4% Asian; 3% Multi-cultural; 1% American Indian or Alaska Native. In the district, 60% of the students qualified for the federal free/reduced-price lunch program.

Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP): The program of study developed by the school district, and approved by the Florida State Board of Education, to prepare new school leaders for the job responsibilities of being a principal which included successfully meeting the expectations of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

Professional demographics: Characteristics of the research participants that were included in the statistical analysis: current position, years of experience as an Executive Cabinet member, years of experience as an administrator, age, race/ethnicity, gender, years of classroom teaching experience, years of leadership experience, undergraduate major.

Professional development services designee: The school district administrator who has the responsibility of designing professional development programs and experiences for all teachers and administrators in the school district. This administrator develops, coordinates, implements, and conducts follow-up activities for all training programs.

Program completer: A current employee of the school district who has successfully completed the Preparing New Principals Program.

Preparing New Principals Program Senior-Level School District Administrator Survey: A survey instrument developed by the researcher for use in surveying senior-level district administrators.

Standard: A behavior, skill set, or knowledge base that should be demonstrated by the administrator of an effective school.

Methodology

Research Design

This study was conducted using a mixed methods design incorporating quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data collected for the study used a perceptual online survey of senior-level school district administrators (Appendix B). Qualitative data were collected in follow-up structured interviews with senior-level school district administrators who agreed voluntarily to be interviewed. Each of the interviews were conducted confidentially, transcribed, coded by responses, grouped, and assigned an appropriate theme.

This research study was conducted at the request of the professional development services designee of the Orange County Public School District. The study was not associated with the implementation of any programs and did not impact the senior-level school district administrators who responded to the survey or participated in interviews in any way.

Participants

The population for this study was comprised of 40 senior-level school district administrators in a large urban school district in Florida. These 40 participants worked in the school district and were either directly or indirectly responsible for placing completers of the Preparing New Principals Program in principal positions in the school

district. All senior-level school district administrators had prior experience in the school district as an assistant principal, principal, or non-school based administrator.

Instrumentation

The Preparing New Principals Program Senior-Level School District Administrators Survey was modified from an existing research instrument developed by Pelletier (2011) that was used to gather data for her doctoral research. The instrument consisted of the required components of the OCPS Preparing New Principals Program and the newly adopted 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. It also enabled the collection of program development decisions through an interview process of survey participants.

A group of current and former senior-level school district administrators, considered connoisseurs in school leadership, reviewed the instrument for content validity including credibility, accuracy, and relevance. In addition, members of cohort one in the Executive Ed.D. in Educational Leadership program were also approached and invited to review and provide feedback on the survey, thereby providing additional content validity. Once reviewed, the survey was edited and revised further, based on the input of these professionals. The survey focused on the perceptions of senior-level school district administrators' perceptions of the components of the OCPS Preparing New Principals Program as it related to completers and their ability to adequately meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

The survey instrument was developed for data collection from senior-level school district administrators and consisted of three sections. In the first section, participants were asked to indicate the value they placed on the required components of the Preparing New Principals Program in terms of preparing school leaders. The three required components or constructs of the program were: (a) instructional leadership, (b) building community and decision making, and (c) technical knowledge. These constructs and the survey items associated with each of them are displayed in Table 1.

In the second section of the survey, participants were asked to indicate their perceptions of the extent to which respondents perceived that the Preparing New Principals Program had prepared program completers to be successful in demonstrating the newly adopted Florida Principal Leadership Standards. In the third section of the survey, senior-level school district administrators were asked two open-ended questions about how the PNPP could be further enhanced. In addition, senior-level school district administrators had an opportunity to voluntarily participate in a follow-up structured interview by the researcher. The structured interview questions were developed after a thorough analysis of the data collected from the survey and open-ended questions.

Table 1

Constructs and Survey Items

Constructs	Survey Items
Instructional Leadership	2-15
Building Community and Decision Making	16-24
Technical Knowledge	25-34

Procedures

Orange County Public School's professional development services designee along with the superintendent were instrumental in the enablement of this research. The designee was contacted and provided information on the structure of the Preparing New Principals Program and input into the survey instrument. She also arranged a meeting with the superintendent to select the senior-level school district administrators who were responsible for directly or indirectly placing qualified candidates into principal positions.

The school district's Senior Director for Accountability, Research and Assessment was contacted for approval prior to conducting the research. The researcher submitted the appropriate documents including a research request form along with the research proposal to the Office of Accountability, Research, and Assessment (Appendix C). Moreover, approval for the pending research was also obtained from the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board (Appendix D).

Following approval of the research, the 40 Orange County Public School's senior-level school district administrators who had been identified received an e-mail from the researcher with support from the school district's superintendent advising them that they would be receiving a request to complete a survey and stressing the importance of their input into the possible restructuring of the current Preparing New Principals Program. One week later, a follow-up e-mail was sent to prospective respondents requesting that they complete an electronic survey. The e-mail included the district approval forms, the participant informed consent letter (Appendix E), and a link to the electronic survey. The research participants were not identified or linked to their survey responses in any way.

Though the researcher knew the identities of those originally invited to participate, he did not know who completed the survey. Only one general follow-up e-mail thanking participants who had responded and reminding non-respondents to participate was sent.

In the third section of the survey, respondents were asked if they would be willing to be interviewed. Volunteers were contacted, and face-to-face interviews were arranged. Structured interview questions (Appendix F) were synthesized after careful examination of the survey results and were used to elicit additional information beyond that which was obtained from the survey itself. Consenting interviewees were assigned a number, and each interview was audiotaped, transcribed, and maintained in a locked file cabinet only accessible to the researcher.

Data Analysis

Data were collected using the online survey tool, SurveyGizmo. At the conclusion of the survey window, these data were exported into SPSS version 20 software for analysis. Interviews were transcribed, coded, and analyzed for common or significant statements. The specific methods and procedures used to analyze the data and answer the research questions are discussed in Chapter 4.

Significance of the Study

In order to assess the alignment of Orange County Public School's Preparing New Principals Program with the newly adopted Florida Principals Leadership Standards in 2011, assistance was requested from the professional development services designee.

The researcher planned to shed light on the insights that may be gained from senior-level school district administrators into the value of the current Preparing New Principals Program and their readiness to effective school leaders. With the data collected from this research, existing practices should be examined and used to assist in the restructuring of the current principal preparation program in order to better align with the newly enacted principal leadership standards in Florida. Survey results and the structured interview results may also be useful in assisting the OCPS professional development designee in modifying, updating, and intentionally structuring the program to better principal candidates in a level two program that leads to principal certification. The findings from this study could provide valuable information to the school district and strengthen the current Preparing New Principals Program. This study may also add to the current literature on perceptions of senior-level school district administrators on preparing new principal programs.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The study was delimited to one school district in the state of Florida. Results may not be generalizable to other school districts or other states.
2. Survey respondents were delimited to senior-level school district administrators who indirectly or directly placed program completers into principal positions in one school district in the state of Florida.

Limitations

1. Because it was important to maintaining anonymity of respondents, the researcher was limited in the ability to maximize the response rate by actively encouraging prospective participants to complete the survey.
2. The survey called for participants to self-report their perceptions as to the value of various aspects of the Preparing New Principals Program and the preparedness for success of program completers. The quality of the data, therefore, was dependent on participants' accurate interpretation of questions, quality of reflections with regard to the program, and the understanding of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

Assumptions

1. It was assumed that study participants completing the survey were school leaders who served as senior-level school district administrators and were directly or indirectly responsible for placing preparing new principals program completers in principal positions.
2. It was assumed that study participants would comprehend the language and terminology in the survey instrument.
3. It was assumed that the study participants would respond with candor and indicate their honest perceptions to each question within the survey.
4. It was assumed the interpretation of the data collected would accurately reflect the perceptions of the study participants.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of senior-level district administrators as to the value of the Preparing New Principals Program in preparing new principals to be successful based on Florida's new principal leadership standards. This chapter has presented an overview of the study, stating the problem and explaining its clarifying components. The conceptual framework has been introduced and the methodology which was employed in conducting the research has been presented. The instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis strategies employed to answer the three research questions which guided the study have also been detailed. Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature and related research relevant to key components of the study.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter contains a review of the literature and research related to effective principal characteristics, principal preparation programs, the Florida Leadership Standards, and the Orange County Public School's Preparing New Principals Program. In light of the newly adopted leadership standards in Florida, school districts across the states have been updating and redesigning their principal preparation programs in order to better align them with the state's new mandate. Educational experts have continuously searched for the qualities of effective principals and how principals acquire those qualities. This study was structured to build on the existing research. The relationship between effective principal characteristics and principal preparation programs was explored to investigate support that may be useful in re-designing a large urban school district's new principal preparation program.

The first section of this chapter explores the characteristics of effective principals with particular emphasis on the impact of leadership on student achievement. The second section focuses on the different types and models of principal preparation programs in the nation: university-based programs, district-based programs, and university-district partnerships. School district level office administrators' perceptions of principals' preparedness are discussed in the third section. The fourth section describes the history and the development of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The final section

examines the Preparing New Principals Program in Florida with specific emphasis on the program of the target district. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Effective Principals Characteristics

As the 21st century began, more attention than ever was being placed on the single variable of leadership as it related to increased student achievement across public school systems in each state in the U.S. (Hale &Moorman, 2003). In 2005, Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson conducted a review of leadership research with specific emphasis on the development of successful principals. They found three critical aspects of the principal's job: (a) supporting teachers, (b) managing the curriculum in a way that fostered student learning, and (c) possessing the ability to create powerful systems to transform schools to champion teaching and learning for all students.

Reporting on a six-year study of 180 schools in nine states, Mitgang (2012) observed that of all the variables that impact student achievement, leadership was a close second to the actual teaching that occurred in the school. In a milestone report, Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) stated that "there are virtually no documented instances of troubled schools being turned around without intervention by a powerful leader. Many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds, but leadership is the catalyst" (p. 5).

According to an extensive meta-analysis conducted by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty in 2003, in which the relationship between leadership and student achievement were studied over a 30-year period, 21 specific leadership practices were identified and

correlated directly to student achievement. The three most effective practices with the highest correlation with student achievement identified by the authors included: (a) input (.30) in which principals empower teachers by involving them in the decision-making process; (b) situational awareness (.33) in which the principal has the innate ability to know everything that is taking place in the school and can proactively respond quickly to potential problems that are lurking; and (c) intellectual stimulation (.32) in which the principal strives to keep the faculty and staff up-to-date on the most recent educational reforms, theories, policies and strategies (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

The Southern Regional Educational Board [SREB] (2009) attributed principals' impact on student achievement to daily interactions with teachers about (a) structuring the school environment so as to ensure that it is conducive to learning, (b) ensuring that the curriculum is aligned to the standards, and (c) making hiring decisions that positively impact the quality of teaching (p. 2). The Wallace Foundation (2012) later identified five key responsibilities that defined a principal as a leader of learning: (a) creating a vision with high standards focused on all students; (b) creating and maintaining a positive school culture among teachers and students; (c) identifying and nurturing potential leaders; (d) refining instructional strategies; and (e) handling of human capital, data and systems to increase productivity and increase student achievement (p. 4).

Edlefson (2000) interviewed 10 highly effective school administrators in Ohio on practices that enabled quality work in their schools. The first practice identified was the ability to share decision-making. The school principal, as a "leader of leaders," (p. 13) allows everyone to have a piece of the accountability as well as giving teachers

opportunities to gain leadership experience. The second practice identified was the interaction of the principal with the teachers and staff. Collegial conversations were frequent with a focus on teaching and learning. The last practice pinpointed teachers as the experts and the leaders at the school.

The investment in good principals is a financially sound practice that leads to improvement in teaching and learning. The principal is the key in establishing a culture where excellence is not isolated in one classroom but is spread throughout the school campus (Wallace Foundation, 2011). According to The Wallace Foundation (2011), Linda Darling-Hammond stated,

> It is the leader who both recruits and retains high-quality staff. Indeed, the number one reason for teachers' decisions about whether to stay in a school is the quality of administrative support--and it is the leader who must develop this organization. (p. 2)

Robinson (2011) defined three capabilities of student-centered leadership that school leaders need to be effective, stating that principals need to (a) be knowledgeable about how to match the administrative day to day operations with the learning goals of the students; (b) be skillful in using that day to day knowledge in problem-solving; and (c) build the relational trust with all of the stakeholders (p. 43). Robinson synthesized the five dimensions of student-centered leadership from 199 survey items given to teachers on the practices of their principals. Each dimension had an average effect size as it impacted student outcomes. The five dimensions were (a) establishing goals and expectations (.42), (b) resourcing strategically (.31), (c) ensuring quality teaching (.42),

(d) leading teacher learning and development (.84), and (e) ensuring an orderly and safe environment (.27). These five dimensions confirm that leaders can have an impact on the achievement of their students. Robinson also stressed the importance in understanding the type of leadership practiced by school leaders.

> It is not particularly fruitful to ask whether leaders make a difference to student learning or achievement because the answer depends on what it is they actually do. It is better to ask what type of leadership practice makes a difference to student learning. (Robinson, 2011, p. 143)

Kouzes and Posner (2007) analyzed over a thousand personal-best leadership experiences and identified five practices of school leaders that were used when extraordinary things were accomplished within the organization. The first of five practices included modeling the way through clarifying values and reflection. The second practice was to inspire a shared vision in which a common purpose was identified while at the same time bringing the vision to life. The third practice was to challenge the process and have leaders search and seize opportunities. The fourth practice concerned enabling others to act, requiring a climate of trust. The final practice was to encourage the heart by expecting the best and creating a spirit of community (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

In a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to student achievement, Hattie (2009) applied his tools to a large body of research and produced an effect size (denoted d) for 138 influences in a variety of areas including student, home, school, teacher, curricula, and teaching approaches. In the domain of school, Hattie proclaimed that the

greatest gains in student achievement were attained by school leaders who encourage teachers to reach for loftier goals and provide those same teachers an environment that is safe from criticism. Such leaders also allow teachers to work together where every member supports, critiques, and holds other members accountable for student learning.

In the area of instructional leadership, Hattie (2009) identified several specific dimensions that had high effects on student achievement. School leaders who encouraged and participated in the professional development of their teachers saw the largest mean effect of d = 0.91. The next dimension in order of impact on student achievement was planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum with a mean effect of d = 0.74. In this specific dimension, the school leaders who regularly visited classrooms and provided the teachers with formative and summative feedback saw student achievement rise. The attributes that had the lowest mean effect on student achievement were the recognition and rewarding of individual accomplishments (r = 0.30) and visibility in forming quality relationships with teachers and students (r = 0.32). According to Hattie,

> Schools leaders and teachers need to create a school, staffroom, and classroom environments where error is welcomed as a learning opportunity, where discarding incorrect knowledge and understandings is welcomed, and where participants can feel safe to learn, re-learn, and explore knowledge and understanding. (p. 239)

Orr and Orphanos (2011) indicated that the surge of attention on effective schools by the public has created a heightened awareness of the impact a principal or assistant

principal makes on student achievement. "The research has yielded strong evidence that leaders' influence is felt primarily through their direct effects on staff and organizational conditions" (p. 19).

Principal Preparation Programs

A 2006 Southern Regional Education Board report emphasizing the need to redesign principal preparation programs proclaimed that "The state is in the driver's seat when it comes to the design and quality of principal preparation and it appears that in many states the ignition key is still in the off position" (p. 13). Beginning in 2000, states have seen an increase in principal accountability through the adoption of focused leadership standards (The Wallace Foundation, 2011). According to Hale and Moorman (2003), "Principals across the nation agree that administrator training programs deserve an 'F'" (p. 5). These authors reported that principal preparation programs had yielded only incremental growth in the last quarter of the 20th century and were in need of a major reconstruction. In a survey of educational leaders, 69% of responding principals indicated that traditional leadership preparation programs were not aligned with the realities they encounter on a day-to-day basis (Farkas, Johnson, Duffett,, Foleno, & Foley, 2001). In a report of The Wallace Foundation (2011), criticisms of principal preparation programs included an abundance of theory not applicable to the real-world job principals have to face and inappropriately sequenced programs of study that make it difficult for learning to build on previous coursework. According to Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007), specific indicators need to be present for

effective principal preparation programs to flourish: (a) clear focus and values about leadership and learning around which the program is coherently organized; (b) standards-based curriculum emphasizing instructional leadership, organizational development, and change management; (c) field-based internships with skilled supervision; (d) cohort groups that create opportunities for collaboration and teamwork in practice-oriented situations; (e) active instructional strategies that link theory and practice, such as problem-based learning; (f) rigorous recruitment and selection of both candidates and faculty; and (g) strong partnerships with schools and districts to support quality, field-based learning (p. 12).

With the increased pressure and accountability placed upon principals, it is critical that educational leadership preparation programs produce qualified, well-educated, and more importantly effective principals (Linn, Sherman, & Gill, 2007). Mitgang (2007) commented that the preparation programs of school leaders deserved national attention and an increase of energy and attention in order to adequately provide every child in the nation a chance to succeed. According to Mitgang (2007), in the Wallace Foundation report, "Repeatedly, we heard that the days of 'sink or swim' for new principals must end if they are to stand any reasonable chance of succeeding in their increasingly tough jobs" (p. 5).

According to Hess and Kelly (2007), principal preparation programs should incorporate topics such as data analysis, accountability, and research skills as well as interviewing, hiring, evaluating, and terminating personnel. Hess and Kelly conducted an extensive study that examined 31 principal preparation programs' syllabi for skills and

knowledge. A total of 210 syllabi were collected representing programs that ranged from the elite programs in the United States to large programs that produced the most principal candidates and included some typical programs. Syllabi were collected and coded by weeks, based on one of seven major strands of school leadership. The results of the study indicated that programs, regardless of type, dedicated over 15% to managing for results and managing personnel. Over 30% of time, however, was spent on technical knowledge which included topics such as law, finance, facilities, data training, research skills, and technology. "Principal-preparation programs that pay little attention to data, productivity, accountability, or working with parents may leave their graduates unprepared for new responsibilities" (Hess & Kelly, 2007, p. 268).

In a joint project of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and the Tennessee State Board of Education to redesign educational leadership for two universities in Tennessee, the redesigned principal preparation program was built around: (a) strong partnerships between universities and districts; (b) selective candidate process; (c) internships that were real-world; (d) courses restructured to focus on student achievement for all students; (f) mentoring support from experienced principals and former principals; (g) peer support from principal candidates in cohort model; and (h) diverse membership base with a state board of education mandate to recommend policy changes to reform school leader preparation (SREB, 2009).

The coursework and skills embedded in principal preparation programs should reflect the current research in school leadership, instructional leadership, and management (Davis et al., 2005). Also fundamental is the importance that the content in

the preparation programs mirror the state licensing standards. The program content should be relevant and include components such as field-based internships, problem-based learning, cohort groups, and mentorship for the experience to be authentic results-based (Davis et al., 2005). Principal preparation programs have traditionally focused on general management theories, school laws, and administrative actions with little to no emphasis on student achievement, teacher effectiveness, professional development, curriculum and assessment, and organizational change (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007).

University-Based Programs

A 2011 Wallace Foundation report offered guidance to policy makers on educational policy and questioned the quality and applicability of most teacher preparation programs housed in the university-based programs where a majority of the principals in 21st century schools were being educated. "Redesigning training programs has payoffs for universities as they are able to reform and improve their leadership preparation programs and gain more prestige" (The Wallace Foundation, 2011, p. 3).

LaPointe et al. (2006) observed that associated with university-based preparation programs has been focused on subjects such as school law, fiscal responsibility, and human resources and was not in-touch with the roles of principals in 21st century schools. They noted that across a majority of the states, a push to restructure leadership preparation programs has been underway with an emphasis on new accreditation guidelines and requiring universities to adhere to rigorous standards. The program redesign in Missouri provides a good example. "In Missouri, all 17 university principal

preparation programs were redesigned to reflect the essential leadership behaviors" (LaPointe et al., 2006, p. 3). In reporting on a survey of principals on the topic of leadership training in universities, Mitgang (2008) found that seven of 10 principals believed that university-based preparation programs were not aligned with the real-world job description of the principal and were not preparing them to lead schools. Consistent flaws in university-based preparation programs are prevalent in research studies and the following list describes the weaknesses:

- Admission standards that allow participants to "self-select" themselves without having to demonstrate either the potential or intention to assume school leadership positions;
- Curricula and knowledge base that may not adequately take into account the needs of the school, district, and increasingly diverse student bodies;
- Weak connections between theory and practice;
- Faculty who may have little field of experience as leaders; and
- Shallow or poorly designed internships and field-based experience that are not sufficiently connected to the rest of the program. (Mitang, 2008, p. 4)

According to Davis et al. (2005), the university-based preparation programs usually houses coursework for prospective administrators that is disconnected, including subjects such as school law, budget, and personnel instead of interdisciplinary subjects aligned to state parameters. These types of programs are often characterized by liberal admission standards that permit candidates to apply and be accepted regardless of their future aspirations. Many candidates who apply and take graduate level courses do so

only to increase their salaries, never intending to become school principals (Davis et al., 2005).

There are some examples of university-based programs that provide models for future preparation. The University of Connecticut and Delta State University in Mississippi are two prime examples of preparation programs that offer an innovative program of study for future principals that incorporate clinical internships with a mentoring component that is resilient, partnerships with school districts for quality placements, relevant curriculum that is practical, and a group of candidates that are connected in a cohort (Davis et al., 2005). Another university-based preparation program in the Mid-West, whose primary goal was to focus on the principal as the leader of change, added a course, Human Behavior in Educational Administration, to its program that addressed attributes such as taking risks, making critical decisions, working in groups, school change, as well as cultural and diversity factors (Edlefson, 2000).

District-Based Programs

Given the limitations of university-based preparation programs to provide future principals with the tools needed to lead successful schools, districts have increasingly taken steps to provide leadership in providing quality and relevant principal preparation programs (Orr, King, & LaPointe, 2010). "Districts became a competitor by creating their own leadership preparation programs that were directly aligned with their standards and reform priorities" (p. 5). School districts in Massachusetts, Indiana, Rhode Island, and Missouri became competitors with the university-based preparation programs in

these states by offering leadership programs to principals over which they had full control. School districts retained complete control of the programs, from the competencies each candidate had to complete to the district experiences in which each candidate would participate. With complete control, however, came excessive demands on the school district in terms of demands on school district personnel time (Orr et al., 2010).

The number of successful district-based principal preparation programs has continued to grow. According to Mendels (2012), school districts around the United States have increasingly begun to recruit candidates who show great potential in becoming effective principals and have proceeded to provide them with high-quality training that aligns with the needs of the school district. One of the notable and popular district-based programs in existence is the New York City (NYC) Leadership Academy, a training facility for New York educators. The NYC Leadership Academy, in partnership with the state of New York, has received national recognition for the quality of experiences and rigor of the coursework provided to its principal candidates (Mendels, 2012).

New York is not the only state that has become a major producer of high-quality principals through its partnership with the district. Prince George's County has also collaborated in its program to train principals via a partnership with the National Institute for School Leadership, an education policy and development group based in Washington, D.C. (Mendels, 2012). The Wallace Foundation (2011), reported that principal candidates who graduated from district-based programs such as the NYC Leadership

Academy and were placed in under-achieving schools raised student achievement in English-language arts and mathematics at a higher rate than principals newly hired to the district.

LaPointe et al., (2006), researched eight professional development programs for principals that spanned university-based and district-initiated programs. School districts have found that the best way to fill vacant principal positions is the creation of district-based preparation programs. The rationale has been that program completers are current with the school district's goals and needs. "Overall, graduates describe the quality and attributes of their [district] program and internship more positively than comparison principals" (p. 11). In the district-based program principal candidates proclaimed that their program incorporated best practice components such as a focus on instructional leadership with (a) an emphasis on school improvement, (b) knowledgeable faculty members who were practitioners in their field of expertise, (c) use of a cohort model, (d) the combination of theory with practice, and (e) a substantial amount of reflection on their experiences and development as a leader (LaPointe et al., 2006).

According to Davis et al. (2005), school districts in New York City's District 2, San Diego, California, and St. Paul, Minnesota have each created year-round training in principal preparation programs. Training has been focused on supporting, coaching, mentoring, and evaluating strategies for teachers as well as providing principal candidates with opportunities to engage in problem-solving dialogues with networks of principals.

University and District-Based Partnerships

Davis et al. (2005) spoke to the need and desirability of university-school district partnerships in preparing principals, stating "The need for stronger clinical training has encouraged a growing number of universities to collaborate with districts and schools as equal partners in the design, implementation, and assessment of pre-service principal preparation programs" (p. 12). Still, these researchers found that partnerships are seldom formed between conventional preparation programs within the university and bordering school districts that contain valuable resources. Similarly, principal preparation programs housed within districts fail to reach out to their local universities and tap into the intellectual pool of resources.

According to Mendels (2012), a model in the arena of university and school district collaboration is located in Denver with a population of 79,000 students. This 10-year partnership between the school district and the Ritchie Program for School Leaders at the University of Denver has been regarded as a preparation model in school leadership. It features paid internships, rigorous selection criteria, curriculum concentrated on the principal's role of raising student achievement, and involves experienced faculty members from the university and school district. Another model example was identified in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, a large urban school district in North Carolina that expanded its principal preparation program with Winthrop University to include Queens University in order to produce qualified school leaders ready to take over challenging schools (Mendels, 2012).

According to Vanderhaar et al. (2006), school districts and universities should collaborate and develop a curriculum for school leaders that is focused on results and can weather the obstacle of time. "It is clear that well-conceived programs for principal preparation programs can and should exist side-by-side with strong university-based preparation programs" (Vanderhaar et al., 2006, p. 31). In light of increased accountability placed on school leaders, it is crucial that the partnerships between universities and school districts develop into strong collaborative efforts that prepare school leaders for the challenges they will face (Quinn, 2005).

In Simmons et al. (2007), university-district collaboration appeared as one of the three most critical components to principal preparation programs. A balance should be established between university programs heavy in theory and the school districts that have alternative routes to the role of a principal. As sited by Fry, Bottoms, & O'Neill (2005), when investigating the quality of internships housed in universities, some of the evidence one should look for includes the level of collaboration between universities and school districts during principal preparation, e.g., real-world assignments that provide the principal candidates with opportunities to apply the knowledge learned according to the standards and research; placements in schools with a diverse population of students, teachers, and parents; creation of a handbook that jointly defines expectations, processes and schedules; and feedback from supervising faculty that provide opportunities for growth. In partnerships where the universities and school district collaborate on the structure of principal preparation programs, university faculty serve as advisors to the

school districts as well as provide on-site university courses to rising principals (Davis et al., 2005).

Orr et al. (2010) provided a good example of a strong partnership between a school district and the university in their description of a St. Louis preparation program in which principal candidates participate in an internship four days a week and attend classes on Thursday evenings and all day Fridays. The classes are structured in a format that allows the candidates to problem-solve and connect the learning with their day-to-day experiences in their internship. As courses conclude, discussions between district and university take place in order to keep the classes relevant to the needs of the school district.

Hale and Moorman (2003) spoke to the value of district-university partnerships in identifying good principal candidates. They stated,

> Absent partnerships with school districts, there are no easily accessible mechanisms for identifying the best candidates--individuals who have shown the greatest promise of future success as a principal and who will be likely to return to the school district and make valuable contributions. (p. 6)

Central Office Perceptions of Principal Preparation Programs

Petzko (2008), in commenting on a Public Agenda Survey conducted on exemplary leadership preparation programs, noted that "80% of superintendents and 69% of principals asserted that the leadership training in schools of education was out of touch with reality "(p. 227). In a national collection of requested input from superintendents

and/or principals on the question of what they believed to be the most important aspect of principal preparation programs, 60% identified the skills of developing and maintaining interpersonal relationships, best instructional strategies, collaborative decision making, evaluation and supervision, and instructional leadership as the most important qualities in a program. In addition, almost half of the superintendents stated that the required skill set relating to federal/state constitutional provisions, statutory standards and regulations, and the process of collective bargaining were nearly absent in the newly appointed principals (Petzko, 2008).

In a research study conducted by Whitaker (2001), 103 superintendents were surveyed on the quality and quantity of the principal candidates. Over 90% of the respondents indicated that there was a moderate to extreme shortage of principal candidates. One particular superintendent commented on the weaknesses of the candidates during the interview process and stated, "There is lot of interest in being able to hire people who understand how to deal with data, how to analyze assessment information, and to be able to develop a plan of how to improve" (p. 3). When looking at the principal preparation programs, several of the superintendents reported a longing for the university-based programs to play a more active role in preparation programs and to establish a better line of communication with school districts (Whitaker, 2001).

Superintendents acknowledged that expectations for principals were rising, and that the criteria for success were becoming more rigorous in school districts across the nation. Hess and Kelly (2007) reported that when superintendents described the qualities of successful principals, descriptors such as knowledge of accountability, instructional

leadership, ability to close the achievement gap, and discernment of teacher quality were at the top. "In fact, 67% of the principals reported that typical leadership programs in graduate schools of education are out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's school districts" (p. 245). Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) affirmed that over 50% of superintendents viewed the shortage of qualified principal candidates as a major problem across school districts.

Florida Principal Leadership Standards

According to Mendel (2012), "Obtaining effective principals requires four essential elements: principal standards, high-quality training, selective hiring, and a combination of solid on-the-job support and performance evaluation, especially for new hires" (p. 49). Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) called attention to the numerous inconsistencies and lack of common standards that have historically been found in principal preparation programs. However, based on Mitgang's 2008 report, this may have changed to some extent. As of that date, 46 states had adopted some form of leadership standards which they could use to evaluate principal preparation programs and evaluate school leaders with the intention of increased accountability.

The federal government has also taken into account the importance that school leadership plays in education as evidenced by funding efforts including Race to the Top (RttT) and school improvement grants (Florida Senate, 2012). Many states have responded to these grant opportunities and have, as a direct result, altered their standards

for principals to meet new and more universal standards such as those developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (Mendel, 2012).

The state of Florida has remained independent and has elected to retain its own standards and not join the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). Florida's leadership standards have emerged from the Florida Statutes. The adoption of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) in 2011 was preceded by a lengthy history of attention to competencies and standards beginning in 1985. A copy of the standards is provided in Appendix A.

In 1985, 19 Florida Principal Competencies were adopted and were used in preparing and certifying administrators across the state. In 1999, the Florida Principal Competencies were revisited, modifying them to add Human Resources Management and Development as a domain to the list. In 2002, the Florida Commissioner of Education called business, higher education, and school district leaders from across the state to an Educational Leadership Summit in which the prime focus was to review educational leadership in the state of Florida (Florida Department of Education, 2012). The results of the summit were that new educator leadership standards backed by the state were developed and student achievement was the ultimate goal of the standards. A committee was established to research and draft the standards, and a process of peer review was established to involve all stakeholders (Florida Department of Education, 2012).

After the standards were drafted, a series of meetings were held beginning in 2003 that involved over 200 contributors from 40 school districts who edited and revised the standards. In addition, all school level principals and representatives from the Florida

Association of School Administrators (FASA), Florida Association of District School Superintendents (FADSS), Florida Association of Professors of Educational Leadership (FAPEL), and the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) reviewed and provided feedback to the committee on the recommended standards (Florida Department of Education, 2012). The process resulted in the replacement in 2005 of the Florida Principal Competencies with the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The newly appointed Florida Leadership Standards in April 2005, were later adopted into rule (6 A-5.080) by the State Board in 2006-2007. As a result, the Educational Leadership and School Principal Certification programs were reconfigured to implement the new standards in 2008. The new standards served as the foundation for principal preparation programs and required the following actions by institutions of higher education, school districts and the Florida Department of Education: (a) revision of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE); (b) establishment of executive leadership programs; (c) reform of principal professional development programs; (d) establishment of principal designation programs; (e) revision of principal and assistant principal selection processes; and (f) revision of district, principal, assistant principal performance appraisal systems (FLDOE, 2012)

In 2011, a committee of teachers, principals, assistant principals, district administrators, superintendents, representatives from postsecondary institutions, and school board members convened with the task of revising the FPLS to align with contemporary research on effective school leadership in response to Race to the Top (RttT) and Senate Bill 736 (Florida Senate, 2012). The Teacher and Leader Preparation

Implementation Committee (TLPIC) used Reeves and Smith's (Florida Department of Education, 2012) Leadership and Learning Center framework to guide their work. On November 15, 2011, after several drafts in which public input was collected and rule development workshops were conducted, the State Board of Education adopted into State Board Rule the New Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The new standards, displayed in Table 2, are categorized using four domains and ten standards (Florida Department of Education, 2012). The standards set forth for principals provide the basis for shaping what is taught in principal preparation programs, what is looked for in potential candidates, the content of professional development, and what is assessed in on-the-job performance evaluations (Mendels, 2012). The standards are presented in their entirety in Appendix A.

Table 2

Florida Principal Leadership Standards and Domains (2011)

Domains	Standards
1. Student Achievement	Student learning results Student learning as priority
2. Instructional Leadership	Instructional plan implementation Faculty development Learning environment
3. Organizational Leadership	Decision making Leadership development School management Communication
4. Professional and Ethical behaviors	Professional and ethical behaviors

The Florida Legislature and the State Board of Education have allowed through Florida Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081 the opportunity to obtain the certification of school principal via a bi-level certification process that included a level one and a level two program. Level one programs lead to the initial certification in educational leadership and prepares the candidates in the newly adopted Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Level two programs immediately follow with continued preparation that lead the candidate to their final goal of certification in School Principal.

Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP)

The Wallace Foundation (2012) stated that districts are tasked with creating principal preparation programs that are rigorous, aligned with the standards, and relevant for modern-day principals whose main priority is raising student achievement. Orr and Orphanos (2011) indicated that "quality preparation matters and contributes significantly to what graduates learn and, ultimately, to how they practice leadership and work to improve their schools" (p. 50).

Orange County Public Schools (OCPS) revised its principal preparation program, a program for those certified in educational leadership who have been newly appointed to assistant principals, in May 2008 to align with the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) adopted by the Florida State Board of Education. In OCPS, newly appointed assistant principals or assistant directors are immediately placed in the Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) which encompasses three major components taking between two and three years for completion with a cap of five years. A leadership development

team is created for each principal candidate that includes the learning supervisor, PNPP coach, area superintendent, and the senior director of Professional Development Services (OCPS, 2008).

The first component requires a set of trainings that are created by the district and provide the principal candidates with required technical skills and knowledge aligned with the prior Florida Principal Leadership Standards. This first component aims to build leadership capacity within all principal candidates placed in the program and is divided into three categories: (a) instructional leadership, (b) building community, and (c) OCPS way-technical). The courses required within the instructional leader section of the training involve conferencing skills for administrators, expert leaders series, leadership for the differentiated classroom, classroom walkthrough, schools that learn, strengthening personnel assessment, ESOL for administrators, and several instructional leadership dialogues with sitting administrators (OCPS, 2008).

Once enrolled in the PNPP, newly appointed assistant principals or assistant directors are administered an educational leadership assessment from the Accelerated School Administrator Program (ASAP) in each of the 10 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. If principal candidates score above 70% (the passing score signifying competency) on any of the assessments, they are automatically exempt from trainings and proceed to selecting Individual Leadership Plans (OCPS, 2008).

The second component involves the creation and execution of leadership development plans using an action research model and enables candidates to demonstrate competency in the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The plans span over the

school year and begin only after consulting and receiving approval from the learning supervisor and PNPP coach. Each plan is required to focus on one or two specific FPLS, should be data-driven, and focused on a particular problem within the school. There should be concentrated efforts to align outcomes with student achievement levels and demonstrate knowledge of the FPLS through activities carried out to solve the school-based dilemma. Each learning supervisor reviews and rates each plan at the conclusion of the school year for evidence of growth (OCPS, 2008).

The final component of the PNPP is the completion of an eight-week internship supervised by the building level principal. In this portion of the program, the principal candidate assumes full responsibility of the principal role. According to Simmons et al. (2007), internships are an essential part of any principal preparation program and should be comprised of an intense yearlong experience, compensated in order to warrant well-prepared beginning principals. In the eight consecutive weeks of the candidate's new responsibilities, the learning supervisor, typically the building principal, relinquishes the leadership role to the candidate, assisting as needed. At the conclusion of the internship, a survey is administered to the faculty and staff in order to provide feedback to the principal candidate on performance on each of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. In addition to the survey, the principal candidate must also participate in at least two job shadows for every year in the program. The job shadows are intended for candidates to remove themselves from their buildings and observe schools at different grade and socioeconomic levels, and where principals display leadership styles different than they are accustomed to in their home school (OCPS, 2008).

Summary

The literature review has reinforced the relationship between effective principals and student achievement. The Southern Regional Educational Board (2009) noted that for schools without an effective principal there is almost no chance of improving student achievement. The Wallace Foundation (2011) reported the changes taking place in schools. Educational leaders have moved away from roles as traditional building managers focused on facilities, logistics, and following district regulations. They have assumed roles as instructional leaders focused on building a vision, creating a climate conducive to teaching and learning, building future leaders, improving instruction, and data-mining.

The literature review has also yielded information on how crucial the effective design of principal preparation programs are to the betterment of school districts across the nation. Regardless of whether the principal preparation program is university-based, district-based or a partnership between the two, solid programs are characterized by a combination of theory and practice along with a strong focus on the relevant duties associated with the role of principal. Davis et al. (2005), in their review of research, summarized it well, indicating that the most effective principal preparation programs report a standing relationship between the university and the district, are research-based, provide genuine experiences, use the cohort model, and provide mentors.

The direction of changes made by states and districts in terms of principal preparation programs has been clear. The last quarter century has seen a shift in standards required for principal certification (Mitgang, 2008), and the cry for reformed

leadership standards that are clear and emphasize leadership for student learning has been voiced by regional organizations such as the SREB (Petzko, 2008) and individual states.

In this chapter, the long history of Florida's emphasis on educational leadership has been reviewed. The history and development of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards was discussed, and the importance of the competence of principal candidates relative to initiatives, i.e., RttT and Senate Bill 736, was noted.

The program that was the focus of this research, the Preparing New Principals Program in the target district, was also explained. The review of literature explains the Preparing New Principals Program in Orange County as well as the three components of the program including required trainings aligned with the FPLS, leadership development plans, and the critical internship.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In the state of Florida, school principals must undergo two school leadership programs in order to receive certification as a school principal. The purpose of the first leadership program, as outlined in Florida Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081 (Florida Board of Education, 2007), is to attain the initial qualifications for certification in educational leadership and then allows for one to become an assistant principal. The purpose of the second leadership program is to prepare level one assistant principals to become principals and builds on the experiences from the first program.

This study was conducted in the Orange County Public School district in the state of Florida. The study was initiated by a senior-level school district administrator in an urban school district in order to gain information that could be used in possible revisions of the existing Preparing New Principal's Program (PNPP). The chapter has been divided into five sections containing: (a) a restatement of the purpose of the study and the three research questions which guided the study, (b) the process used in selecting the participants for the study, (c) the instrumentation used for data collection, (d) the procedures for collecting the data, and (e) the process of data analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of senior-level district administrators in the Orange County Public School District as to the value of the

Preparing New Principals Program in successfully preparing new principals as defined by the new principal leadership standards adopted by the Florida State Board of Education in November 2011. In 2012, Orange County Public Schools was named the 11th largest school district in the nation, fourth largest in the state of Florida, with almost 22,000 employees serving over 183,000 students (Orange County Public Schools, 2012). Given the size of the school district and the large number of qualified administrators required to lead the district's schools, the need for a strong principal preparation program aligned with the new principal leadership standards was apparent. The purpose of this study was to analyze data gathered to answer the three research questions which guided the study and provide feedback to the district that could be used in redesigning the OCPS Preparing New Principals Program.

Research Questions

The three research questions formulated to guide the research were as follows:

1. To what extent, if any, do perceptions in value of the Preparing New Principals Program components differ among senior level school district administrators?
2. To what extent, if any, do senior-level school district administrators perceive that Preparing New Principals Program completers are prepared to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards?

3. Which of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards do senior level school district administrators identify as the most beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement?

Selection of Participants

In 2012, OCPS employed approximately 462 district-level administrators and 464 school-level administrators (Orange County Public Schools, 2012). This study used the entire population of district-level school administrators in the target district from 2008 to 2011. The OCPS superintendent was contacted for the list of senior-level district administrators who had direct or indirect influence in placing completers of the OCPS Preparing New Principals Program in principal positions within the school district. All of the senior-level district administrators had some level of experience as an assistant principal, principal, or non-school based administrator. The list included 40 senior-level district administrators comprised of 28 females and 12 males. In 2012, when this study was conducted, 26 remained employed in the school district, 10 had retired, two had been employed as superintendents in other school districts, and two were no longer employed in the school district.

According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), it is recommended that when dealing with a population size of 40, a minimum sample size of 36 be considered. For this study, the researcher surveyed the entire population of 40 senior-level district administrators. Because the intent of the given study was to relay the varying perceptions of the senior-level district administrators on the components of the PNPP and the readiness of the

principal completers to meet the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards to the OCPS district, generalization of the results should be limited to the school district and preparing new principals program in this study. According to Krathwohl (2009), this particular study did not possess the characteristics of external generality since the research conducted in this study was specific to senior-level school district administrators in OCPS and their perceptions of the PNPP and alignment to the new FPLS.

Six survey participants responded in an email to the researcher, volunteering for a follow-up structured interview. These nonrandom samples of the larger population were contacted and a date, time and location were scheduled. In a qualitative study that encompasses interviews, Lunenburg and Irby (2008) indicated that the best number of survey participants was between one and 20. Of the volunteers, five remained employed in the district and one was retired. The six volunteers included four females and two males.

Instrumentation

The instrument utilized in this study was the Preparing New Principals Program Senior-Level School District Administrator Survey (Appendix B). The instrument was adapted from an existing research instrument developed by Pelletier (2011). The instrument was constructed based on the required components of the OCPS PNPP and the newly adopted 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Survey completers were also afforded an opportunity to volunteer to participate in a structured interview process.

One of the main purposes of administering the modified instrument was to collect data as to the value that senior-level school district administrators placed on each of the 33 PNPP components for their influence on the professional practice and success of school leaders. Survey items were organized into four sections. Section I was focused on three constructs: (a) instructional leadership, (b) building community and decision making, and (c) technical knowledge. It contained items 2-34 with a Likert-type scale to measure the value each participant placed on the required components of the preparing new principals program. Each participant was able to choose from five possible choices including impractical, not valuable, valuable, extremely valuable, and not applicable. Participants chose impractical if one of the PNPP components was not practical or sensible in influencing the professional practice and success of a school leader. The choice of not valuable was selected if participants did not believe the component was worth much and, therefore, not useful in the professional practice and success of school leaders. Section II of the survey (items 35-84) also used a Likert-type scale to assess the participants' perception of readiness of the program completers preparation to meet the 2011 FPLS. Each participant was able to choose from five possible choices including strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, and no opinion.

In Section III of the survey, which contained items 85-86, school district administrators were asked two open-ended questions which afforded survey respondents an opportunity to comment on the effectiveness of the PNPP in producing qualified school leaders. The final portion of the survey allowed the participants the opportunity to voluntarily participate in a structured interview process, thereby providing additional

valuable insight on program development decisions. Structured interview questions were synthesized based on the analysis of data obtained from the responses to the Section III open-ended questions. In the structured interviews, five open-ended questions were included in the interview questions.

In 2003, Rubio, Berg-Weger, Tebb, Lee, and Rauch defined the process of establishing content validity as including a panel of content and lay experts in the field who have published or worked in the field. The modified instrument was reviewed for content validity through an extensive process that included knowledgeable educational experts including professors in the College of Education at the University of Central Florida and OCPS district-level administrators who had served as principals and assistant principals and had vast experience with the PNPP program. Students in the first cohort of the Executive Ed. D in Educational Leadership program at the University of Central Florida, which included a wide range of school administrators, were also involved in reviewing and commenting on the survey sections and questions. Through these sources, the researcher was provided with input regarding the clarity of the intended purpose of the survey, thereby adding support for the instrument's content validity.

Data Collection

Prior to starting the data collection process, the researcher acquired the sponsorship of the OCPS School District Superintendent in order to improve the likelihood and volume of the senior-level school district administrators' responses. The inclusion of a sponsor for the survey research has vast benefits in that it can significantly

increase the response rate among individuals who might not otherwise be disposed to participate in the survey (Dillman et al., 2009).

The study used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies to obtain data. SurveyGizmo, a secure web-based online data collector, was used to collect and warehouse the data, and the data were held in a secure data center that was password-protected and retrievable only by the researcher. The collected survey data were later exported from SurveyGizmo and then uploaded into Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 20) computer software. The confidential online survey (Appendix B), focused on the values and perceptions of the survey participants. According to Dillman (2000), the online survey was one of the most significant advances in survey technology in the 20th century. Qualitative data were collected through a structured interview process with senior-level district administrators who volunteered and were then contacted by the researcher via phone or email to establish a time and place for the confidential interview.

According to Dillman (2000), a tailored design method to increase the response rate includes five elements. In this study, two of the five elements used were (a) a respondent-friendly questionnaire and (b) up to five contacts with the questionnaire recipient.

After the researcher received the appropriate documentation of approval for the research to be conducted from the school district's Senior Director for Accountability, Research, and Assessment (Appendix C) and the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board (Appendix D), the researcher sent a personalized electronic

email to each of the 40 senior-level school district administrators identified as the population to establish the importance of the study and ask for participant input in modifying and revamping the current program. According to Dillman (2000), a multiple number of email contacts increases the response rate. Thus, the researcher contacted the 40 senior-level school district administrators a week later via email and included the electronic link to the survey as well as the Informed Consent Letter (Appendix E). These items provided the participants with an explanation of the researcher's purpose of the study and the intended outcome of the research process. The letter included the support of the school district superintendent and further stressed the importance of the results of the study as possibly redesigning the PNPP program in Orange County Public Schools. Participants were guaranteed confidentiality and assured that their feedback would be kept secure and confidential. The researcher knew the identities of the 40 senior-level district administrators selected to participate in the research study, but all survey data were confidential, and the anonymity of respondents was maintained.

A second contact email was distributed to the survey participants, after which 16 participants completed the survey. The following week, a third contact email was sent, thanking the superintendent for her support as well as those who had completed the survey. A plea was also made asking for those who had not completed the survey to consider completing it in order to enhance the current program. The result of the third contact email produced six additional survey responses, increasing the total number of responses to 22. The final personalized contact was sent one week later and yielded one additional response. This brought the total completed surveys to 23 for a response rate of

58%. The survey link was open and accepting responses from December 15 to January 18, 2013.

After reviewing the responses to the open-ended questions in the Preparing New Principals Program Senior Level School District Administrator Survey, the researcher constructed the template for questions that would be used in the structured interview with the six participants that volunteered. According to Krathwohl (2009), face-to-face interviews are most beneficial for the researcher in that it creates an environment of trust, provides an opportunity for the researcher to exhibit interest in the responses given by the participant, and provides an opportunity for the participant to expand on answers when probed by the researcher. The face-to-face structured interviews were scheduled to be conducted over a month in late January. The researcher met with all six participants at an agreed upon location.

The same process was used for each structured interview and included a brief overview of the study. The researcher assured the interviewees that their identity would not be disclosed to the district, read the consent letter (Appendix E) aloud, and had each interviewee sign, giving permission for the interview to be recorded. The researcher used SoundNote, an Ipad application to record the interview. The same set of questions (Appendix F) were read to each participant and they were able to expand on their answers based on their direct experiences with principals who had completed the PNPP program. At the conclusion of each interview, the researcher transcribed the interview (Appendix F) and disposed of the recording. At the conclusion of each interview, the researcher assigned a number to each interviewee that only the researcher could decode.

Data Analysis

Analysis of Quantitative Data

A quantitative analysis of the data acquired from the 23 responses to the electronic survey was performed. These responses were uploaded into SPSS version 20 for statistical analysis.

Analysis for Research Question 1, as to the extent that perceptions in the value of the Preparing New Principals Program components differed among senior level school district administrators, used data obtained from survey items 2-34 on the Preparing New Principals Senior-Level School District Administrator Survey. The collected responses to the Likert scale were assigned a number that ranged from 1 to 4 and uploaded into SPSS to find the descriptive statistics that included mean, confidence interval, standard deviation, and frequency for component of the PNPP. These descriptive statistics were then reported and categorized into the following three constructs: (a) instructional leadership, (b) building community and decision making, and (c) technical knowledge. A mean for each construct was derived and a one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there was any significant difference between the means of each of the constructs. A significance level of .05 was established. According to Lomax (2007), a significance level of .05 ($p = .05$) can be used as the common level of significance in educational research.

For Research Question 2, as to the extent senior-level school district administrators perceived that Preparing New Principals Program completers were

prepared to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, data were analyzed by each Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) and then by one of the four constructs using descriptive statistics. The responses to the Likert scale were matched to a value (1 to 5) and uploaded into SPSS to find the mean, confidence interval, standard deviation and frequencies for each component of the Florida Principals Leadership Standards (items 35-84).

Data for Research Question 3, which sought to identify Florida Principal Leadership Standards that senior level school district administrators identified as the most beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement, were analyzed by combining the standards into four domains: (a) student achievement, (b) instructional leadership, (c) organizational leadership, and (d) professional and ethical behavior. The items included in each domain are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011): Domains and Survey Items

Domains	Survey Items
Student Achievement	35-40
Instructional Leadership	41-57
Organizational Leadership	58-78
Professional and Ethical behaviors	79-84

A mean was calculated for each domain and then used in performing a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test. The ANOVA was calculated for each of the four

domains to find the difference in the level of preparation to meet the standards in each domain and one professional demographic measure. Table 4 describes the independent and dependent variables along with the appropriate statistical tests run for each research question.

Table 4

Research Questions, Data Sources, and Statistical Methods

Research Question	Variables		Survey Item	Statistical Method
	Independent	Dependent		
1. To what extent, if any, do perceptions in value of the Preparing New Principals Program components differ among senior level school district administrators?	The construct within PNPP	Perceived value of the PNPP construct	2-34	Mean, confidence interval, standard deviation, frequency, ANOVA
2. To what extent, if any, do senior level school district administrators perceive that preparing New Principals Program completers are prepared to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards?	A specific leadership standard	Belief of being able to demonstrate a specific leadership standard	35-84	Mean, confidence interval, standard deviation, frequency
3. Which of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards do senior level school district administrators identify as the most beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement?	A specific leadership standard	Belief of being able to demonstrate a specific leadership standard	35-84	Mean, confidence interval, standard deviation, frequency, ANOVA

Ancillary Analysis of Qualitative Data

A qualitative analysis was performed for data acquired from survey items 85-86 as well as the voluntary structured interview responses from the six participants. Data collected from the six voluntary participants were analyzed and followed the tips for writing interview protocols and conducting successful interviews suggested by Jacob and Furgerson (2012):

1. Use a script.
2. Provide a consent for participant to sign.
3. Record the interview and maintain eye contact with interviewee.
4. Meet in a quiet location.
5. Ensure that both interviewee and interviewer are undisturbed throughout the interview.
6. Show interest and emotion to the interviewee.
7. Keep the interview on track and focused.
8. Make sure to listen carefully to what the interviewee is saying.
9. Thank the interviewee and end with the script.

The five interview questions asked of each of the interviewees were:

1. From your experiences in supervising principals, what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school district's PNPP?
2. From your experiences in supervising principals, what do you think are the three least beneficial components of the school district's PNPP?
3. What items/experiences should be added to the PNPP?
4. If you could design the ideal preparation program for the 21st century, what would it look like and how long would it take?
5. What other insights would you like to offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for our school district that would result in more effective principals?

The six interviews took place over a one-month period and each followed the same protocol suggested by Jacob and Furgerson (2012). At the conclusion of the last interview, the process of transcribing began. Each interview recorded on SoundNote was played continuously and transcribed by the researcher. Each transcribed interview was read, analyzed, and key phrases and themes were literally "cut" and placed in three categories, each representing one of the research questions. After the key themes and phrases of each transcribed interview were placed in the three categories, additional analysis of similarities and differences was conducted to further categorize responses within each research question. A spiral down approach was used to bring large theme categories into subcategories that would provide substance to each research question.

Each transcribed interview was read thoroughly, question by question, looking for common phases and themes. The researcher then sorted the themes by questions, placed

them in piles, and assigned a code. The themes were then combined; and overall themes, trends, and patterns were established. Tables were created by question to identify the top themes pertinent to the particular question and included sample responses from the interviewees. The intent of the qualitative data obtained from the structured interviews was to add to data collected in the quantitative portion of the research. According to Leech & Onwuegbuzie (2007), "Qualitative data can be used to strengthen quantitative research designs in general and intervention research designs" (p. 560). Data were triangulated by comparing and contrasting the results from the quantitative and the qualitative parts of this study. Thus, as advocated by Leech (2007), two different types of data validated the research findings.

Summary

This chapter has presented a detailed description of the methodology used to conduct the study. Included were a statement of the problem and a description of the population. The target population of the 40 senior-level school district administrators was described along with the processes used in ensuring content validity on the survey instrument used in the collection of data. The procedures for each of the data collection methods, quantitative and qualitative, were delineated. The methods of collecting and analyzing the data for each of the three research questions were displayed followed by the statistical tests conducted. The in-depth analysis of the research questions, using tabular displays and accompanying narratives, is presented in Chapter 4 along with the analysis of the qualitative data gathered in two open-ended questions and structured interviews.

CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to measure the various perceptions of those who held the position of senior-level district administrator from 2008-2011 in the Orange County Public School District as to the value of the Preparing New Principals Program in successfully preparing new principals as defined by the new principal leadership standards adopted by the Florida State Board of Education in November 2011. The data analyzed in this study were obtained from the 23 respondents to the Senior-Level School District Administrator Survey. These data were used to answer three research questions in order to provide constructive feedback to the district that could be helpful in revamping the existing school district Preparing New Principals Program.

Research Question 1

To what extent, if any, do perceptions in value of the Preparing New Principals Program components differ among senior-level school district administrators?

This research question was addressed first with descriptive statistics. All of the questions that were addressed appeared on the first portion of the survey, related to perceived value of PNPP components. All of these items provided 4-point Likert scale responses including I = impractical, NV = not valuable, V = valuable, and EV = extremely valuable. A fifth option, NA = not applicable, was available.

The descriptive statistics were addressed in two ways. The first involved calculating means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals for each individual item. According to Lomax (2007) overlapping confidence intervals is a good way to determine whether mean responses differ from one another. Overlapping intervals indicate similar means, whereas, non-overlapping intervals indicate mean differences (Lomax, 2007). The second way in which descriptive statistics were examined involved reporting the frequencies and percentages of each response for each question. Thus, a single narrative description precedes each pair of tables, linking data in the two tables.

Tables 5 and 6 provide the descriptive statistics and the frequencies and percentages for the value placed on the first component of the PNPP, instructional leadership. The mean score (M) along with the average distance from the mean (SD) are identified in Table 5 for each of the PNPP components of instructional leadership. Items are in rank order from highest to lowest mean score to indicate what senior-level school district administrators valued as extremely valuable to impractical. The item receiving the highest mean and ranking of extremely valuable was the 8-week principal internship (M = 3.87 and EV = 87.0%). The top ranking item indicated that a seven of eight of the 23 senior-level school district administrators placed a strong value on the internship. Of a possible 4.0, the mean score was 3.87. The next two items with the highest means and ranking of extremely valuable was the conference skills/coaching skills (M 3.70 and EV = 69.6%) and response to intervention (face-to-face) (M = 3.67 and EV = 60.9%). It should be noted that 2 (8.7%) survey participants indicated a response of not applicable on this particular survey response.

Additionally, the item receiving the lowest mean and ranking of impractical or not valuable was the written leadership plan (M = 3.14 and I/NV = 13%). The mean of 3.14, despite being the lowest mean score in the instructional leadership component, was indicated by the senior-level district administrators as valuable, and nearly one-third of placed a rating of extremely valuable on the written leadership plans. The next item receiving the lowest mean and ranking of impractical or not valuable was the item ESOL for Administrators (M = 3.14 and I/NV = 21.7%) followed by the Leadership Assessments (ASAP PORTAL) (M = 3.17 and I/NV = 8.7%). There were three items that had low responses and came next in having the lowest means. The three items were all on-line courses and include Leadership for Differentiated Classroom, Response to Intervention, and Schools that Learn.

Table 5

Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components: Instructional Leadership (N = 23)

Item #	Item Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
16	8-week principal internship	23	3.87	0.34	3.72	4.02
2	Conferencing skills/coaching skills	23	3.70	0.47	3.49	3.90
6	Response to Intervention (face-to-face)	21	3.67	0.48	3.45	3.89
14	Job Shadows	23	3.61	0.58	3.36	3.86
13	Relationship with completers principal mentor	23	3.57	0.51	3.35	3.78
11	Instructional Leadership Dialogues	22	3.55	0.67	3.25	3.84
12	Relationship with assigned PNPP Coach	23	3.52	0.73	3.21	3.84
3	Expert Leaders Series	20	3.35	0.49	3.12	3.58
8	New Managers Orientation	23	3.43	0.51	3.22	3.65
4	Leadership for Differentiated Classroom (on-line)	16	3.25	0.58	2.94	3.56
5	Response to Intervention (on-line)	17	3.24	0.56	2.95	3.52
7	Schools that Learn (on-line)	15	3.20	0.68	2.83	3.57
10	Leadership Assessments (ASAP PORTAL)	18	3.17	0.62	2.86	3.47
9	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) for Administrators	22	3.14	0.77	2.79	3.48
15	Written leadership plans	22	3.14	0.77	2.79	3.48

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 6

Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components, Instructional Leadership (N = 23)

Item	Impractical *f* (%)	Not Valuable *f* (%)	Valuable *f* (%)	Extremely Valuable *f* (%)	Not Applicable *f* (%)
8-week principal internship	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	20 (87.0)	0 (0.0)
Conferencing skills/coaching skills	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (30.4)	16 (69.6)	0 (0.0)
Response to Intervention (face-to-face)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (30.4)	14 (60.9)	2 (8.7)
Job Shadows	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	7 (30.4)	15 (65.2)	0 (0.0)
Relationship with completers principal mentor	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	10 (43.5)	13 (56.5)	0 (0.0)
Instructional Leadership Dialogues	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	6 (26.1)	14 (60.9)	1 (4.3)
Relationship with assigned PNPP Coach	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	5 (21.7)	15 (65.2)	0 (0.0)
Expert Leaders Series	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (56.5)	7 (30.4)	3 (13.1)
New Managers Orientation	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (56.5)	10 (43.5)	0 (0.0)
Leadership for Differentiated Classroom (on-line)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	10 (43.5)	5 (21.7)	7 (30.4)
Response to Intervention (on-line)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	11 (47.8)	5 (21.7)	6 (26.1)
Schools that Learn (on-line)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	8 (34.8)	5 (21.7)	8 (34.8)
Leadership Assessments (ASAP PORTAL)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	11 (47.8)	5 (21.7)	5 (21.7)
ESOL for Administrators	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)	9 (39.1)	8 (34.8)	1 (4.3)
Written leadership plans	1 (4.3)	2 (8.7)	12 (52.2)	7 (30.4)	1 (4.3)

Tables 7 and 8 provide the descriptive statistics and the frequencies and percentages for the value placed on the second component of the PNPP, building community and decision making by senior-level school district administrators. The mean score (M) along with the average distance from the mean (SD) are identified in Table 7 for each of the PNPP components of building community and decision making. Items are

in rank order from highest to lowest mean score to indicate what senior-level school district administrators valued as extremely valuable to impractical. The item receiving the highest mean and ranking of extremely valuable was ethical leadership (M = 3.65 and EV = 69.6%). The top ranking item of ethical leadership indicated that almost three quarters of the senior-level school district administrators placed a strong value on this particular descriptor of the PNPP. Of a possible 4.0, the average score was a 3.65. The next two items with the highest means and ranking of extremely valuable was interviewing and hiring practices (on-line) (M = 3.45 and EV = 47.8%) and facilitative leadership, tapping power of participation (M = 3.39 and EV = 47.8%).

Additionally, the items receiving the lowest means and ranking of impractical or not valuable were the staff development protocol practices (M = 3.00 and I/NV = 13.0%) and diversity (M = 3.10 and I/NV = 13.0%). When it came to placing a value on each of the items in this particular component, the item of staff development received a value of not applicable from seven of the 23 senior-level school district administrators and diversity received a value of not applicable from two of the 23 senior-level school district administrators. Given the fact that these two areas of diversity (on-line) and staff development protocol practices did not elicit a specific value could indicate that the participants did not have strong opinions about the particular item component or did not want to indicate negative perspectives.

Table 7

Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components: Building Community and Decision Making (N = 23)

Item #	Item Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
18	Ethical Leadership	23	3.65	0.57	3.40	3.90
20	Interviewing and Hiring Practices (on-line)	20	3.45	0.69	3.13	3.77
19	Facilitative Leadership, Tapping Power of Participation	23	3.39	0.66	3.11	3.68
22	Problem Solving and Decision Making (PSDM)	23	3.39	0.58	3.14	3.64
25	Yearly survey of school staff	23	3.35	0.57	3.10	3.60
17	Ruby Payne Awareness (on-line)	21	3.33	0.66	3.03	3.63
21	Media Relations	23	3.26	0.54	3.03	3.49
24	Diversity (on-line)	21	3.10	0.63	2.81	3.38
23	Staff Development Protocol Practices (on-line)	17	3.00	0.61	2.69	3.31

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 8

Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components, Building Community and Decision Making, (N = 23)

Item	Impractical *f* (%)	Not Valuable *f* (%)	Valuable *f* (%)	Extremely Valuable *f* (%)	Not Applicable
Ethical Leadership	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	6 (26.1)	16 (69.6)	0 (0.0)
Interviewing and Hiring Practices (on-line)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	7 (30.4)	11 (47.8)	3 (13.0)
Facilitative Leadership, Tapping Power	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	10 (43.5)	11 (47.8)	0 (0.0)
Problem Solving and Decision Making	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	12 (52.2)	10 (43.5)	0 (0.0)
Yearly survey of school staff	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	13 (56.5)	9 (39.1)	0 (0.0)
Ruby Payne Awareness (on-line)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	10 (43.5)	9 (39.1)	1 (4.3)
Media Relations	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	15 (65.2)	7 (30.4)	0 (0.0)
Diversity (on-line)	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	13 (56.5)	5 (21.7)	2 (8.7)
Staff Development Protocol Practices	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	11 (47.8)	3 (13.0)	6 (26.1)

Tables 9 and 10 provide the descriptive statistics and the frequencies and percentages for the value placed on the final component of the PNPP, technical knowledge, by senior-level school district administrators. The mean score (M) along with the average distance from the mean (SD) are identified in Table 9 for each of the PNPP components of technical knowledge. Items are in rank order from highest to lowest mean score to indicate what senior-level school district administrators valued as extremely valuable to impractical. The item receiving the highest mean and ranking of extremely valuable was the teacher evaluation system (FPMS or Marzano) (M = 3.87 and EV = 87.0%). The mean score of 3.87 was the highest mean of all three PNPP constructs. The highest frequency and percentage of all three PNPP constructs at 87%

considered knowledge about the teacher evaluation system to be extremely valuable. The next two items with the highest means and ranking of extremely valuable was employee relations (M = 3.64 and EV = 63.6%) followed by budget (M = 3.61 and EV = 60.9%). These two items had all of their frequencies in the categories of valuable and extremely valuable with more than half assigning extremely valuable.

In addition, the item receiving the lowest means and ranking of impractical or not valuable included the SharePoint Orientation (M = 2.84 and I/NV = 21.7%). Of the items in this construct, 17.4% of the senior-level school district administrators placed a value of not applicable on SharePoint Orientation. The item with the next lowest average was podcasts (M = 2.89 and NV = 17.4%) with 21.7% placing a value of not applicable. This item in the construct of technical knowledge tied with data analysis (on-line) in having the most participants not placing a value. This could be due to the fact that the senior-level district administrators did not believe it was applicable or did not know much about the particular component. Lastly, the PNPP orientation (M = 3.13 and NV = 17.4%) rounded out the lowest mean and ranking of impractical or not valuable.

Table 9

Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components: Technical Knowledge (N = 23)

Item #	Item Descriptor	*N*	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
27	Teacher Evaluation System (FPMS or Marzano)	23	3.87	0.34	3.72	4.02
30	Employee Relations	22	3.64	0.49	3.42	3.85
26	Budget	23	3.61	0.50	3.39	3.82
28	Master Schedule	22	3.55	0.60	3.28	3.81
29	Data Analysis (on-line)	18	3.33	0.91	2.88	3.78
34	Yearly progress meetings with district staff	22	3.23	0.61	2.96	3.50
32	PNPP Orientation	23	3.13	0.69	2.83	3.43
31	Podcasts	18	2.89	0.58	2.60	3.18
33	SharePoint Orientation	19	2.84	0.77	2.47	3.21

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 10

Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Value Placed on Preparing New Principal Program (PNPP) Components, Technical Knowledge (N = 23)

Item	Impractical *f* (%)	Not Valuable *f* (%)	Valuable *f* (%)	Extremely Valuable *f* (%)	Not Applicable *f* (%)
Teacher Evaluation System (FPMS/Marzano	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	20 (87.0)	0 (0.0%)
Employee Relations	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (34.8)	14 (60.9)	1 (4.3%)
Budget	0 (0.0	0 (0.0)	9 (39.1)	14 (60.9)	0 (0.0%)
Master Schedule	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	8 (34.8)	13 (56.5)	1 (4.3%)
Data Analysis (on-line)	1 (4.3)	2 (8.7)	5 (21.7)	10 (43.5)	5 (21.7%)
Yearly progress meetings with district staff	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	13 (56.5)	7 (30.4)	1 (4.3%)
PNPP Orientation	0 (0.0)	4 (17.4)	12 (52.2)	7 (30.4)	0 (0.0%)
Podcasts	0 (0.0)	4 (17.4)	12 (52.2)	2 (8.7)	5 (21.7%)
SharePoint Orientation	1 (4.3)	4 (17.4)	11 (47.8)	3 (13.0)	4 (17.4%)

For each of the three constructs, instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge, composite variables were created for analysis via one-way ANOVA. For a given construct, all pertinent items with valid responses (those other than not applicable) were summed and divided by the number of items to attain a composite variable that retained the same scale as the original items (minimum of 1, maximum of 4) and could be interpreted the same way. Although the same group of respondents generated responses to each of these three constructs, the fact that each constructs measured a different component of perceived preparation prompted the independent treatment of variables. Therefore, a single dependent variable of perceived preparation was while the independent variable reflected the three types of preparation: instructional leadership, building community and technical knowledge.

Several assumptions were checked prior to running the one-way ANOVA including normality and homogeneity of variance. The first assumption was that the samples came from normal distributions and using the formal statistical test for normality such as the Shapiro-Wilk the normality test results yielded that normality assumptions were met: Instructional Leadership: skewness = -0.54, kurtosis = 0.22, Shapiro-Wilk p = .35; Building Community and Decision Making: skewness = -0.89, kurtosis = -.47, Shapiro-Wilk p = .08; Technical Knowledge: skewness = -0.34, kurtosis = -0.14, Shapiro-Wilk p = .61.

Homogeneity of variance was the second assumption checked to ensure the variability of scores within each subgroup was homogeneous. This assumption was

tested with Levene's test for Homogeneity of Variance and the results indicated that the assumption had not been violated, $F(2, 66) = 0.09$, $p = .91$.

Lastly, after all assumptions were verified, a one-way ANOVA was calculated. The results displayed in Tables 11 and 12 indicated that there was no statistically significant difference among the respondents in their beliefs related to the three constructs, $F(2, 66) = 0.54$, $p = .59$. Although the differences in the composite variables were not statistically significant, it is of interest to note that senior-level school district administrators' attitudes were about equally as strong toward the building knowledge and decision making component ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.42$) as they were toward the technical knowledge component ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.38$), and the instructional leadership component was rated the highest ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.36$). Again, however, there is no statistically significant difference in the perceived perception of value the senior-level district administrators place on the Preparing New Principals Program components.

Table 11

Analysis of Variance Results, Difference in Value Placed on Preparing New Principals Program(PNPP) Components by Construct Category (N = 69)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Perceived Preparation Type	0.16	2	.08	0.54
Error	9.92	66	.015	
Total	10.09	68		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics, Value Placed on Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Components by Construct Category (N = 23; n = 23 per group)

Group	*M*	*SD*	95% CI	
			LL	*UL*
Instructional Leadership	3.46	0.36	3.30	3.62
Building Community and Decision Making	3.34	0.42	3.16	3.53
Technical Knowledge	3.37	0.38	3.21	3.53

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

Research Question 2

To what extent, if any, do senior-level school district administrators perceive that Preparing New Principals Program completers are prepared to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards?

This research question was analyzed using descriptive statistics. All of the items that were analyzed appeared in the second portion of the survey and addressed the perceptions of senior-level school district administrators regarding the preparedness of PNPP completers to be successful in demonstrating the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement using a 5-point Likert-type response scale where SD = strongly disagree, D = disagree, N = neutral, A = agree, SA = strongly agree. A numeric value of 1 = SD, 2 = D, 3 = N, 4 = A, and 5 = SA was assigned to the respective responses.

The descriptive statistics were addressed two ways. The first method involved calculating means, standard deviations, and 95% confidence intervals for each individual question. The second method in which descriptive statistics were examined involved reporting the frequencies and percentages of each response for each question.

Tables 13 and 14 provide the descriptive statistics and the frequencies and percentages for the value placed on the first construct of the 2011 Florida Principals Leadership Standards, student achievement, by senior-level school district administrators as to the preparedness of the PNPP completers'. In Table 13, the mean score (M) along with the average distance from the mean (SD) is reported for senior-level school district administrator's. Items are in rank order from highest to lowest mean score to indicate which item descriptor of the 2011 Florida Principal's leadership Standards PNPP completers were most prepared for as perceived by senior-level school district administrators. Due to the narrow range of scores, the researcher combined the values of agree and strongly agree for discussion purposes in order to gain a better understanding of the perceived preparedness of the PNPP completers.

The item receiving the highest mean and ranking of agree/strongly agree was the item of school climate supports student learning (M = 3.87 and A/SA = 82.6%). These results indicated that though the mean showed the overall response to fall between neutral and agree, a high majority (82.6%) of senior-level administrators believed that PNPP completers were prepared to demonstrate this standard. The next highest means were learning results evidenced by assessments (M = 3.74 and A/SA = 69.6%) followed by high expectations for growth in all students (M = 3.74 and A/SA = 78.3%). Both items

had the same means, but more survey participants, a total of 78.3%, believed that the PNPP program completers were better prepared to demonstrate high expectations for growth in all students than they were to demonstrate learning results as evidenced by various assessments. The item receiving the lowest mean scores from senior-level school district administrators on the PNPP completers' preparedness on meeting the Florida Principals Leadership Standards in the first construct of student achievement was aiding faculty efforts to close student subgroup performance gaps (M = 3.35 and D/SD = 39.1%). This mean was significantly lower than the other five items in the construct of student achievement and had the highest percentage of responses in the categories of disagree and strongly disagree. The next lowest mean was learning goals on state and school district standards (M = 3.48 and D/SD = 30.4%). The senior-level school district administrators perceived that the PNPP completers were least prepared in ensuring that the learning goals were based on state adopted student academic standards as well as the district adopted curricula.

Table 13

Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Student Achievement Construct (N = 23)

Item #	Item Descriptor	*M*	*SD*	95% CI *LL*	95% CI *UL*
38	School climate supports student learning	3.87	1.10	3.39	4.35
36	Learning results evidenced by assessments	3.74	1.10	3.27	4.21
39	High expectations for growth in all students	3.74	1.25	3.20	4.28
37	Student learning-focused faculty system	3.70	1.15	3.20	4.19
35	Learning goals on state/district standards	3.48	1.24	2.94	4.01
40	Faculty efforts to close subgroup performance gaps	3.35	1.40	2.74	3.95

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 14

Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Student Achievement, (N = 23)

Item	Strongly Disagree *f* (%)	Disagree *f* (%)	Neutral *f* (%)	Agree *f* (%)	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
School climate supports student learning	1 (4.3)	3 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (56.5)	6 (26.1)
Learning results evidenced by assessments	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)	2 (8.7)	10 (43.5)	6 (26.1)
High expectations for growth in all students	2 (8.7)	3 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (52.2)	6 (26.1)
Student learning-focused faculty system	1 (4.3)	4 (17.4)	1 (4.3)	12 (52.2)	5 (21.7)
Learning goals on state/district standards	1 (4.3)	6 (26.1)	2 (8.7)	9 (39.1)	5 (21.7)
Faculty efforts to close subgroup performance gaps	2 (8.7)	7 (30.4)	1 (4.3)	7 (30.4)	6 (26.1)

Tables 15 and 16 provide the descriptive statistics and the frequencies and percentages for the value placed on the second construct of the 2011 Florida Principals Leadership Standards, instructional leadership, by senior-level school district administrators as to the preparedness of the PNPP completers'. Items are in rank order from highest to lowest mean score to indicate which item descriptor of the 2011 Florida Principal's leadership Standards PNPP completers were most prepared for as perceived by senior-level school district administrators. The items receiving the highest means and ranking of agree/strongly agree included the item of communicate relationships among standards, instruction, and student performance (M = 3.96 and A/SA = 78.3%), implement Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (M = 3.87 and A/SA = 73.9%), and use diversity to improve student learning (M = 3.87 and A/SA = 78.3%). The items receiving the lowest means included the appropriate use of aligned assessments (M = 2.96 and D/SD = 47.8%), and faculty understanding of cultural and developmental issues related to student learning (M = 3.13 and D/SD = 43.4%).

Table 15

Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Instructional Leadership (N = 23)

				95% CI	
Item #	Item Descriptor	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
43	Communicate relationships among standards, instruction, and student performance	3.96	1.07	3.50	4.42
53	Use diversity to improve student learning	3.87	1.01	3.43	4.31
41	Implement Florida Educator Accomplished Practices	3.87	1.06	3.41	4.33
51	Engage faculty in professional learning	3.78	1.00	3.35	4.21
52	Safe, respectful, inclusive learning environment	3.78	1.09	3.31	4.25
46	Learning linked to strategic objectives	3.65	1.07	3.19	4.12
47	Evaluate, monitor, provide instruction feedback	3.65	1.03	3.21	4.10
54	Promote valuing similarities and differences in students	3.61	1.08	3.14	4.07
42	Data analysis for instructional planning	3.52	1.38	2.93	4.12
48	Employ instructionally proficient faculty	3.48	1.12	2.99	3.96
50	Implement learning enabling culturally relevant instruction	3.35	1.30	2.79	3.91
55	Monitor and feedback quality of learning environment	3.30	1.36	2.71	3.89
56	Continuous improvement processes for student success	3.30	1.19	2.79	3.82
44	Implement curricula/standards w/rigor, relevance	3.30	1.26	2.76	3.85
49	Identify faculty instructional proficiency needs	3.26	1.18	2.75	3.77
57	Faculty understanding of cultural and developmental issues related to student learning	3.13	1.22	2.60	3.66
45	Appropriate use of aligned assessments	2.96	1.07	2.50	3.42

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 16

Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Instructional Leadership, (N = 23)

Item	Strongly Disagree *f* (%)	Disagree *f* (%)	Neutral *f* (%)	Agree *f* (%)	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Communicate relationships among standards, instruction, and student performance	0 (0)	4 (17.4)	1 (4.3)	10 (43.5)	8 (34.8)
Use diversity to improve student learning	0 (0.0)	4 (17.4)	1 (4.3)	12 (52.2)	6 (26.1)
Implement Florida Educator Accomplished Practices	0 (0.0)	4 (17.4)	2 (8.7)	10 (43.5)	7 (30.4)
Engage faculty in professional learning	0 (0.0)	4 (17.4)	2 (8.7)	12 (52.2)	5 (21.7)
Safe, respectful, inclusive learning environment	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)	1 (4.3)	11 (47.8)	6 (26.1)
Learning linked to strategic objectives	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)	3 (13.0)	10 (43.5)	5 (21.7)
Evaluate, monitor, provide instruction feedback	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)	2 (8.7)	12 (52.2)	4 (17.4)
Promote valuing similarities and differences in students	0 (0.0)	6 (26.1)	1 (4.3)	12 (52.2)	4 (17.4)
Data analysis for instructional planning	1 (4.3)	7 (30.4)	2 (8.7)	5 (21.7)	8 (34.8)
Employ instructionally proficient faculty	0 (0.0)	7 (30.4)	2 (8.7)	10 (43.5)	4 (17.4)
Implement learning enabling culturally relevant instruction	1 (4.3)	8 (34.8)	1 (4.3)	8 (34.8)	5 (21.7)
Monitor and feedback quality of learning environment	1 (4.3)	9 (39.1)	1 (4.3)	6 (26.1)	6 (26.1)
Continuous improvement processes for student success	1 (4.3)	7 (30.4)	2 (8.7)	10 (43.5)	3 (13.0)
Implement curricula/standards w/rigor, relevance	0 (0.0)	10 (43.5)	1 (4.3)	7 (30.4)	5 (21.7)
Identify faculty instructional proficiency needs	0 (0.0)	9 (39.1)	3(13.0)	7 (30.4)	4 (17.4)
Faculty understanding of cultural and developmental issues related to student learning	1 (4.3)	9 (39.1)	2 (8.7)	8 (34.8)	3 (13.0)
Appropriate use of aligned assessments	0 (0.0)	11 (47.8)	4 (17.4)	6 (26.1)	2 (8.7)

Tables 17 and 18 provide the descriptive statistics and the frequencies and percentages for the value placed on the third construct of the 2011 Florida Principals Leadership Standards, organization leadership, by senior-level school district administrators as to the preparedness of the PNPP completers'. Items are in rank order from highest to lowest mean score to indicate which item descriptor of the 2011 Florida Principal's leadership Standards PNPP completers were most prepared for as perceived by senior-level school district administrators. The items receiving the highest means and ranking of agree/strongly agree included the item of maintain high visibility at school (M = 4.22 and A/SA = 91.3%), recognize individuals for effective performance (M = 4.13 and A/SA = 91.3%), and allocate resources to promote school improvement and faculty development (M = 4.04 and A/SA = 91.3%). The items receiving the lowest means and ranking of disagree/strongly disagree included the plan succession management for key positions (M = 3.09 and D/SD = 43.4%), and evaluate decisions for effectiveness, equity, and outcome (M = 3.57 and D/SD = 21.7%).

Table 17

Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Organization Leadership, (N = 23)

Item #	Item Descriptor	*M*	*SD*	95% CI	
				LL	*UL*
75	Maintain high visibility at school	4.22	0.74	3.90	4.54
73	Recognize individuals for effective performance	4.13	0.55	3.89	4.37
70	Allocate resources to promote school improvement and faculty development	4.04	0.77	3.71	4.38
63	Cultivate potential and emerging leaders	3.96	0.93	3.56	4.36
69	Establish appropriate deadlines for self/organization	3.96	0.77	3.62	4.29
64	Evidence of delegation and trust in subordinates	3.91	0.90	3.52	4.30
66	Teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning	3.91	0.85	3.55	4.28
77	Utilize appropriate technology for collaboration	3.91	0.79	3.57	4.26
71	Fiscal responsibility; maximize resources	3.91	0.85	3.55	4.28
72	Actively listen to and learn from stakeholders	3.87	0.92	3.47	4.27
67	Supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education leaders	3.87	0.82	3.52	4.22
78	Faculty receives timely info about requirements and standards	3.87	0.82	3.52	4.22
74	Communicate student expectations to community	3.83	0.72	3.52	4.14
76	Opportunities to engage community in constructive conversations about important school issues	3.78	0.74	3.46	4.10
58	Prioritize decisions impacting quality of student learning and teacher proficiency	3.78	1.17	3.28	4.29
68	Organize time and projects effectively	3.74	1.01	3.30	4.18
61	Empower others and distribute leadership	3.70	1.02	3.25	4.14
59	Use critical thinking to define problems and solutions	3.70	1.22	3.17	4.22
62	Effective technology integration for decision making	3.61	1.20	3.09	4.13
60	Evaluate decisions for effectiveness, equity, outcome	3.57	1.16	3.06	4.07
65	Plan succession management for key positions	3.09	1.38	2.49	3.68

Note. CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit; *UL* = upper limit.

Table 18

Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Organization Leadership, (N = 23)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	f (%)	*f* (%)	*f* (%)	*f* (%)	*f (%)*
Maintain high visibility at school	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	1 (4.3)	13 (56.5)	8 (34.8)
Recognize individuals for effective performance	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	16 (69.6)	5 (21.7)
Allocate resources to promote school/faculty improvement	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	0 (0.0)	16 (69.6)	5 (21.7)
Cultivate potential and emerging leaders	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	1 (4.3)	13 (56.5)	6 (26.1)
Establish appropriate deadlines for self/organization	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	1 (4.3)	16 (69.6)	4 (17.4)
Evidence of delegation and trust in subordinates	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	1 (4.3)	14 (60.9)	5 (21.7)
Teacher-leadership functions focused on instruction/students	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	16 (69.6)	4 (17.4)
Utilize appropriate technology for collaboration	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	2 (8.7)	15 (65.2)	4 (17.4)
Fiscal responsibility; maximize resources	1 (4.3)	1 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	18 (78.3)	3 (13.0)
Actively listen to and learn from stakeholders	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	2 (8.7)	13 (56.5)	5 (21.7)
Supportive relationships among all stakeholders	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	3 (13.0)	14 (60.9)	4 (17.4)
Faculty receive timely information	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	3 (13.0)	14 (60.9)	4 (17.4)
Communicate student expectations to community	0 (0.0)	2 (8.7)	2 (8.7)	17 (73.9)	2 (8.7)
Opportunities to engage community school issues	0 0.0)	2 (8.7)	3 (13.0)	16 (69.6)	2 (8.7)
Prioritize decisions for quality	1 (4.3)	3 (13.0)	3 (13.0)	9 (39.1)	7 (30.4)
Organize time and projects effectively	0 (0.0)	5 (21.7)	0 (0.0)	14 (60.9)	4 (17.4)
Empower others and distribute leadership	1 (4.3)	3 (13.0)	1 (4.3)	15 (65.2)	3 (13.0)
Use critical thinking to define problems and solutions	2 (8.7)	3 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (56.5)	5 (21.7)
Effective technology integration for decision making	1 (4.3)	5 (21.7)	1 (4.3)	11 (47.8)	5 (21.7)
Evaluate decisions for effectiveness, equity, outcome	1 (4.3)	4 (17.4)	4 (17.4)	9 (39.1)	5 (21.7)
Plan for succession management	3 (13.0)	7 (30.4)	2 (8.7)	7 (30.4)	4 (17.4)

Tables 19 and 20 contain the descriptive statistics and the frequencies and percentages for the value placed on the final construct of the 2011 Florida Principals Leadership Standards, professional and ethical behavior, by senior-level school district administrators as to preparedness of the PNPP completers'. Items are in rank order from highest to lowest mean score to indicate which item descriptor of the 2011 Florida Principal's leadership Standards PNPP completers were most prepared for as perceived by senior-level school district administrators. The items receiving the highest means and ranking of agree/strongly agree included the item of adheres to Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct (M = 4.48 and A/SA = 100%), and engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment w/school system (M = 4.04 and A/SA = 86.9%). The items receiving the lowest means and ranking of disagree/strongly disagree included focused on school vision, reacts constructively (M = 3.30 and D/SD = 39.1%), and demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn (M = 3.70 and D/SD = 21.7%).

Table 19

Ranked Means and Standard Deviations for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Professional and Ethical Behavior, (N = 23)

				95% CI	
Item #	Item Descriptor	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
79	Adheres to Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct	4.48	0.51	4.26	4.70
82	Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment w/school system	4.04	0.93	3.64	4.44
81	Commitment to success of all students	3.91	0.90	3.52	4.30
84	Demonstrate explicit improvement in specific performance areas	3.87	0.87	3.49	4.25
83	Demonstrate willingness to admit error and learn	3.70	1.15	3.20	4.19
80	Focused on school vision, reacts constructively	3.30	1.26	2.76	3.85

Note. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

Table 20

Ranked Frequencies and Percentages for Senior-Level School District Administrators Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers' on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards: Professional and Ethical Behavior, (N = 23)

Item	Strongly Disagree *f* (%)	Disagree *f* (%)	Neutral *f* (%)	Agree *f* (%)	Strongly Agree *f (%)*
Adheres to Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct	0 (0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (52.2)	11 (47.8)
Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment w/school system	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (56.5)	7 (30.4)
Commitment to success of all students	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	1 (4.3)	14 (60.9)	5 (21.7)
Demonstrate explicit improvement in specific performance areas	0 (0.0)	3 (13.0)	1 (4.3)	15 (65.2)	4 17.4)
Demonstrate willingness to admit error and learn	1 (4.3)	4 (17.4)	1 (4.3)	12 (52.2)	5 (21.7)
Focused on school vision, reacts constructively	1 (4.3)	8 (34.8)	1 (4.3)	9 (39.1)	4 (17.4)

Research Question 3

Which of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards do senior level school district administrators identify as the most beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement?

Composite variables were created via a one-way ANOVA in order to analyze further each of the four FPLS constructs, student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behaviors. The results of the one-way ANOVA are displayed in Table 21. For a given construct, all pertinent items with

valid responses were summed and divided by the number of items to attain a composite variable that retained the same scale as the original items (minimum of 1, maximum of 5) and could be interpreted the same way. Although the same group of respondents generated responses to each of the four constructs. The fact that each construct measured a different component of perceived importance for success prompted the independent treatment of variables. Therefore, a single dependent variable of perceived importance for success was created, while the independent variable reflected the four types of perceived importance: student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behaviors..

Several assumptions were checked prior to running the one-way ANOVA including normality and homogeneity of variance. The first assumption was that the samples came from normal distributions and using the formal statistical test for normality such as the Shapiro-Wilk the normality test results yielded that normality assumptions were met: Student Achievement: skewness = 0.51, kurtosis = -0.81, Shapiro-Wilk p = .14; Instructional Leadership: skewness = 0.24, kurtosis = -1.17, Shapiro-Wilk p = .23; Organizational Leadership: skewness = -0.69, kurtosis = -.93, Shapiro-Wilk p = .24; Professional and Ethical Behaviors: skewness = -0.61, kurtosis = 0.08, Shapiro-Wilk p = .52.

Homogeneity of variance was the second assumption checked to ensure the variability of scores within each subgroup was homogeneous. This assumption was tested with Levene's test for Homogeneity of Variance and the although the results indicated that the assumption had not been violated, $F(3, 88) = 3.49$, $p = .02$.

Lastly, after all assumptions were verified, a one-way ANOVA was calculated. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference among the respondents in their attitudes toward the four FPLS constructs, $F(3, 88) = 1.01$, $p = .40$.

Table 21

Analysis of Variance Results: Difference in Perceived Preparedness of Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers by Construct (N = 92)

Source	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*
Perceived Preparation Type	1.96	3	.065	1.01
Error	56.99	88	.065	
Total	58.95	91		

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Descriptive statistics were obtained for each of the groups of the Florida Principals Leadership Standards and their means were compared to one another. Although no test was required due to the one-way ANOVA, the results displayed in Table 22 provides valuable information. The mean score for instructional leadership (M = 3.52, SD = 0.85) was lower than that of organizational leadership (M = 3.83, SD = 0.59) and of professional and ethical behaviors (M = 3.88, SD = 0.71), but not to a significantly significant degree. Lower than the score for instructional leadership but higher than that of the others was the mean score for student achievement (M = 3.64, SD = 1.02). No other differences among composite variables were statistically significant. This means that the senior-level school district administrators perceived that the FPLS

construct of professional and ethical behaviors was the most beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement followed by organizational leadership and student achievement. The mean score for instructional leadership was the lowest and signified that the senior-level school district administrators perceived that this construct was the least beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics for Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP) Completers: Perceived Preparedness by Construct (N = 92; n = 23 per group)

			95% CI	
Group	*M*	*SD*	*LL*	*UL*
Student Achievement	3.64	1.02	3.21	4.08
Instructional Leadership	3.52	0.85	3.15	3.88
Organizational Leadership	3.83	0.59	3.57	4.08
Professional and Ethical Behaviors	3.88	0.71	3.58	4.19

Note. CI = confidence interval, *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit.

Qualitative Analysis

Open-ended Questions

Senior-level school district administrators were asked to respond to two open-ended questions in the concluding portion of the quantitative survey. In Item 91, respondents were prompted to respond to "The principals hired would have been better

prepared to be a school leader if. . .” and asked to complete the phrase. All 23 respondents completed the statement on this item. In the second open-ended question, Item 92, respondents were given the prompt, “Please provide any other comments that you believe will improve the effectiveness of the Preparing New Principals Program?” The response rate for this question was 74% with 17 of the 23 respondents answering this question.

In analyzing the data obtained from the responses to the open-ended questions, the researcher followed the steps recommended by Taylor-Powell and Renner (2003). These researchers recommended (a) familiarizing oneself with the data, (b) defining the focus, (c) organizing the data, (d) identifying trends and patterns, and (e) explanation of the trends and patterns (Taylor-Powell & Renner, 2003, p. 2). Thus, the data obtained at the conclusion of the survey through Survey Gizmo were extracted into SPSS, and the answers to Items 91 and 92 were disaggregated, matching respondents by number to their responses. The researcher reviewed each respondent’s answers several times to familiarize himself with the data and then defined a focus for each of the questions, organizing the data into a spreadsheet that would permit the identification of patterns and trends across each question. Lastly, an explanation of each of the patterns and trends were derived from the responses.

Table 23 provides the three themes that emerged from the respondents’ answers to Item 91, The principals hired would have been better prepared to be a school leader if. . . The three themes that appeared in this open-ended question were that the principals would have been better prepared if they had a diverse level of experiences, if they had a

strong mentoring/coaching experience, and a differently structured internship. Table 23 contains the total number of related responses to each of the emergent themes and provides sample responses from the senior-level school district administrators related to each of the themes identified. Of the 18 respondents, four indicated that principals would have been better prepared if they had diverse levels of experiences. Mentoring was suggested by five survey participants, and three cited principal internships as an area that needed to be strengthened. The principal candidates are each certified with Level I Educational Leadership and the through the completion of a required principal internship through the school district's PNPP, the principal candidates are eligible to receive Level II certification.

Many other responses were given by the senior-level district administrators' in responses to Item 91 that did not generate enough for a theme in Table 23. The survey participants perceived that principals hired would have been better prepared to be a school leader if there was more preparation in the area of data and the use to inform instructional practices. Another senior-level school district administrator stated that they would like to see principals hired have more experience with data analysis and how to use it to drive instruction as well as use the data to help teachers to become better at their craft. The survey participants also perceived that principals hired would have been better prepared to be a school leader if more training was provided with regards to teacher evaluation and school leadership evaluation as well in-depth training regarding practices such as budget, and school scheduling. The mention of better understanding of the need to appreciate the school culture already in place before quickly making changes just

because the principal had the title as well as understanding building relationships was also mentioned in the first open-ended question. Lastly, comments regarding principals being better prepared in the areas of systems thinking, change facilitation, and collective leadership as well as a better understanding of the strategies and methods on increasing student achievement for all learners including gifted, students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELL), and struggling learners.

Table 23

Themes and Sample Responses to Open-ended Item 91 (N = 23)

Themes (Total related Responses)	Sample Responses to Open Ended Item: *Principals hired would have been better prepared to be a school leader if. . .*
Diverse Level of Experiences (4)	". . . they have had diverse school level experiences ranging from working with inner city schools and more suburban settings" (Respondent 3).
	". . . they had adequate experiences from more than one school setting as an assistant principal and had been AP for at least 5 years" (Respondent 19).
	". . . every school leader should have experiences in different schools, inner-city, racially and ethnically mixed and high poverty schools where they can have the opportunity to work with ALL children" (Respondent 20).
Mentoring/Coaching (5)	"…job shadowing with successful principals" (Respondent 6).
	". . . more intense and coaching continued through the first year on the job" (Respondent 16).
	"They had a leadership coach for two years. . . not an instructional leadership coach. There is a big difference and I would like to talk to discuss this with you. This person is not their supervisor" (Respondent 18).
Principal Internships (5)	"They have more than one internship experience" (Respondent 10).
	"Internships were longer and more intense" (Respondent 16).
	". . . they had a full semester of an internship at a school and more importantly if the supervising principal is a high performing in the area of student achievement, not just day to day management" (Respondent 24).

Table 24 provides the top three themes that emerged in the review of senior-level district administrators' responses to Item 92, Please provide any other comments that you

believe will improve the effectiveness of the Preparing New Principals Program. Respondents shared a total of six comments related to the importance of a mentoring/coaching component in improving the effectiveness of the PNPP. Of the 17 respondents, two mentioned the need for PNPP candidates to gain diverse levels of experiences. Finally, the last theme directed at improving the effectiveness of the PNPP was the need to revamp and update the PNPP program. A total of five senior-level school district administrators offered suggestions directed at modifying or restructuring the program.

Many other responses were given by the senior-level district administrators' in responses to Item 92 that did not generate enough for a theme in Table 24. The survey participants perceived that in order to improve the effectiveness of the Preparing New Principals Program, a component of servant leadership and time management need to be added to better prepare future principals. Another comment revealed by the senior-level district administrators in the open-ended response stated that in order to improve the PNPP program, it needs to be differentiated for assistant principals based on their knowledge, experience, and current responsibilities. "Many have deep experiences and knowledge in particular areas, but need more that what the program offers in others" (Respondent 15). Finally, the senior-level district administrators stated in the open-ended response that focusing less on paperwork and added tasks independent of their job assignment and more on areas of fiscal responsibilities such as budget, FTE, master schedule was crucial to improving the PNPP.

Table 24

Themes and Open-ended Responses to Item 92 (N = 17)

Themes (Total Related Responses)	Sample Responses to Open Ended Item: *Please provide any other comments that you believe will improve the effectiveness of the Preparing New Principals Program.*
Mentoring/Coaching (6)	"The more experiences given to have mentors and shadowing the better" (Respondent 3).
	"Develop a program for aftercare—coaching through year one as a principal" (Respondent 16).
	"More exposure to the leadership at schools who have moved their schools and closed the achievement gap" (Respondent 14).
	"PNPP coaches should be recommended and not just be friends with the candidate. The principal should also be recognized as an effective leader" (Respondent 20).
Diverse Level of Experiences (2)	"There is no substitute for on-the-job experiences. All new principals should spend time in schools with high as well as low SES. The principal's job in these schools is vastly different and should be recognized as such" (Respondent 5).
	"Program participants should have experiences in various socio-economic types of school settings" (Respondent 29).
Revamp/Update Preparing New Principals Program (5)	"I believe that the program needs to be retooled to meet the needs of school administrators in the 21st century. The job has changed and the program has not kept pace with the needs of principals in today's schools." (Respondent 2)
	"Due to other stresses on the system for time and attention, the PNPP program has not been updated for a few years and was showing its age." (Respondent 8)
	"A total revamping is necessary." (Respondent 24)

Note. Comments may exceed 18 due to multiple responses.

Tables 23 and 24 provide the responses to the open-ended questions from the senior-level school district administrators. The two tables have similar themes that comprise of the need for the Preparing New Principals Program to modify the program to have principal candidates experience diverse levels of experience ranging from high-socioeconomic to low-socioeconomic and primary to secondary schools. Another parallel between the tables was the theme of mentoring and coaching. Senior-level administrators indicate the need for strategic placement of PNPP candidates with mentors and coaches that are experienced in moving schools and recognized as effective leaders.

Structured Interviews

The researcher conducted a total of six interviews with senior-level school district administrators who had completed the initial survey and volunteered to take part in the structured interview process. The six interviews were transcribed by the researcher and then read, analyzed, and organized in three categories, each representing one of the research questions. The following tables and accompanying narratives contain sample responses to the five items from those interviewed and the themes that emerged in the responses to each interview question. A final summary table summarizes the reoccurring themes across all interview items and responses by the PNPP constructs with which they are associated: instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge.

Interview Question 1

The first interview question asked senior-level administrators what they thought were the three most beneficial components of the school district's Preparing New Principals Program. Table 25 contains the themes and sample responses generated by the interviewees to this first question. The most frequently reoccurring theme was the exposure to the Expert Series and the networking the PNPP candidates experienced in those trainings. The components of facilitative leadership, budget, and mentoring and coaching were all mentioned by at least two of the six of the interviewees. Themes not mentioned in the table, but referenced as a beneficial component to the PNPP included problem-solving decision-making, data analysis, teacher evaluation system, and the internship components.

Table 25

Beneficial PNPP Components: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6)

Themes (Total Related Responses)	Sample Responses to Structured Interview Question 1: *From your experiences in supervising principals, what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school district's PNPP?*
Expert Series/Networking (4)	"So it gives them an opportunity to network with key people" (Interviewee 3).
	"Sometimes you don't know what you know until you're exposed to others and have those conversations" (Interviewee 6).
Facilitative Leadership (2)	"How to work with people and not be autocratic" (Interviewee 1).
	"…it was invaluable to me in master schedule processes. It taught me how to work with various stakeholders" (Interviewee 2).
Mentoring and coaching (2)	"I think the mentoring that goes on as they work with another assistant principal that has been through it recently is a good thing" (Interviewee 3).
	"Creating networks of good principals to mentor and coach PNPP participants" (Interviewee 1).
Budget (2)	"Not just the numbers but how to actually calculate the programs they want and how to pay for it" (Interviewee 1).
	"I think the budget training is good" (Interviewee 5).
Job Shadowing (2)	"Visiting other schools with different populations" (Interviewee 4).
	"The coaching they receive with the job shadows is really important" (Interviewee 5).

Note. Comments may exceed 6 due to multiple responses.

Interview Question 2

The second interview question asked the senior-level school district administrators what they thought were the three least beneficial components of the school district's Preparing New Principals Program. Table 26 contains the themes and samples of comments provided in response. There was no overarching component that emerged in response to this question. Rather, respondents offered comments about the program in general, identifying several aspects of the program as least beneficial components of the PNPP. The survey participants mentioned that the several of the components were there for compliance purposes and did not honor the knowledge that principal candidates were entering the program with. Mentioned by at least two of the six interviewees was the fact that the PNPP was compliance oriented and not flexible to candidates coming in with experience. Many stated that the entire program seemed to be more of a burden than a help because items such as the binder portfolio, on-line classes, and several meetings were more to check an item of the list than to build the instructional leadership capacity of the candidates. Additional programmatic features mentioned as least beneficial to the PNPP at least once included the redundancy of the courses, the components that were focused on managing the store, the data component, the mentorships, and the job shadows. Lastly, interviewees believed that the courses in the PNPP were too broad, there was no accountability of the on-line courses taken and finally the diversity of the school district was not included within the program.

Table 26

Least Beneficial PNPP Components: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6)

Themes (Total Related Responses)	Sample Responses to Structured Interview Question 2: *From your experiences in supervising principals, what do you think are the three least beneficial components of the school district's PNPP?*
Compliance oriented (2)	"We do have pockets of people that come in that shine naturally and we should differentiate a little bit more" (Interviewee 3).
Redundancy (1)	"The courses can be redundant. I think that the best ones are the ones where they could take what they are working on and make that part of a practical thing what they are already doing so it's not double work" (Interviewee 3).
Data (1)	"If we are looking at data, it needs to be real data. It doesn't need to be manufactured data that everyone looks at, because I don't think that's a real concept" (Interviewee 6).
Binder (1)	"The biggest complaint is the humongous binder" (Interviewee 4).
Too Broad (1)	"I think sometimes, it's too broad. It's a lot of stuff" (Interviewee 5).
Mentorships (1)	"I think because it is structured incorrectly is the mentorships. I honestly believe that the mentorships are solely dependent upon the relationship built between the mentor and the mentee, and sometimes those relationships are in name only" (Interviewee 2).
Job Shadows (1)	"I don't think the job shadows necessarily are as effective as they should be because I don't think they are scripted enough for an assistant principal to garner the information that they are looking for" (Interviewee 2).
Diversity (1)	"I found sometimes that the diversity workshops that I participated in I really kind of felt like I already had the information" (Interviewee 2).
Accountability (1)	"We have to make it more of an accountable piece. Not just take the course online and check it off when you're done" (Interviewee 1).

Note. Comments may exceed 6 due to multiple responses.

Interview Question 3

The third interview question asked senior-level school administrators to identify what items/experiences should be added to the PNPP. There were a variety of responses from the respondents on this particular question. Table 27 contains the themes and sample comments generated by most of the interviewees to this question.

Many survey participants believed the PNPP contained all the right topics it just needed to be changed. Two of the interviewees stated the internship component of the PNPP needed to be lengthened, making it a true internship where the principal candidate has full control of the school. In addition, it was noted that at least two different internships experiences in diverse settings were needed. Other interviewees stated that the budget component needed to be more of a major part of the PNPP along with a shift of focus on operational components to the instructional leadership construct. Interviewees also mentioned the need for the data component of the PNPP to incorporate more real-world examples as well as the accountability of the learning from the components to be measured. Lastly, senior level administrators mentioned the need to streamline the PNPP process as well as create more online courses for the PNPP which contradicts their perceptions mentioned earlier on the value they place on the on-line items throughout each of the three constructs. A majority of each on-line item of the PNPP rank toward the bottom of each construct.

Table 27

PNPP Components that Should be Added: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6)

Themes (Total Related Responses)	Sample Responses to Structured Interview Question 3: *What items/experiences should be added to the PNPP?*
Principal Internship (2)	"I really think that the internship has to be a true internship" (Interviewee 4). "I think the internship should be longer" (Interviewee 5).
Diverse experiences (2)	"I would highly recommend that anybody who wants to be an administrator have experience in every single type of school" (Interviewee 1). "Two different experienced as an assistant principal before you could become a principal" (Interviewee 3).
Instructional leadership vs. Operational issues (1)	"I think another big thing we have to work on is instructional leadership…I think our PNPP surrounds more operational issues" (Interviewee 2).
Streamline process (1)	"I don't know that all of it was the very best use of time, but we just need to streamline as much as we possibly can" (Interviewee 3).
Data Management (1)	"I think by default our principals have gotten good at data. I don't believe our PNPP system really focuses on where you get your data from, how you manage it, and how to utilize it to be an instructional leader" (Interviewee 2).
Accountability of learning (1)	"I think if we say that this is what we are doing and that I think the right thing is to do it, we need to monitor and make sure that it's done" (Interviewee 6).
Increase online components (1)	"The more they can do online the better. That way they can do it on their own time" (Interviewee 3).
Budget (1)	"I think the budget has to become a major part" (Interviewee 2).

Note. Comments may exceed 6 due to multiple responses.

Interview Question 4

The fourth interview question asked senior-level administrators to share their thoughts on the design of an ideal program to prepare principals for the 21st century, what would it look like and how long would it take. This question by far sparked the most discussion and insightful comments. Table 28 contains the themes and samples of their responses on this topic.

An interviewee mentioned the need to be focused on early identification, stating that "the principal preparation program should start with the principal identifying potential instructional leaders within the building and coaching them to see if the particular track of educational leadership is the right choice" (Interviewee 2). Another interviewee explained the need for an ideal program to be practical, hands-on with every component meaningful to the role of an instructional leader (Interviewee 3). Other interviewees stated that the PNPP candidate needed different experiences, including the internship at two separate sites. Interviewee 6 suggested that PNPP participants serve in a co-principal model for an entire year prior to departing the program. Lastly, it was suggested that the final component consist of a lengthy internship process lasting 18 months that would begin six months prior to a year-long internship (Interviewee 5).

Table 28

PNPP for the 21st Century: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6)

Themes (Total Related Responses)	Length of Program	Sample Responses to Structured Interview Question 4: *If you could design the ideal preparation program for the 21st century, what would it look like and how long would it take?*
Early identification (1)	2 years	"I think it starts the moment somebody has an inclination to become an administrator, or the leadership within the building identifies someone who has the potential to be an instructional leader" (Interviewee 2).
Practical/reflective (1)	No indication	"I don't know how long it would take, but everything needs to be practical, hands on, meaningful, and relevant" (Interviewee 3). A reflective piece in which the candidates ask themselves "How badly do I want it? What am I willing to sacrifice? How do I budget my time? How do I maintain balance and my health?" (Interviewee 3).
Diverse experiences (1)	2 years	"I believe it would look a little different with experiences in a variety of socioeconomic areas" (Interviewee 1).
Internship (1)	2 years	"The individual would have to demonstrate leadership before in a variety of ways, but the main thing in the two years is that the individual would actually serve two internships at two different sites" (Interviewee 4).
Co-Principal model (1)	2 years	"I think we need to look at a model, that before we move an assistant principal into another school, especially if it's a new assistant principal, they must be a co-principal for a year with a principal for an entire year" (Interviewee 6).
Planning phase (1)	18 months	"Okay, so it would start in January with the principal that the candidate would be working with the following year. The internship would then commence on July 1st through June 30th" (Interviewee 5).

Note. Comments may exceed 6 due to multiple responses.

Interview Question 5

The last question asked of the senior-level school district administrators was related to other insights they could offer to assist in the development of a Preparing New Principals Program for the school district that would result in more effective principals. This question generated a reiteration of many of their responses to the previous four questions, but a few new insights were gained. Table 29 contains the themes and responses generated by the interviewees to this concluding interview question.

The internship component was mentioned again by one interviewee, stating that although the PNPP candidate assumes responsibilities in the internship, the principal is really still in-charge. Another interviewee stated that personnel guiding the PNPP program needs to be increased due to the sheer number of PNPP candidates in a large school district. Side-by-side coaching was also mentioned as a development strategy in an improved PNPP program along with a component of self-development that would focus on developing the goals and values of the PNPP candidates. Lastly, one interviewee indicated that the PNPP program required too much busy work, and another suggested that the district should look at the success of Fortune 500 companies.

Table 29

Insights to Improving the PNPP: Themes and Sample Responses (N = 6)

Themes (Total Related Responses)	Sample Responses to Structured Interview Question 5: *What other insights would you offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for our school district that would result in more effective principals.*
Fortune 500 Companies (1)	"I really think that the internship has to be a true internship" (Interviewee 4).
Side-by-side coaching (1)	"I would highly recommend that anybody who wants to be an administrator have experience in every single type of school" (Interviewee 1).
Internship (1)	"I think another big thing we have to work on is instructional leadership…I think our PNPP surrounds more operational issues" (Interviewee 2).
Personnel leading PNPP (1)	"I don't know that all of it was the very best use of time, but we just need to streamline as much as possibly can" (Interviewee 3).
Self-development (1)	"I think by default our principals have gotten good at data. I don't believe our PNPP system really focuses on where you get your data from, how you manage it, and how to utilize it to be an instructional leader" (Interviewee 2).
Too many requirements (1)	"I think if we say that this is what we are doing and that I think the right thing is to do it, we need to monitor and make sure that it is done" (Interviewee 6).

Note. Comments may exceed 6 due to multiple responses.

Table 30 summarizes the reoccurring themes across all five interview questions, specifically the items and responses by the PNPP constructs with which they are associated: instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge. Each tentative theme was placed under one of the three constructs

of the PNPP or in a separate category named PNPP Instructional Model. The themes that were similar were added together and placed in parenthesis. The summary table below indicates that the most themes reoccurring happened under the construct of Instructional Leadership. Mentoring and Coaching, the Expert Leaders series, and the Internships were mentioned as tentative themes four times, whereas Job shadows was mentioned three times. The next construct with as many reoccurring themes was under Technical Knowledge. The theme of budget appeared four times and data analysis appeared three. This correlates to the open-ended question, Item 91 in which senior-level school district administrators in which budget and data was also emphasized. The theme of PNPP Instructional Model included several responses that all entailed the delivery method of the PNPP. The specific items incorporated within this theme included the focus being more compliance-oriented with a redundancy of the items within the PNPP program. The mention of the binder and the accountability for the courses taken was also mentioned in the theme of delivery.

Table 30

Reoccurring Themes by PNPP Constructs of the Preparing New Principals Program (PNPP)

Instructional Leadership (total n = 15)	Building Community and Decision Making (n = 4)	Technical Knowledge (n = 8)	PNPP Instructional Model (n = 7)
Mentoring and Coaching (4)	Facilitative Leadership (2)	Budget (4)	Delivery (4)
Job Shadows (3)	Problem Solving and Decision Making (1)	Data Analysis (3)	Focus on Managing the store (1)
Expert Leaders series (4)	Diversity (1)	Teacher Evaluation (1)	Broad/Streamline (1)
Internship (4)			On-line components (1)

Note. Comments may exceed 6 due to multiple responses.

Summary

Chapter 4 has presented the analysis of the quantitative and the qualitative data collected from senior-level school district administrators as to their perceptions of the value of the Preparing New Principals Program and its impact on preparing the candidates to meet the newly adopted 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Three research questions provided the framework for the collection and analysis of the data.

The quantitative results of the data analysis led to the finding that there was no statistically significant difference in value of the senior-level school district administrator placed on the three constructs of the PNPP. The results also provided descriptive statistics on the readiness of PNPP completers as indicated by the perception of the

senior-level school district administrators on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards adopted in 2011. Lastly, the four constructs of the FPLS were analyzed and statistics indicate that there was a statistically significant difference among the respondents in their attitudes toward the four constructs of student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behaviors.

Qualitative data were obtained from open-ended responses and structured interviews. Patterns and themes were identified with components emerging related to the PNPP constructs of instructional leadership, building community and decision making and technical knowledge. Mentoring and coaching were repeatedly mentioned throughout the interviews in which respondents called for a true experience with an experienced and proven leader in the area of instructional leadership and closing the achievement gap of diverse populations. A discussion of the results, as well as implications for practice, and recommendations for future research follow in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The chapter contains a summary of the study and a discussion of the findings resulting from analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. Included in the chapter are implications for practice, recommendations for future research, and concluding comments. The problem statement in the research conducted was surrounding the Florida State Board of Education's adoption of new Florida Principal's Leadership Standards in November of 2011 and the impact on the Preparing New Principal's Program in Orange County Public School District. Through Florida Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081 a dual certification process is required before the certification of school principal is issued to candidates.

Summary of the Study

This research was a direct outgrowth of the Florida State Board of Education's adoption of new Florida Principal's Leadership Standards in November of 2011 and an interest in discovering the impact of the standards on the Preparing New Principal's Program in the Orange County Public School District. The purpose of the study was to measure the perceptions of 40 senior-level school district administrators as to the value of the Preparing New Principal's Program in preparing new principals to be successful on the newly adopted Florida principal leadership standards. The research questions which guided the study were designed to: (a) identify the difference in value as perceived

among the senior-level school district administrators on the components of the Preparing New Principals Program; (b) identify the perception of senior level school district administrators on the level of preparedness to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards; (c) determine the most beneficial components of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards as perceived by senior-level school district administrators in improving student achievement.

Chapter 1 provided an overview of the study. The literature review in Chapter 2 provided the background knowledge and rationale as to why the research was being conducted.

Chapter 3 described the methodology used in conducting the research. Quantitative data were gathered using an instrument adapted from an existing research instrument developed by Pelletier (2011). Qualitative data were gathered from responses to two open-ended items on the survey and six interviews conducted with respondents who volunteered to be interviewed.

In chapter 4, the researcher provided the presentation and analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data collected from the participants. In the quantitative section, each research question was analyzed and the appropriate statistics were shown. The qualitative section provided data on the open-ended questions from the survey and the structured interviews conducted from voluntary participants. The chapter concluded with a summary of the findings.

Discussion of the Findings

Three research questions formed the premise of the research study and led to the examination of the Preparing New Principals Program and the Florida Leadership Principal Standards as perceived by senior-level school district administrators in Orange County Public Schools. The following sections present the findings for each of the three research questions.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 queried senior-level school district administrators as to their perceptions in the value of the Preparing New Principals Program components. The data used in analyzing the first research question were collected from the 23 survey participants from section 1 of the survey instrument. Each set of questions was divided into one of three PNPP constructs and the mean, standard deviation, confidence intervals, and frequencies were analyzed by constructs. In addition, for each of the three constructs (instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge), composite variables were created for analysis via one-way ANOVA. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference among the respondents in their attitudes toward the three PNPP constructs of instructional leadership, building community and decision making, and technical knowledge. There was a moderate amount of practical significance ($\eta = .32$) as is evidenced in the following discussion.

The research by Darling-Hammond et al. (2007), Davis et al. (2005), Hess and Kelly (2007), and SREB (2007) stated that effective principal preparation programs included internships in the field with an effective supervisor. The survey results for the first PNPP construct, instructional leadership, aligned with the research and showed that 87% of the survey participants found the eight-week principal internship extremely valuable, followed by conferencing skills/coaching skills and response to intervention (face-to-face). The components that were rated the lowest included the written leadership plans, where 31.8% of the participants found it extremely valuable, shadowed by ESOL for Administrators, and the Leadership Assessments (ASAP PORTAL). The Wallace Foundation (2011) claim noted in the literature review that principal preparation programs are inappropriately sequenced and do not build upon each other supported the data in this study. These components, discussed by several of the participants in the structured interviews, suggested that many of the components are "busy work" and not really relevant to the program.

The survey results for the second PNPP construct, building community and decision making, showed that 69.6% of the senior-level district administrators perceived the ethical leadership component as extremely valuable, followed by interviewing and hiring practices (on-line). Research by Waters et al. (2003), Robinson (2011), and SREB (2007) support the notion that ethical leadership and interviewing and hiring practices are essential to an effective principal preparation program. The components that were rated the lowest included the staff development protocol practices, where 17.6% of the participants found it extremely valuable, followed by diversity, and the media relations.

The researcher's literature review did not align with the data reported from the participants that showed staff development and diversity at the lowest rated in relation to perceived value in a principal preparation program so it may be that the content or delivery of these unique components need to be addressed. Hattie (2009), Orr and Orphanos (2011), Robinson (2011), and Waters et al, (2003) all identified a connection to high student achievement gains when school leaders lead or encourage quality staff development. This researcher believed the low scores in this study may have been due to the content delivery within the PNPP program. If staff development is viewed as not helpful to principal candidates, they will be viewed as items to be checked-off a list with no connections or practical applications.

The survey results for the third PNPP construct, technical knowledge, showed that 87% of the survey participants found the teacher evaluation system (FPMS or Marzano) extremely valuable, followed by employee relations, and budget. These findings were supported by other researchers (SREB,2009);Wallace Foundation, 2011; Waters et al., 2003) who addressed the need for a principal to have situational awareness and be able manage people and resources to maximize student learning. The components that were rated the lowest included the SharePoint Orientation where 15.8% of the participants found it extremely valuable, followed by podcasts and the PNPP orientation. These components of the PNPP were added at a time when the extent of using technology was checking and sending emails. Much has changed in 2013, and many of the principal candidates are well versed in the areas of using SharePoint and podcasts and, therefore,

do not need to be taken from their work locations for a full day for these outdated components.

It can be interpreted by looking at the variances of respondent frequencies, that in a number of the analyses, senior-level administrators either did not respond or selected not applicable. These responses were then were treated as missing values. It is possible that the respondents wanted to avoid negative perceptions and chose not to indicate a perspective on individual items. It is also possible that some survey participants were out of touch with the PNPP and did not know what the particular component offered principal candidates. The PNPP program also experienced several changes over the last decade; thus survey participants could have been disconnected from the PNPP components that had a low response rate in each of the three constructs.

Research Question 2

To what extent, if any, do senior-level school district administrators perceive that Preparing New Principals Program completers are prepared to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards?

The data used in analyzing the second research question were collected from the 23 survey participants from section 2 of the survey instrument. Each set of questions were divided into one of four Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) constructs (student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and profession and ethical behavior), and the mean, standard deviation, confidence intervals, and frequencies were analyzed by each FPLS constructs.

In the survey results for the first FPLS construct, student achievement, 82.6% of the senior-level district administrators agreed or strongly agreed that the PNPP prepared principal candidates to meet the Florida Principal Leadership Standard stating that school climate supports student learning. The research by Davis et al. (2005) stated that one of the three critical aspects of the principal's job was the ability to put strong systems in place in the school that advocate teaching and learning for all students The Southern Regional Educational Board [SREB] (2009) concurred with the research of Davis et al. (2005) and stated that the structure and climate of the school environment attributed to the principals impact on the student achievement. Nearly 78.3% of the survey participants indicated that the PNPP prepared principal candidates to meet the FPLS that stated principal candidates have high expectations for growth in all students followed by 69.6% who indicated principal candidates ensure student learning results are evidenced by assessments. The FPLS that was rated the lowest, indicating that the senior-level district administrators perceived that the PNPP as not as successful in preparing principal candidates, were the items of engaging the faculty in closing the learning performance gaps among student subgroups and ensuring that the school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted standards and the districts adopted curricula. Davis et al. (2005) stated in their research that a fundamental component in the preparation of principals was the alignment to the state licensing standards.

The item in the survey results for the second FPLS construct, instructional leadership indicating that 78.3% of the senior-level district administrators agreed or strongly agreed that the PNPP prepared principal candidates to meet the Florida Principal

Leadership Standard regarding their ability to communicate relationships among standards, instruction, and student performance as well as the standard regarding their use of diversity to improve student learning. The research conducted by Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) provided specific indicators needed for principal preparation programs to be successful including standards-based curriculum emphasizing instructional leadership, organizational development, and change management, all which validate the results in this construct. Hattie (2009) provided a high effect size in improving student achievement for the specific dimension in which school leaders habitually visit classroom and provide teachers with constructive formative and summative feedback. The second FPLS construct included 17 items and the means of each item hovered around the neutral rating of 3 which may indicate that this construct was not impactful according to the respondents. If the survey items had been further subdivided, and more participants were included in the sample, a bigger difference may have been noticed.

The item in the survey results for the third FPLS construct, organizational leadership showed that 91.3% of the survey participants agreed or strongly agreed that the PNPP prepared principal candidates to meet the Florida Principal Leadership Standard in the areas of maintain high visibility at the school, recognizing individuals for effective performance, and allocating resources to promote school improvement and faculty development. Kouzes and Posner (2007), Robinson (2011), and Waters et al. (2003) concurred with these findings, indicating that the aforementioned items improve teaching and learning for all students.

Lastly, the final FPLS construct, professional and ethical behavior, had the highest ratings with 100% of the survey participants agreeing or strongly agreeing that the PNPP prepared principal candidates to meet the Florida Principal Leadership Standard that mentions the adherence to the code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct. Kouzes and Posner (2007) had earlier observed that modeling and clarifying values and reflection was one of the five practices a school leader made in making a great impact on the organization. Components in the FPLS construct had the highest means and scores of all four constructs, setting it apart from the other three. This may be explained with the information that this construct contains items that could easily create disciplinary actions, even termination, for principals, hence the high scores from the senior-level administrators on the ability of the PNPP in preparing principals to meet the FPLS.

Standards that survey respondents rated lower in preparedness included the ability to demonstrate resiliency by staying focused on the school vision, reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership, and the ability to demonstrate willingness to admit error and learn from it. Coaching and mentoring in the PNPP is somewhat haphazard as indicated by respondents and supported with comments from every participant in the structured interview; they mentioned the importance of a strong and reliable coach and mentor. According to Hattie (2009), this is relevant as he advocated for school leaders to embrace an environment and culture of learning so that leaders can learn from their errors. The culture of the school should be a safe one, where the teachers can learn, re-learn and seek understanding without fear of

their jobs. The low scores on the two standards may be a result of principal candidates not receiving appropriate mentoring and coaching. As Mitgang (2007) mentioned, principals can no longer be thrown into a "sink or swim" positions.

Research Question 3

Which of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards do senior-level school district administrators identify as the most beneficial to the success of a principal in improving student achievement?

For each of the four FPLS constructs (student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, and professional and ethical behaviors), composite variables were created for analysis via one-way ANOVA. The ANOVA results indicated there was no statistically significant difference among the survey respondents in their attitudes among the four constructs.

The FPLS construct of professional and ethical behaviors was rated significantly higher than the other three constructs, with organizational leadership close behind. The two constructs with the lowest significance were student achievement and instructional leadership. The results from the survey were surprising, because the focus on the preparing principals program has been on instructional leadership for the purpose of increasing student achievement. Still, these were the two lowest rated FPLS constructs. It is the belief of the researcher that the construct with the highest mean, professional and ethical behavior, was rated so high because the standards contained within it can "make or break" a principal, above all other constructs listed. A principal who does not adhere

to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional conduct for the education profession in Florida can quickly be demoted or even terminated. Furthermore, the standards such as demonstrating resiliency, demonstrating a commitment to success of all students while identifying the barriers to their success, demonstrating explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations, and engaging in professional learning that improves professional practice are foundational components critical to becoming a successful principal in the 21st century.

Ancillary Findings

To gain further insight into the quantitative data provided by senior-level district administrators, data were also analyzed from (a) two open-ended questions at the end of the survey and (b) six interviews conducted with respondents who volunteered to share additional thoughts with the researcher. Following is a summary and discussion of the qualitative findings as they relate to the themes identified and the results of the quantitative analysis.

The survey results within each construct were analyzed and the items receiving the lowest means were cross-referenced with the themes and categories identified in the interviews. In the FPLS construct of student achievement, one of the items receiving low marks was faculty efforts to close subgroup performance gaps. This topic was repeatedly referenced in all six interviews in regard to the need for principal candidates to have at least one internship in a school with predominately economically disadvantaged students. Several senior-level administrators commented that principal candidates who were placed

in diverse schools with wide gaps in student subgroups struggled immensely if they had not had an experience in this type of school.

In the FPLS construct of instructional leadership, items that received low scores were the appropriate use of aligned assessments and faculty understanding of cultural and developmental issues related to student learning. In their interviews, senior-level administrators noted principal candidates lacked appropriate experiences, mentorship, and accountability in demonstrating their knowledge and skills in each of the PNPP classes. Interviewee 1 stated,

> We have to make it more of an accountable piece. Not just, take a course online and then check it off when you are done. I mean, maybe they have to show with concrete examples personal experiences in which they demonstrated the task.

In the FPLS construct, organizational leadership, the items with the lowest scores in the quantitative analysis were "plan succession management for key leaders" and "evaluate decisions for effectiveness, equity, and outcome." Problem-solving and decision making were reoccurring themes derived from interviews with the senior-level administrators. Those interviewed stated that the lack of practical experiences where principal candidates could practice and use real-world examples to solve problems and make decisions was a weak area of the current PNPP. In addition, the lack of a true mentorship and coaching program contributed to individual "silos" created by the mentees.

Lastly, in the quantitative analysis, the construct of professional and ethical behaviors which included "focused on school vision, reacts constructively" and

"demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn" generated the lowest senior-level administrator scores. A theme that emerged from the interviews that supported the quantitative data was the notion that principal candidates need to identify their individual values and goals. These values and goals help candidates determine what types of principals they will be. Participant 4 stated, "I think it is important that the PNPP have self-development programs."

In summary, the tentative themes were combined and placed in Table 30 as reoccurring themes by PNPP constructs of the preparing new principals program. Under the construct of instructional leadership the survey participant's perceived that the mentoring and coaching were one of the essential themes throughout the structured interviews. They also mentioned the mentor could not be just an assigned principal in name only, but an experienced principal with a proven track record. Job shadows were another reoccurring theme in the interviews because it provided the principal candidates with an opportunity to visit other schools and network with principals in diverse learning environments. Lastly, the internships were another hot topic and essential theme throughout the interviews. There was much dialogue that sprouted with the mention of internships in the PNPP program. In the construct of Technical knowledge, budget did appear several times as a tentative theme in the structured interviews while other tentative themes appeared only once.

Recommendations for School Leaders

The purpose of this study was to measure the perceptions of senior-level district administrators from Orange County Public Schools as to the value of the Preparing New Principals Program in successfully preparing new principals as defined by the new principal leadership standards adopted by the Florida State Board of Education in November 2011. Based upon the findings of the study, the following recommendations are offered to the client for consideration in improving the PNPP.

1. It is suggested that a diverse group of senior-level district administrators, who have direct contact with school principals, serve on a committee to consider the wisdom of restructuring the PNPP program that is aligned with the new 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards.
2. It is recommended that each component of the PNPP be examined to determine if it has the quality of content and delivery expected and desired outcome and if it should be improved or deleted from the program.
3. It is suggested that a mechanism for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each newly appointed assistant principal be formed in order to differentiate the program as needed for each participant.
4. It is recommended that the program be streamlined to focus on the necessary components that enhance the instructional leadership capacity of the participants, to improve student learning, and close achievement gaps.

5. It is recommended that the PNPP extend over a period of two years, being flexible for candidates who are coming from out-of-state and demonstrate their success in regard to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.
6. It is suggested that mentors be selected for each of the PNPP participants in the first month of the program and that selected principals have at least three years of experience with demonstrated student achievement gains in their schools. These mentors need preparation to ensure that they also have mentoring skills and are willing to commit to mentoring novice assistant principals as expected and needed.
7. It is suggested that either an effective retired principal or college professor be assigned to the principal candidate as an objective coach, who plays no role in the candidate's annual performance evaluation. This coach would visit monthly during the first year and then bi-weekly throughout the internship.
8. It is recommended that the principal candidate undergo two different internships that last at least one semester each. Each internship should be in different schools, one being with economically disadvantaged students.
9. It is recommended that the PNPP have a system of measuring the knowledge and/or skills attained in each of the components to ensure mastery of the content.
10. It is suggested that the PNPP program add a component that includes self-development to build upon the candidate's values and goals.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are suggested as possibilities for future research in measuring the perceptions of senior-level school district administrators in the effectiveness of a Florida's preparing new principals program.

1. It is recommended that further research be conducted on the effectiveness of principals who complete the PNPP as it relates to the student achievement of the schools.
2. It is recommended that further research be conducted in other districts/states to investigate whether PNPP programs that are totally on-line are more effective than face-to-face programs.
3. It is recommended that further research be conducted with a larger population within the district.

Conclusions

This dissertation measured the perceptions of senior-level school district administrators in the Orange County Public School district as to the value of the Preparing New Principals Program in successfully preparing new principals as defined by the new principal leadership standards adopted by the Florida State Board of Education in November 2011. The results of the study indicated that a majority of the senior-level district administrators believed that most of the items required in the preparing new principals program were important. An important finding was that any item in the preparing new principal program that was completely on-line often elicited survey

responses of not applicable instead of a value that could be measured. These not applicable responses may have been an indication that respondents believed that on-line courses serve no value to candidates in the preparing new principals program. This was confirmed in the face-to-face structured interviews. On the other hand, the eight-week principal internship, ethical leadership, and the Teacher Evaluation System items in the PNPP were all significantly important to the senior-level district administrators as evidenced in the open-response questions, structured interviews, and survey results.

This study uncovered no major difference between the survey respondents in their perceptions of the PNPP completers being prepared to be successful in demonstrating the 2011 FLPS. Adhering to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct, along with maintaining high visibility in the school, ranked among the highest of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards mentioned by the survey participants. When comparing the four constructs, Professional and Ethical Behaviors scored the highest. This could be due to the fact that senior-level school district administrators believe that it is the most important and the basis for all other constructs.

The most significant results occurred in the open-ended response section of the survey as well as the structured interviews. Survey participants were more comfortable and provided honest feedback to each of the questions. The study revealed the importance placed by the senior-level district administrators on the quality of the principal internship. The lengths, location, quality of the supervising principal were all factors addressed by the survey responders in whether candidates would be adequately prepared to take on the role of the principal. In addition, all of the senior-level district

administrators interviewed stated that the current PNPP needed re-structuring in order to catch up to the 21st century and the district's new vision and mission. Items in the PNPP such as the binder, job shadows, leadership plans, and job shadows were deemed as compliance oriented and redundant, with too many requirements.

It is with optimism that the researcher provides the OCPS district with the research in this dissertation to aid in their efforts to update and revamp the current Preparing New Principals Program and successfully train principal candidates to become instructional leaders in an age of increased accountability and high-stakes testing. With an increase in outstanding principal candidates in Orange County Public Schools, student achievement should become evident.

APPENDIX A
FLORIDA PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS

Florida State Board of Education Rule: 6A-5.080 Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

(1) Purpose and Structure of the Standards.

(a) **Purpose**. 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.

(b) **Structure**. There are ten (10) Standards grouped into categories, which can be considered domains of effective leadership. Each Standard has a title and includes, as necessary, descriptors that further clarify or define the Standard, so that the Standards may be developed further into leadership curricula and proficiency assessments in fulfillment of their purposes.

(2) The Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

(a) **Domain 1: Student Achievement**:

1. **Standard 1**: Student Learning Results. Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's student learning goals.
    a. The school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula; and
    b. Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.
2. **Standard 2**: Student Learning as a Priority. Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success. The leader:
    a. Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning;
    b. Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning;
    c. Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students; and
    d. Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.

(b) **Domain 2: Instructional Leadership:**

1. **Standard 3**: Instructional Plan Implementation. Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. The leader:
    a. Implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C., through a common language of instruction;
    b. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement;
    c. Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance;
    d. Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school; and
    e. Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.
2. **Standard 4**: Faculty Development. Effective school leaders recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff. The leader:
    a. Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan;
    b. Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction;
    c. Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served;
    d. Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;
    e. Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction; and
    f. Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.
3. **Standard 5**: Learning Environment. Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population. The leader:
    a. Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities

for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy;

b. Recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning;
c. Promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students;
d. Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment;
e. Initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being; and
f. Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.

(c) **Domain 3: Organizational Leadership:**

1. **Standard 6:** Decision Making. Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data. The leader:
   a. Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency;
   b. Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions;
   c. Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed;
   d. Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate; and
   e. Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.
2. **Standard 7:** Leadership Development. Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization. The leader:
   a. Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders;
   b. Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders;
   c. Plans for succession management in key positions;
   d. Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning; and
   e. Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders.

3. **Standard 8:** School Management. Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment. The leader:
    a. Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans;
    b. Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization;
    c. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development; and
    d. Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.
4. **Standard 9:** Communication. Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community. The leader:
    a. Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders;
    b. Recognizes individuals for effective performance;
    c. Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community;
    d. Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school;
    e. Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.
    f. Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration; and
    g. Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.

(d) **Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior:**

1. **Standard 10:** Professional and Ethical Behaviors. Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader. The leader:
    a. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.;
    b. Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership;
    c. Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community;
    d. Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system;
    e. Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it; and
    f. Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.

Rulemaking Authority 1001.02, 1012.34, 1012.55(1), 1012.986(3) FS. Law Implemented 1012.55, 1012.986, 1012.34 FS. History–New 5-24-05, Formerly 6B-5.0012, Amended 12-20-11.

APPENDIX B
PREPARING NEW PRINCIPALS PROGRAM
SENIOR-LEVEL SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY

Preparing New Principals Program Senior Level School District Administrator Survey

I give my informed consent to participate in this study by completing this survey.

a. Yes

b. No

Section I

Choose the most appropriate response that reflects the **value** you place on the experience for its influence on the professional practice and success of school leaders. It is important that you indicate how you honestly feel about these experiences, not how you think you should reply. Please choose "not applicable" for any experiences that were not present during the time frame you served as a senior level school district administrator.

PNPP Components	Impractical	Not valuable	Valuable	Extremely valuable	Not Applicable
2. Conferencing skills/coaching skills					
3. Expert Leaders Series					
4. Leadership for the Differentiated Classroom (on-line)					
5. Response to Intervention (on-line)					
6. Response to Intervention (face-to-face)					
7. Schools that Learn (on-line)					
8. New Managers Orientation					
9. ESOL for Administrators					
10. Leadership Assessments (ASAP-PORTAL)					
11. Instructional Leadership Dialogues					
12. Relationship with assigned PNPP Coach (not completers building principal)					
13. Relationship with completers principal mentor					
14. Job Shadows					
15. Written leadership plans					

16. 8-week principal internship					
17. Ruby Payne Awareness (on-line)					
18. Ethical Leadership					
19. Facilitative Leadership-Tapping the Power of Participation					
20. Interviewing and Hiring Practices (on-line)					
21. Media Relations					
22. Problem Solving and Decision Making (PSDM)					
23. Staff Development Protocol Practices (on-line)					
24. Diversity (on-line)					
25. Yearly survey of school staff					
26. Budget					
27. Teacher Evaluation System (FPMS or Marzano)					
28. Master Schedule					
29. Data Analysis (on-line)					
30. Employee Relations					
31. Podcasts					
32. PNPP Orientation					
33. SharePoint Orientation					
34. Yearly progress meetings with district staff					

Section II

Based on your experiences of PNPP, please indicate your level of agreement with how well program completers were prepared to demonstrate the following.

The PNPP effectively prepared principals to:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
35. Ensure the school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district adopted curricula.					
36. Ensure student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.					
37. Enable faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning.					
38. Maintain a school climate that supports student engagement in learning.					
39. Generate high expectations for learning growth by all students.					
40. Engage faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.					
41. Implement the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices through a common language of instruction.					
42. Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement.					
43. Communicate the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance.					
44. Implement the district adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school.					
45. Ensure the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.					
46. Generate a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan.					
47. Evaluate, monitor, and provide timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction.					
48. Employ a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served.					

49. Identify faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology.						
50. Implement professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction.						
51. Provide resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.						
52. Maintain a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy.						
53. Recognize and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning.						
54. Promote school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students.						
55. Provide recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment.						
56. Initiate and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being.						
57. Engage faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.						
58. Give priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency.						
59. Use critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions.						
60. Evaluate decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed.						
61. Empower others and distributes leadership when appropriate.						
62. Use effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.						
63. Identify and cultivates potential and emerging leaders.						

64. Provide evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders.						
65. Plan for succession management in key positions.						
66. Promote teacher–leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning.						
67. Develop sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders.						
68. Organize time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans.						
69. Establish appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization.						
70. Manage schedules, delegate, and allocate resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development.						
71. Be fiscally responsible and maximize the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.						
72. Actively listen to and learn from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders.						
73. Recognize individuals for effective performance.						
74. Communicate student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community.						
75. Maintain high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engage stakeholders in the work of the school.						
76. Create opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.						
77. Utilize appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration.						
78. Ensure faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.						
79. Adhere to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida.						
80. Demonstrate resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership.						
81. Demonstrate a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their						

impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community.					
82. Engage in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system.					
83. Demonstrate willingness to admit error and learn from it.					
84. Demonstrate explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.					

Section III

Please provide the researcher with responses that will be helpful in informing program development decisions.

85. The principals hired would have been better prepared to be a school leader if…

86. Please provide any other comments that you believe will improve the effectiveness of the Preparing New Principals Program.

If you would like to volunteer to be confidentially interviewed by the researcher or have additional comments for input into the new PNPP that is being developed, please contact me, Eddie Ruiz, directly at ruize2@knights.ucf.edu or call my cell phone at 407-808-1696.

Thank you very much for taking your time to complete this survey. I can assure you, your input is confidential and will be very valuable to school district administrators as they work to develop the new program for preparing administrators.

APPENDIX C
DISTRICT APPROVAL FOR THE RESEARCH

Submit this form and a copy of your proposal to:
Accountability, Research, and Assessment
P.O. Box 271
Orlando, FL 32802-0271

Orange County Public Schools

RESEARCH REQUEST FORM

RECEIVED JUL 09 2012

Your research proposal should include:
- Project Title
- Purpose and Research Problem
- Instruments
- Procedures and Proposed Data Analysis

Requester's Name Eddie Ruiz Date 7/2/2012

E-mail eddie.ruiz@ocps.net Phone 407-808-1696

Address 2585 Guiana Plum Drive, (Street) Orlando, FL (City, State) 32828 (Zip)

Institutional Affiliation University of Central Florida

Project Director or Advisor Dr. Rosemarye Taylor Phone 407823-1469

Degree Sought: (check one) ☐ Associate ☒ Doctorate ☐ Bachelor's ☐ Not Applicable ☐ Master's ☐ Specialist

Project Title: Senior Level District Administrators' Perception of Effectiveness of One School District's Preparing New Principals Program

ESTIMATED INVOLVEMENT

PERSONNEL/CENTERS	NUMBER	AMOUNT OF TIME (DAYS, HOURS, ETC.)	SPECIFY SCHOOLS BY NAME AND NUMBER OF TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS, ETC.
Students	0		
Teachers	0		
Administrators	40	15 to 20 minutes	District level only
Schools/Centers	0		
Others (specify)	0		

Specify possible benefits to students/school system: This study will contribute valuable insight from OCPS Senior Level District Administrators into the current Preparing New Principals Program and its effectiveness in preparing them for the job responsibilities of being an effective principal. Results of this study will be used to assist in designing a new principal preparation program to meet the specifications of newly enacted principal leadership standards in Florida.

ASSURANCE

Using the proposed procedures and instrument, I hereby agree to conduct research in accordance with the policies of the Orange County Public Schools. Deviations from the approved procedures shall be cleared through the Senior Director of Accountability, Research, and Assessment. Reports and materials shall be supplied as specified.

Requester's Signature Eddie Ruiz

Approval Granted: ☒ Yes ☐ No Date: 7-9-12

Signature of the Senior Director for Accountability, Research, and Assessment Dixie Contreras

APPENDIX D
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: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Eddie A. Ruiz**

Date: **August 21, 2012**

Dear Researcher:

On 08/21/2012, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Exempt Determination
Project Title:	Senior Level School District Administrator' Perceptions of Effectiveness of A Florida Preparing New Principals Program
Investigator:	Eddie A. Ruiz
IRB Number:	SBE-12-08590
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX E
INFORMED CONSENT LETTERS: SURVEY AND INTERVIEWS

July 20, 2012

Dear OCPS Administrator,

My name is Eddie Ruiz a doctoral student at the University of Central Florida as well as the Principal of Jackson Middle School. You are invited to participate in a confidential research study titled "Senior-Level School District Administrator' Perceptions of Effectiveness of A Florida Preparing New Principals Program" designed to gather data on Orange County Pubic School's principal preparation program. As a senior-level school district administrator, your perspective is important to this study. You are one of approximately 40 senior level school district administrators, who were either directly or indirectly responsible for placing completers of the Preparing New Principals Program in principal positions in the school district during the time period from 2008 through 2011, who is being invited to participate in this study. Your collective input, which is anonymous, will be used to help guide the development of a new program for preparing future principals in our district. This electronic survey should take you approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Your participation is voluntary. You can decline to participate in this study without any repercussion. There is no anticipated professional or financial risk involved with completing the survey. The results of this survey may be published in aggregate, but no participants will be identified. The survey responses are anonymous, so your identity is protected. In addition, each participant will have the opportunity to voluntarily take a structured interview with the researcher in a set location agreed by both researcher and participant. The structured interview should last no more than 15 minutes. This is interview is solely initiated by the participant by simply responding to the last question in the survey and emailing the researcher. The results of the structured interview will be kept confidential and stored securely by the researcher.

If you have questions or need additional information, contact me at eddie.ruiz@ocps.net or my faculty advisor at the University of Central Florida, Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, at (407) 823-1469 or at rosemarye.taylor@ucf.edu. Research conducted at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is done under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns regarding research participants' rights may be directed at the UCF Institutional Review Board Office at the University of Central Florida Office on Research and Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826. The telephone numbers are (407) 823-3778 or (407)882-3299.

The submission of the online survey will indicate your consent to participate in this study. The link to the survey is: http://edu.surveygizmo.com/s3/1095993/Preparing-New-Principals-Program-Senior-Level-School-District-Administrator-Survey.

Thank you for your assistance with this study.

Sincerely,

Eddie Ruiz, Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida
Principal, Jackson Middle School, Orange County Public Schools
eddie.ruiz@ocps.net
(407) 249- 6430

February ____, 2013

Dear Senior-Level School District Administrator,

You recently completed an online survey regarding the Senior-Level School District Administrator' perception of the Preparing New Principal Program and volunteered to be interviewed to provide additional information about principal preparation. The interview will take no longer than 20 minutes to complete and consists of five questions. Your signature on this consent letter indicates your agreement to have this interview recorded.

Results from the interview will be analyzed and provided to the school district along with the results of the survey. Results will be anonymous. Your name will not be placed on the data collection instrument, only your participant number.

You will not receive any compensation or direct benefits for participating in this interview. Your participation is voluntary and you can withdraw from the interview at any time.

If you have any questions or comments please communicate with me at ruize2@knights.ucf.edu or you can call my cell phone at 407-808-1696. Questions and concerns about research participant's rights may be directed to the UCF IRB Office, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826. The phone number for the IRB office is 407-823-2901.

Thank you,

Eddie Ruiz
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida

My signature indicates my consent to be interviewed and recorded for this study.

_____ _____

Signature Date

APPENDIX F
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND TRANSCRIPTS

Structured Interview Questions

1. From your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three (number) most beneficial components of the school district's Preparing New Principals Program?

2. From your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three (number) least beneficial components of the school district's Preparing New Principals Program?

3. What items/experiences should be added to the PNPP?

4. If you could design the ideal preparation of principals for the 21st century, what would it look like and how long would it take?

5. What other insights would you like to offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for our school district that would result in more effective principals?

Researcher: Meeting with interviewee #1 on February 14, 2013. Do you verbally agree to be recorded for this interview?

Interview 1: I agree.

Researcher: All right so we can begin. So my first question for you is from your experience in supervising principals what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school districts PNPP?

Interview 1: I would say budget. And not just the numbers but how they actually calculate the programs they want and how to pay for it. Another one I would say would be how to work with people and not be autocratic. You've gotta make decisions as a group if you want their buy in and not just come in, um, and think you're the one in charge, which you are, but, um, you'll never make it. Um, they won't back you. They'll fight you on it. Because they're the ones, even though you may make the final decisions, they're the ones that's gonna carry it out. And the third thing, um, we need to do more about; and I don't know if we have these, but we need to do more about creating networks of principals, but good principals. Principals with integrity, principals who have a track record of doing the right thing and you know, good test scores, knowing how to manage a budget not just putting people together because that's my friend or we're in the same cluster. But people who are interested in helping others. Um, so you can make better principals.

Researcher: So refer back to what you said, you say you said, budget, uh, and not just the numbers but how to manipulate and how to work it to get the things that you need.

Interview 1: How to take it through, yeah.

Researcher: How to work with people in relationships, making decisions as a group, not coming in there authoritative and and, uh, you need to get that buy in and creating networks of principals so mentorship piece good ones with integrity, uh, and have good reputation not just, uh, a buddy system. Anything else you want to add to that?

Interview 1: No. It may come to me later.

Researcher: Sounds great. And any of these, the questions, you can just elaborate as much as you want, so, that's the purpose of it. So from your experiences supervising principals, what do you think are the least three benefits of components of the PNPP?

Interview 1: And that's hard for me to speak on because I'm not too sure what all the components of the PNPP are.

Researcher: Which I need to probably put in front of you so you can see them, that would've been good to do.

Interview 1: Can you tell me off hand?

Researcher: Yeah, it's like, uh, if you remember the components of the PNPP you're talking about, uh, actually I will bring, let me see if I have a copy of that, where would I have a copy of that? I don't have a copy of that. It just, you have the budget piece, you have like the facilitative leadership if you, if you remember some of these facilitative leadership, you had the problem solving, decision making, you have the ...public relations.

Interview 1: So we're talking about the workshops, the different … ?

Researcher: Yeah, all those components that are, that are in there, uh, on the PNPP, you know the mentor-you know they have the job shadows you had to do the, um, you know, uh, the job shadows, there's the internship competent to it where you had to be supervising you know, be in charge of the school for like nine weeks, for the nine weeks, uh, then all the course work that you had to do to you know, the assessment piece of it. Before it used to be FPMS and now it's the Marzano piece, um, budget, public relations, um, managing, uh, you know employees, you know all those, all those pieces that, you know that a lot of people just would go to and just sign off and do. Those are the ones I'm talking about.

Interview 1: All right give me the question again.

Researcher: So, from your experience as supervising principals what do you think the three least beneficial components of the PNPP.

Interview 1: Least beneficial, least beneficial. I would say they were all good. But we have to make it more of, uh, accountable piece. Not just, take the course online and check it off when you're done. I mean, I think maybe they have to show … like give me an example of when you did use this to back up the fact that you just took that course, you know. Give me an example of a time you did budget, uh, a program in your school, how did you facilitate it?

Researcher: Application, evidence of it.

Interview 1: Yeah, or you know decision making. All right, give me an example, you know, of when there was a crisis in your school between two different factors, um, and you had to bring it to term. What did you do? Show me that you followed the steps of the decision making process. So I think we need more, more, uh, let's see substantiated truth. You know, half of us could take these classes online at the end of the day and we would just take it. Because we knew it was required, you know like the management directives. Okay, I know not to do that. Um, did it ever happen in your school, you know, where you did have to follow you know management directive number four? How did you do it? How did you precede? Remember we used to have the Star, where you'd have to give examples …

Researcher: Situation the task the analysis of how you responded. Yeah I remember that.

Interview 1: Right, that's what they need to do with that. Might be a little bit of extra work but everybody can BS through those things, just to check it off and finish the program. How do I know that you really are ready to take over school cuz I put you in the school and now you've got this situation and you dying. You open up that notebook and it's like, "Okay, I'm supposed to do this, this …" but you have no foundation of when you did it before, you know, so maybe the principal should give a little bit more.

Researcher: So the principals should relinquish a little bit more …

Interview 1: Relinquish a little bit more even though they may not be during their internship. Principals have a lot of work to do, it's a crisis coming up principals don't need to feel they gotta do it all. I would send my AP. You know when I was on my vacation and suddenly somebody, you know wasn't gonna come in and schools about to start, I would tell my AP, you hire them, I'm not there, you go through the whole interview process with them. You really like them then you check background, you hire them. But if they turn out to be a mess; you will fire them and you will follow the procedure because I'm not gonna take on that headache. Now that was a good example. You hired the wrong person, all right you fire them, get rid of them. You go through the ninety-seven day or the whole thing but that's your baby. And you gotta do it right cuz its my signature at the very bottom, but, um, give them more responsibility to show that they really did take that course.

Researcher: Nice. Here you go, what items do you think, or experiences should be added to the PNPP? So, not, not talking about the components that are good, we talked about the beneficial ones, the ones that are least beneficial

but now if we were to create one, this would be the ideal PNPP program, what would that look like. What items or experiences would you add?

Interview 1: I would highly recommend that anybody who wants to be an administrator have experience in every single type of school. In a high poverty level school. In a middle class school, an all-white population, an all-black population because you've got some people that've only been at one particular school, they're used to all the parents support and then who knows their entire career may veer that way which is not fair because the bottom line is the majority of our children in our school system are poor and so every single administrator should know how to take care of those children because that's why you're in it. It's all about children so you've gotta be exposed to every single type of children. And yeah maybe you don't speak the language but you get an assistant principal who does speak the language. But, um, yeah, I think we need more principals who have more experience inner city, um, all over.

Researcher: Would you give them a time period or just being in there, so,um, so maybe design a program where there's there's five levels of schools. Are you talking about middle, high … ? or you just talking about the same …

Interview 1: No, if you're an elementary school person then fine but then I want you over Catalina. I want maybe over Sunrise, you know. Maybe I want you over there, um, not Ivy Lane, what's the school where it's predominately Hispanic? You know Catalina's predominately black. But I want you touching all children so that you know, okay, you gotta deal with that culture here. Sometimes it's not all academics. You gotta deal with the culture; you gotta deal with the parents. You know, you can't get parent buy in then you can't deal with all people, how in the world are you gonna reach the children? So that's what I'm talking … not elementary, middle, and high. Unless of course that's where they wanna go. But at least three different schools that might be completely different. Just to let me know that you know how to deal with kids, not just the good kids with parents who have money.

I used to tell my staff, you know we've got kids here who are gonna learn in spite of you. You could be, you know, you could have a hole in your head, those kids are gonna learn anyway because they got parents who's gonna make sure they learn. But then you got kids who's learning's only gonna depend on you. That's what they need to be exposed to.

Researcher: Uh, two more to go here. If you could design the ideal preparation of principals for the 21st Century what would it look like and how long would it take? So you've said a lot of it already a little bit, but, so if you could

design the ideal preparation for principals for the 21st Century what would it look like and how long would it take.

Interview 1: For principals … for principals …

Researcher: We talked about already how it would look a little bit with the different experiences and some of the things that you've said but maybe how long would it take or …

Interview 1: I'd say the prep part maybe … two years. Unless as a teacher you've already had a lot of those experiences. Like having taught up in CRT, um, in the different socioeconomic areas that I'm talking about. Um, staff development most definitely. Um, with of course proof, um, that you not only took the course but did ya use it? And then, matching them up with a good principal, not just somebody who needs an assistant. Um, but somebody that's good. And somebody who follows the rules, and doesn't just do their own thing. Which compromises everybody on that staff.

Researcher: And last one, what other insights would you like to offer to assist in the development in a PNPP for all school districts that would result in more effective principals? What other insights?

Interview 1: Um, I'd like to say those principals who are working within areas ESE areas where they're physically getting hit and beat, I think they out to make more money.

Researcher: So principals that are in areas …

Interview 1: Where it's more physical. You know, where you're constantly, on the guard with kids. Because some places are harder. I think there should be, you know, a stipend or something. Because you wear them out and there should be at least some incentives and also for those teachers in those particular schools to make the teachers stay. Okay, what was that question again?

Researcher: No you're good. But if there are any other insights you'd like to offer in how to assist the development of a new PNPP.

Interview 1: Um, probably more help in the PNPP program. Because I don't know if Debbie is the only one doing it but I don't see how in the world she can possibly do everything she's doing and actually follow-up.

Researcher: Well she's not only doing that but she's doing the Marzano, she has to deal with the Marzano and it's only her and Jenny Reeves trying to do …

Interview 1: Yeah, no I know …and more people to train because the only people who are training right now is Maria.

Researcher: And trainers. Yeah.

Interview 1: Oh yeah, that's it as far as changing the program. There needs to be a time where principals can actually sit and share. Not just a principals meeting and if you want to make the principals meeting an afterwards section that's mandatory sharing. Where you don't run back to your school. But there needs to be time put in a schedule saying "you have to do it" because if you say "find time," nobody finds time because nobody has time. Because it's like principals meeting you know you have to go, you know, and data meetings you have to go. Okay, on this particular day, um, it's a sharing session. Go have breakfast in the morning and then go on to your sights you know and sit and talk. And we used to do that, it was a group of us, um, I think maybe five.

Researcher: After, after the principal meetings?

Interview 1: No, on just random days. We'll say okay, what does your Monday morning look like, you know, any meetings? And we would meet early. 7:30, 6:00 and we'd be back at our schools by 9:00. But we'd sit and talk and not so much talk, we'd just laugh at all the stuff we have to do, the crazy things that happened at school and it was nice cuz we shared, you know, you sittin there thinkin, "Oh God I have to go through this but man I'm glad I didn't have to do what you had to do."

Researcher: Gotcha. Yep …

Researcher: Interview with Interviewee #2 February 21, 2013. He has just signed the release form to be interviewed, do you verbally consent to be recorded for this interview?

Interview 2: I consent (laughs)

Researcher: Beautiful.

So, the first question for you is from your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school district's PNPP … program.

So from the Prepared New Principals Program, what are the three most beneficial components of that, in your experience in serving ... uh ... supervising principals.

Interview 2: I think the one ... I ... uh ... I may reorder them, but the first one that comes to mind is facilitative leadership. Um … it was invaluable to me in master schedule processes. It taught me how to work with various stakeholders for my dissertation research on why principals are involuntarily removed from their positions. The inability to work with multiple stakeholders was one of the primary reasons that led to a career downfall. Um … on a personal note, I also believe that our PSDM model, or our Problem Solving Decision Making model is of value, I think it's underutilized by principals … in a formal sense. But in an informal sense, I think principals use PSDM all the time. So as they are making a decision, they are looking at what the potential impacts are, and then strategizing for how to mitigate or to lessen the impact of a particular decision, depending on whose affected.

Um … I think the other ... piece that's of value … I ... I'm struggling with a couple different topics but I ... I think the other piece that's of value which needs to be further expanded is the budgetary aspect of the training. I think the budget training is good, but ultimately every time I've been to one or trained in one or been the site trainer for one, we always end with “you're really not gonna know budget until you're in charge of it.” … and if we're going to effectively, professionally develop principals, that really shouldn't be the walk-away from a training.

But, just the exposure to SAP, which is our accounting system and, and, sort of s-sort of the FTE side of the budget and looking at the internal accounts aspect, which is the money generated from within a school ... field trips, athletic events, et cetera … I think that's of value to the candidates, I just think we need to do a better job with it.

Researcher: Good. How about ... how about from your experiences in supervising principals, what do you think are the three least beneficial components of the PNPP?

Interview 2: Mm … I think because it's structured incorrectly is the uh … the mentorships … Um ... I ... I ... I honestly believe that the mentorships are, are solely dependent upon the relationship built between the mentor and mentee, and sometimes those relationship are in name only. I don't think it's formalized enough to really draw out what an aspiring principal needs to know and needs to learn.

It's not a part of our program necessarily anymore, but I ... I ... I … and I know we're looking for consistency in building leadership. Not only in the principalship, but in the assistant principalship … but I really believe that the movement of principals to different locations is of value and we're not doing that as much as we used to do anymore.

Um … I always believed that when you worked with a principal, there were things that you learned that you wanted to keep … and, and use as you became a principal, and then there were things that you learned that you realized you didn't want to do when you were a principal.

So that speaks to that aspect of the job shadows. Um … I don't think the job shadows necessarily are as effective as they should be … because I don't think they're scripted enough for an assistant principal to ... to garner the information that they're looking for. Um … I don't think they're ... they're structured enough or scripted enough for … an AP to get what, from that principal, what they want to do as they run their school and also to get examples of things that they wouldn't want to do. And again, it's … it … a good leader meshes all of their experiences … and … and I don't think we're scripted enough there.

… Um … I know why it's in our program … but I would also suggest that if we don't understand diversity at this point within our school district … or maybe we ought to look at something other than the Ruby Payne training that we do … um … I found sometimes that the diversity workshops that I participated in … I really kind of felt like I already had the information.

Sorry, Eddie, for not looking at you. I have to think up, you're …

Researcher: No, you're, you're okay (laughs).

Interview 2: … asking me to recall stuff, so I'm trying to picture a list in my, my head.

Researcher: No, you're good. Don't worry. That's good, three of them. All right.

So … what items or experiences do you think should be added to the PNPP?

Interview 2: I think budget has to become a major part … I wouldn't put that first, but it was the first one that came to mind.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interview 2: I think budget has to be a major part of a principal … um, principalship. My research found that getting in financial trouble, as well as community stakeholder partnerships is a problem … Um … If you make mistakes with money … y … you're going to get in trouble for it. And we need to do a better job, not only of understanding how money is accounted for and how money can be spent … but helping principals to understand the ... the aspect of a finite resource.

2 million dollars, 1.5 million dollars, that's all you're going to get. How do I make that money work … to not only support all of my teachers and my staff, but more specifically to support the curriculum in the initiatives that I want … to do with my children and what my children need. Um, the worst scenario in the world is to find something you want to … put in place that you know will be effective for your children, but not have the money with which to do it cause you've spent it in other places.

I think another big thing we have to work on is instructional leadership … Um, I think our PNPP surrounds more operational issues, and maybe now with the changing of the principals' standards within the state of Florida, maybe our PNPP will shift to that. Um … but I really think a lot of our focus was more on operational silos than the instructional piece. Um … the conversation, the ability to have the conversations necessary to facilitate first-order and second-order change. Again, I go back to that stakeholders problem … your teachers, your students, your parents, your community. You've got to be able to manage all of those different groups to be successful in the position. And you've got to be able to speak about instruction.

Um … I think by default, our principals have gotten good at data. I don't believe our PNPP system really focuses on … where you get your data from, how you manage it, how you utilize it to be an instructional leader.

So, some of them …

Researcher: That's good. Those are awesome. Awesome, awesome.

If you could design the ideal preparation of principals for the 21st century, what would it look like and how long would it take?

Some of it you may have already said, if you want to add, I mean, I could add some more things in there, but ...

Interview 2: I think it starts the moment somebody has an inclination to become an administrator, or the … leadership within the building identifies someone who, who'd be an instructional leader.

So, therefore, a program of development has to be … developed at multiple levels. What do you do with the teacher or instructional unit, in our case, like a dean that shows promise, and how do you support them in making an informed decision to become an assistant principal.

So, I think leadership development starts early on. Even if they don't already have their Masters in Ed. Leadership.

We've got to start helping them make an informed decision as to whether they want to go on and pursue that.

Additionally, I think that there has to be better cooperation. So, in the second level, there has to be better cooperation between the districts, or increase cooperation between the districts and colleges, universities in their ed. leadership preparation programs. Their master's level programs.

We ought to be working with current research, the doctoral programs, especially at the University of Central Florida are coming out with that, that work with … developing leaders to make sure that the theoretical part of passing the FELE is taught, but at the same time the aspects of what's going to be expected of you on the ground in a school building is more well-rounded, and the district needs to support that.

So, level 1, I'm a teacher, a instructional unit interested. I get some support, I get some training, I get some professional level development here at the district that allows me to really think this is a decision I want to make to commit to a Master's program.

Once I'm in the Master's program, the district and the … um … the district and the university work in cooperation with each other to help these people continue to progress.

Once they become APs, then refocusing a PNPP on … on being … on being an instructional leader, how to create change, those types of issues. Um … that really focused training needs to occur, so if I add those all up,

you've kind of got year 1 as a, as a new or sort of inquisitive learner. You have years 2 and 3 in a master's program, possibly 4, depending on how long it takes you to complete. Um … and then you have at least 2 years in a PNPP program.. So, 1, 3, 5, but … so, if you're thinking about PNPP, I still think it's 2. I think 2 is an appropriate amount of time, just because of the level of responsibility that an AP has back at their site. They're not on their own. If you really wanted to change the game, you would pull a talented AP out of his role, or her role and you would train them to be a principal … and PNPP could be collapsed at that point into a year.

Um … it's really kind of outside the box and difficult in a public funding scenario, but I think you could compress the program … if you could increase the ability for that assistant principal for time on task in … in their professional learning.

Researcher: Gotcha. So one year, I mean … just to … 1 year, that inquisitive learner style. Level 2 to three years … uh … year 2 to 3 probably in a Master's degree, which in that role, they would be serving as what, still maybe a teacher, still maybe a dean ...

Interview 2: … It could be a teacher, they could be an AP ...

Researcher: … dean or …

Interview 2: … well, they couldn't be an AP, they'd have to be a dean. Yeah.

Researcher: Right.

And then … and then … year ... maybe possibly two years in a PNPP role … okay.

Interview 2: Yeah, if we keep the structure of the person having to work …

Researcher: … their way through that …

Interview 2: I mean, actually be on the ground in a building while they're doing PNPP, then I … I don't see a way to make it happen any faster, cause the principals need their assistant principals on the ground. You can't have them out every day, every week , for two or three days. You just … can't make it happen. But I think we can compress the training also into what is … what is more appropriate for the modern-day principalship. I think with the state of Florida changing the leadership standards they're … they're re-focusing what principals do and what they should be accountable for … and our PNPP needs to adjust to that.

Researcher: Awesome. And the last question's … easy. And you may have already answered this, so this could be just a time for you to add more but … what other insights would you like to offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for a school district that would result in more effective principals? You've mentioned a lot of it already, but if there's anything else … you can think of as we're talking here.

Interview 2: Repeat the question.

Researcher: What other insights … uh … would you like to … uh … offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for our school district that would result in more effective principals?

Interview 2: I … money's no ob … money's no object? Um … if money's no object, I think there needs to be side-by-side coaching. I don't think it needs to be daily, but I think we have a lot of effective retired administrators … area superintendents, former principals, district-level leaders who have retired who were fabulous school principals.

Um … I think Master's programs and PNPP programs can teach what to do …

Researcher: Hold on, I like that one. I need to write that down. Although I'm recording … cause I just read that book, the "Why" by Simon Sinek, so, ha, you hit a chord with me. So like … what is ...

Interview 2: I think PNPP and the Master's programs can teach what to do, but I think that ability to have someone whose non-evaluative, who you know is going to be there to support you … um … to discuss the how's and the why's.

Because as a new, I'm thinking, especially with a new principal … um … you know, they walk in to all sorts of different situations, they walk into situations where APs and their staff are really supportive and they want … they want to help the principal learn the culture of the building and other things. But at the same time, everyone who comes into a principal's office has an agenda. And … sometimes it's tough to see the forest through the trees, cause you're so busy doing other things. I think having side-by-side coaching, or some type of model like that with a proven, experienced, and effective former principal would be of real value.

I think that's what we're trying to get with our mentorships, but I don't think … and I … and I serve as a mentor … I … I mean, I have … I schedule in order to make it happen, I literally schedule each visit and each conversation … but I know some others … people in the program

don't get that level of support. It's kind of like when you call me, that's great … um … and I think it's because the people who are being asked to mentor have pretty specific and generally, very large responsibilities. If you had someone who is retired …

Researcher: Yeah.

Interview 2: … kind of the way UCF supports their interns with the … with the professor, the former principal who follows the interns around and … and helps them through their internship.

Um … I think we've got some people who live locally who would be fabulous at it. And look at just our current superintendent. As a Broad fellow, she has … a … a... a mentor from the Broad organization that she has 24 hours acc ... 24 hour access to. So, she moves forward running the eleventh largest district in the country. She's … she's ... not on her own. And I think sometimes we leave our principals on their own.

Researcher: All right, anything else?

Interview 2: Nope.

Researcher: All right, we are going to conclude the recording.

Researcher: You have just filled out the survey already and just verbally, Interviewee #3, can you please approve that it is okay to audio record this interview.

Interview #3: It is okay.

Researcher: Thank you for your consent. All right, the first question, from your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school's district PNPP program?

Interview #3: I think it gives them access to a lot of good people in the district who have, you know, kind of made their mark. So it gives them an opportunity to network with key people. I believe that that's important.

I think another aspect especially is the speaker series, when they have an opportunity to go. They have a variety of people that they can go listen to. I think that's very important. And I think the mentoring that goes on as they work with another principal or--I'm sorry--another assistant principal that has been through it recently is a good thing. It gives them a cohort of people who they can make a lasting friend. That they can pick up the phone and call if they just don't know who else to call.

I remember going through the program. It was in a different form, but I still remember my cohort of people and we've kept in touch. So I think that that bonding that takes place. And you're not in it alone, you're in it together. It's a nice cohort. It's kind of like when you go through a university program as a group. You really form a good bond and a good relationship, and somebody else to bounce ideas off.

A lot of times, I think that you think that you're the only one going through it as far as some of the issues that you come up. And it gives you an opportunity to just kind of know that, oh, this is normal. And I think that those are three of the strengths of the program.

Researcher: When you did the cohort group, did all the classes that you had to take, were you--it was the same group altogether?

Interview #3: Mm-hmm.

Researcher: It's not like today where you just sign up for courses. It could be different people.

Interview #3: The way I remem--yeah, the way I remember it, we pretty much all were together. We did some courses during the day, I remember. We did some courses beyond the school day. But this had to be 20 years ago so it's

changed quite a bit since, but I do remember the group of people I went through it with. And we're still, you know, close today.

Researcher: Did they have the same--sorry man--the same programs like--that they have today? Or I mean they've probably switched this …

Interview #3: It's changed. It's a lot more complex today. I think it is along the same line. They try to give you enough of a lot so that you could at least know what you're talking about, and know how to kind of survive and navigate, and get more information. But, yeah, we--I mean they would do things with legal and things on curriculum, and, you know, kind of how to maneuver through the district.

There were certain components of it that based on the Florida competencies that you had to master. It's similar to today, but they didn't have the plans back then that they have to do today. So I think in today's world, it's a little bit more practical. We were kind of in the beginning phases of it way back when.

Researcher: Cool. All right, thank you sir.

Interview #3: Sure.

Researcher: From your experience supervising principals, what do you think are the three least beneficial components of the PNPP as it is today?

Interview #3: I don't know that anything is least beneficial as much as I would say it's--I think the hardest part of it is the time management. I know what impacts principals by having someone go through it is it's really hard when they're out a lot. You need them with you, but at the same time you need to understand that they need to grow.

I think some of it can be redundant and more compliance oriented. We do have pockets of people that come in that shine their naturals and we should differentiate a little bit more. Some people have it. Some people need all we can give them and more, because we're not naturals. And I kind of get the sense that everybody has to go through the same paces, or pretty much the same paces for compliance and checking it off for the state. I don't think that that's so much of a district situation as much as it is a state requirement that they go through so many competencies.

But I think some of it can be redundant. I think that the best ones are the ones where they could take what they're working on and make that part of a practical thing that they're already doing so it's not double work.

What I do think is beneficial, I know that--is the reflection piece. And I would imagine that it's kind of an endurance test for some people and, you know, the job itself is very, very difficult being a new assistant principal. And that on top of it, particularly with the folks that have families and they're trying to find balance in their life, it can be quite a bit.

So the good news is it kind of weeds out anybody that really isn't fit for it. But the bad news is it's--people could come out of balance in their life, I believe.

Speaker 1: All right, what items or experiences do you think should be added to the PMPP?

Interview #3: Well, I do think that it's very clear that they are changing the program so there's got to be a reason why. I know that some people are trying to finish up this year because they know it is going to change. I would probably say there probably needs to be a whole lot more of principle kind of guiding it because you pretty much--every story is unique. And when you bring somebody on, I know not in all cases, but in most cases you pretty much have ideas and responsibilities in mind for that person. I know everyone's got to be an instructional leader. But there are some things that you really need to gear them to. And I really think that the principal should be guiding a lot of this so that they aren't doing double work. It needs to be more precise, I believe.

I really feel strongly that the more they can see other things, know it's out there, I really--I like the way it was back in the day when I first started. You had to have two different experiences as an assistant principal before you could become a principal. So you had to do a part A and a part B. I liked that. They wanted to make sure that you had worked in a title one school and non-title one school before they gave you the opportunity to become a principal. I think that that was really valuable.

Some folks it doesn't--I don't think that that's a requirement anymore. But I think that maybe you stay out of school two years, maybe three at the most and then you flip and go to another setting and see if you could do both. Because I really think in the way things are structured now it's very volatile. Based on school grades, state coming down on us, and things like that, we need our new people to come through. And I believe they need to be versatile. We should be able to put someone anywhere. And the more flexibility we have with people the better.

If people are only used to being in a title one setting and we need them in a non-title one setting in a more fluent school, you know, do--we feel confident that they could crossover and vice versa. Some of it has been in

nothing but a title one setting all their career may not see the other side of, you know, what the most functional schools look like. So it gives you an opportunity to know what you're looking for when you have heavy parent involvement and gives you a different paradigm. So I think that would be something I would add.

I do like the speaker series. I think that that's good. The more people have a chance to interact, reflect, process, I think that's all very, very important. The more they can tie in some of the extras that all of them are required to do anyway, all--if they can wrap it all into the program strategically so that there's less time away would be good.

I'm just going to say this. I don't know that this is true anymore, but I would imagine as you talk to people that go through it. I know 20 years ago when I went through the program, every workshop that we had seem like if it was two days they probably could have done it in one. If it was a full day, in my mind, it could have been done in a half a day. I don't know that all of it was the very best use of time. I know that we have some people down there now that are probably more sensitive to that, but we just need to streamline as much as we possibly can.

The more they could do online the better. That way they can do it on their own time. Maybe if they have kids they can put the kids to bed and sit there and do it in their pajamas somewhere and get it accomplished. Anything we could do to streamline it and protect the time that they're actually in your building, I think, is to our advantage.

Researcher: Thank you sir.

Interview #3: Mm-hmm.

Researcher: You may have answered this already, but now you can--it'll be framed in this type of question. If you could design the ideal preparation of principles with the 21st century, what would it look like and how would it--and how long would it take?

Interview #3: Hmm, good question. I don't know how long it would take, but everything needs to just be very practical, hands on, meaningful, relevant. We need to put our candidates in front of our best people, good models. I think the best--and we can learn from everyone. It's kind of like when you look at the senior internship for teachers. If you could--when you're--you as a principal can match--you take an intern and you put him with your best teacher because through osmosis and just by seeing the modeling, they become a good teacher.

I was blessed that we were able to be in a school we co-taught. And because we were too big and we couldn't have portables so what was really cool about that is I would have an experienced superstar teacher and a rookie paired together. And they might work together for two or three years. And when I had an opening, I could then put that person in a position and they became a superstar.

I think a short internship, a semester of an internship doesn't make you a quality teacher. So who we match our people with is very important. And at the same time I think giving them time to really learn under good leaders, have a variety of opportunities. I think that the more we can do as far as reflective surveys, people do get defensive. But if we could frame our surveys that we send out to faculty to give them valuable information, I know that we do do that, but I don't know that we do often enough. I would almost say that maybe it should be twice a year instead of once a year to give them good feedback.

But what's really important to them is for them to know how they're being perceived. I think that it's important that they're involved in complex decisions. We can't shelter them from some of the more difficult things that we face because that next step is night and day. I just really feel that with what's required today, it's so much different than when I first became a principal. I mean if you minded the store, you kept everyone happy, you move things along a little bit you could get by and buy yourself some time to hone your craft.

But today's people need to be really hitting the ground running especially when you look at Common Core coming up, Park, with the Marzano, I mean this is very, very complicated, with school choice, with school grades, with, you know, there's just so much more that someone has to do now. I think the harder part is, you know, that a lot of people are moving on and retiring. We are going to have a real issue with filling a lot of positions.

And it seems like what happens is that the candidates do become younger and younger and younger, you know, each decade. And it's just a lot. I mean the good part about that is they have the energy and the drive. And I think that that's really awesome. But some of them may not have a whole lot of classroom experience and so they have to just be good at so many different things. Mining the store, yes. Curriculum leaders, absolutely. They have to be able to talk the talk, walk the walk. They have to really be ethical. They have to really be reflective. There's just so much.

And then the issue becomes that the younger they become with less amount of experience, a lot of those folks are balancing families and that's

really challenging. It's a very difficult job, but it's not a 40-hour week, it's not a 50-hour week especially when you're first starting. It's easily a 60-hour week. And if you're a single parent with kids, and doing PMPP and having to do this job at a very high level, it's not for the faint of heart. It's going to take a lot. So almost thinking too with the PMPP plan, I would almost put a component on how you manage your personal life. And really reflecting on how I can make all this work, because it's a heck of a commitment. It's probably one of the most complex jobs that you could possibly have in this country.

Unfortunately, it's not respected as such by the politicians and sometimes by the parents, but I have great respect for anybody that can do the job. It's--you know, I've been away from being a principal for five years. And I think if I went back I would find that the job is much harder than when I left it. I think I can get by on my instincts okay and by staying connected to it. But it is a job that's every year it's becoming more and more demanding. So I really think that that would be something that they would add to the program to really see how badly do I want it? What am I willing to sacrifice? But really, how do I manage--how do I budget my time? How do I maintain balance? How do I maintain my health, quality of being a mom or a dad or, you know, husband or a wife, you know, and being a high end educator. Not easy. Not easy at all.

Researcher: That's a good one. Last one. What other insights besides what we've talked about or do you want to stress again, would you like to offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for our school district that will result to more effective principals?

Interview #3: Well, for the folks like myself that have been around 30 years, I think that we could probably give perspective. I never ever deny a person an opportunity that's new in the pool, that's just trying to get their feet wet, to come in and just kind of talk about the job. A lot of them will come and they'll ask for advice on how to become a principal. I think we could give that back to them willingly.

So I know that executive area directors are very receptive to that as well, so we really want to be good mentors. They want to be coaches. It's a great position to have because they do have that opportunity. They are little bit buffered in that sense that they are not the first person that responds to a school board member that has a need, it's an area of superintendency.

Really, we have to be kind of more in the front lines just to make sure that we're keeping a good pulse as to how things are going. Help direct that a little bit more.

We do make the assistant principal appointments so we're involved in that process. I think it's very important that when I visit a school, I talk to the principal about their assistant principals. We're responsible for coaching them up. if it's not working out, figuring out a place where we might be able to match them more effectively. Give them what they need. Or even get them to the point where they make a decision. Maybe this isn't all that they thought it was going to be and maybe it's not the best career move for them. That's a difficult conversation, but you know, this isn't for everybody.

And I think that the good part about that program is it does give you an opportunity to figure out if that's something that you want to do. I do wrestle sometimes with the internship component of it. I think that we definitely need that. But the bigger concern that I have with that is in actuality, even though we say that the intern is in charge, we know that if a parent's really upset they don't want to talk to the interning principal even if we give them the first crack. They really want to talk to the principal.

The principal still has to be the principal. They don't get a free pass from the central office and results. So they're not going to truly give up reigns of the school for the pure purpose of somebody else is in charge. Kind of like--even like a classroom teacher anymore isn't going to just turn everything over to a senior intern and just say, "Well, is there VAM matters?" Your VAM matters. And, you know, you're not going to turn that over and take that risk.

So how do we really get it to be a pure internship? I don't know. I think that--I wrestle with that. But that's just my two cents.

Researcher: Good stuff. All right. That is the end.

Interview 3: All right. Good luck with it.

Researcher: Thank you.

Researcher: Interview on February 27, with Interviewee #4. You have just signed the consent form, do you verbally accept to be interviewed?

Interview #4: I certainly do, yes.

Researcher: Thank you very much. Alright, our first question here. From you experience in supervising Principals what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school districts PNPP?

Interview #4: The first one I think is when the PNPP as I remember it where the group would bring in expert Principals to round-table discuss issues with the participants. I would think if it is still enforced that the second important is the school visitations.

Researcher: The job shadows?

Interview #4: Yes and the third one would be…well I'm not sure how wide-spread it is but I think a variety of experiences of course is very important.

Researcher: When you say experiences in terms of jobs or…?

Interview #4: Yeah, that's my first choice. Of course I'm not sure exactly where the PNPP is now because it has been several years but…

Researcher: It hasn't really changed. I mean it is changing now but it still has those basic components. From those components from Principals that you supervised that went through that same component, what are those experiences that you saw effected Principals because of those experiences did well?

Interview #4: The variety of experiences is what I mean. In other words as a High School Assistant Principal it's very important to be the point person for various processes in the school. Even more important, and this of course was eliminated as years went on, but at one time it was expected than an Assistant Principal served at two different schools before they became a Principal.

Researcher: Do you think that is good?

Interview #4: I think it is almost mandatory, yes.

Researcher: Beautiful.

Interview #4: I going to do an addendum to that.

Researcher: Go for it.

Interview #4: Part of the variety of experiences that is the most important is for the Assistant Principal to see good examples of leadership. That is the most important thing.

Researcher: Good experiences and good leaders.

Interview #4: Yes, that's crucial.

Researcher: On the flip-side from your experiences supervising Principals what do you think are the three least beneficial components of the PMPP? And just to refresh your memory on some of these things. What are some of the components on there? You are talking about like the courses, the facilitative leadership, the diversity that was online, the PSDM- problem-solving, decision-making. You had the Ruby Payne, technology pieces, the job shadows that we had to do, instructional dialogues, which you mentioned, which were the expert series where people came in to talk about. You had the actual internship where you had to do the internship. You are talking about, there was this long slew of culture classes, there was the budget class. Remember they just had a little budget class that they would do. So those type of courses.

Interview #4: In terms of those kinds of courses I think the really downside of them is if the individual is already competent in that area then to go through it again it just becomes a burden rather than a help, so I really think that in order to make the actual instructional courses work there ought to be some sort of diagnosis. Where is this person? Sometimes you get people who are Assistant Principals who have been in other industries, in the Private sector and then they come and they have to do that. I remember the biggest complaint I used to hear and I never had to do it myself when I was in PNPP was this humongous booklet "the binder" the dreaded binder. And going back to what I said originally. There is nothing more demoralizing than make somebody sit through something they already know. It is like you take a gifted kid in a class, you make them go through all the steps, they are going to get bored, it's just like a hurdle and of course going back to what I didn't say the first time about the important things is about the internships. I forgot about that. They've been diluted.

Interview #4: Yeah, I mean it's been five years since I've even been in the district.

Researcher: Five years already since you have been out of the district? It seems like yesterday we were talking about Acceleration Academy.

Interview #4: I know, and before that I was in the district office for four years, so since I have been supervising Principal it has been nine years, but I sort of forgot the PNPP, because I really do want to talk about the internship. That has been too diluted.

Researcher: So, least beneficial components, any other least beneficial like that you think actual components of the PNPP program that really you think are least beneficial?

Interview #4: I think the binder is just "busy work." I think the training can be counter productive if they are already component in that area, so it just depends. If you get someone who has never worked outside the school district and who has only been a teacher for three years you really might want to think about going through it, but that isn't always the case.

Researcher: How about the mentor/mentee? That is another component you know every Assistant Principal has a mentor. There was a mentor/mentee piece that also was a component of the PNPP.

Interview #4: So who is the Assistant Principals mentor?

Researcher: It is usually somebody that is not at the school. So like mine was when I was at Evan's was Rob Anderson.

Interview #4: Oh, that was good.

Researcher: I mean Dave was my mentor in school, but Rob was my mentor out of school.

Interview #4: I think that's a very good choice, yes. And the purpose is to give people the most possibilities, because a lot of the good things that people do really come as a result of happen-stance. I mean I don't believe in coincidence but being at the right place at the right time and so the more places the Assistant Principal can be the better. I will give you a quick example. When I was out East and we were interviewing for an Assistant Principal somewhere, I can't even remember what school it was, but

anyway Rob Anderson came in and interviewed and he did a fabulous job; he did get the job, it's a long story, but when it was open…

Researcher: To be a Principal

Interview #4: Assistant Principal.

Researcher: Assistant Principal, right.

Interview #4: He was a Dean somewhere.

Researcher: Right.

Interview #4: And then when it came time to open the a new school there was… I'll give you the short version it was just like a quick pick somebody and I said "what about this person who was a Dean at that time at West Orange?" and I remembered from his interview and hired him and he was great, and I think that the more different experiences that we have to encourage and I think that is part of the PNPP that we try to lock-step everybody through the same things and that doesn't always work.

Researcher: So in your eyes what items or experiences do you think should be added to the PNPP?

Interview #4: I really think that the internship has to be a true internship. If you are going to actually do just like when a teacher interns they go into the classroom then after some training they're it and unfortunately that doesn't always happen at schools. They don't get to be "the person" and it is important I think for that internship to be lengthy and I believe that it needs to be all-inclusive. The individual truly must walk in the footsteps of the Principal in order to really see if that is something that he/or she wants to do or if others can see if he/or she can do it.

Researcher: Any other components that you think…

Interview #4: That's the most important one.

Researcher: I think you kind of alluded on this in the last one and I'll ask for elaboration, but if you could design the ideal preparation for Principals in the 21st Century what would it look like and how long would it take?

Interview #4: It would be a two-year program. The individual would have to demonstrate leadership before in a variety of ways, but the main thing in

the two years is that the individual would actually serve two internships at two different sites. That would be the ideal thing.

By then we would know and the individual would know "is this for me?"

Researcher: Any particular schools that they should do?

Interview #4: Yes, yes I would think that it would be important for the individual to be at a school that needs a lot of help where the children are maybe poverty or there has been some dysfunction in the school that needs to be fixed or at-risk children.

Researcher: A Title I experience you think that…

Interview #4: A Title I.

Researcher: So every Principal you think one of those internships should be at a Title I school?

Interview #4: Yes, I would think so, very important. And on the other hand one of the most difficult schools is a school that I've referred to as a "two hump" school. Where you have you know, not a lot in the middle but a lot of the high-end kids and a lot of the low-end kids.

Researcher: It's me.

Interview #4: That's a challenging…you know a school in the middle is a piece of cake; well not really, nothing is a piece of cake but if they are all homogenous and kind of in the middle and you have a suburban school and everything is about the same, the kids all live in the same neighborhood, parent's show up at school, you know it has it's little quarks but not like a two hump school.

Researcher: And you call it a "two hump?"

Interview #4: Two hump, you know…

Researcher: Two hump, yes.

Interview #4: You know like a Bell curve, two curves.

Researcher: Two humps.

Interview #4: High poverty here, high income here.

Researcher: Beautiful-I like that. And then the last question just really anything that we haven't said before. What other insights would you like to offer to assist with development with the PNPP for our school district that would result in more effective Principals?

Interview #4: I am a big believer in that you can't separate that person from the Principal, and Interview.

Researcher: Cannot?

Interview #4: Cannot separate who somebody is as a person. That means their values, their goals. In other words what the individual values determines what kind of. Principal he/or she is going to be. I think it is important that the PNPP that there be self-development programs because know you just running them through Ruby Payne isn't as worth-while as someone who has the values that support Ruby Payne issue.

Researcher: Anything else?

Interview #4: It's a hard job to be ready for. It's a hard job, but it's the best job and the worst job in the world. I loved being a Principal but it is hard when a 15-year-old decides how your week is going to go.

Researcher: Or in my case a 10 or 11-year-old. I'm now in Middle School.

Interview #4: Yes.

Researcher: Well, thank you, I'm going to stop this now.

Interview #4: You're welcome.

Researcher: Interview via phone conference with Interviewee #5. Do you verify and okay this conversation to be recorded?

Interview # 5: Yes, I do.

Researcher: Great. All right. We'll start. The first question for you is From your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school district's PNPP?

Interview # 5: I think the job shadowing is really important. I think the coaching that they receive …

Researcher: With their mentor?

Interview # 5: Uh-huh.

Researcher: Okay.

Interview # 5: Yeah. And the different professional development that gears them towards being able to look at data and what to do with it. I think that's extremely important.

Researcher: So, a little bit--going a little bit into that actual professional developments are there specific ones? You said one with data. Are there any other specific professional developments that you think are crucial?

Interview # 5: I think creating the school climate and the culture where they develop their teachers in a way that they can … look at students and know where they are and where they need to move them to. So I think that any professional--that PNPP has where they can help a school based leader to look at their staff, look at where each of them are and how they need their own professional development so they can look at students individually and be able to move them from where they are to where they need to be.

Researcher: Beautiful.

Interview # 5: Yes, and it goes back to that looking at the data and not what to do with it.

Researcher: Got you.

Interview # 5: Would be the third one.

Researcher: The teacher evaluation system?

Interview # 5: Yes, absolutely.

Researcher: Beautiful.

Interview # 5: The PNPP, when they're looking at Marzano and are making sure that there's new principals when they walk into their first day that they're extremely familiar and comfortable with the domain and the students.

Researcher: Got you. Beautiful. All right, second question, from your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three least beneficial components of the PNPP?

Interview # 5: I think sometimes it's too broad. It's, you know, it's--it's a lot of stuff. So that would be the least beneficial. It's--and I know that they're revamping it and I think that's great, you know? But sometimes there's just too many activity and a lot of professional development that may have been good for a different time that we had in accountability. So I think that the least beneficial would be too much stuff, not enough time.

Researcher: Got you.

Interview # 5: But I know they're working on that.

Researcher: So the third one is what items or experiences do you think should be added to PNPP to make it effective, in your eyes?

Interview # 5: You know, I think that the internship should be longer. And I--because in lieu of all these activities and all these professional development that they have to do, if you had your person who's being prepared for the principalship with an outstanding principal, I mean who's got it going more than just whatever the internship period is right now for at least a year. That would--I would say that would just be an incredible experience. Not only for the procuring--the new principal, the rookie or the rookie to be.

Researcher: Right.

Interview # 5: But for the school system because the years that a principal--what is it? It could be probably 10 years the average lifespan. I don't know what it is these days, but you would know that the district would walk away knowing that this person is ready to step into one of our schools. And we know that they've had on the job training with an experienced principal.

Researcher: Okay. So internship should be longer at least about a year and then also should be with an experienced principal.

Interview # 5: Absolutely, someone who's proficient in all the domains that the PMPP says that we need to. So it's someone who's got that community visibility, someone who understands school culture, someone who understands looking at data and what to do with it, someone who understands the evaluation process, someone who understands budget.

Researcher: Beautiful.

Interview # 5: That will just make that--that potential principal just so much more comfortable in their job when they get to it than the short internship that we have.

Researcher: Got you.

Interview # 5: I would say also that an area that we need to look at is how those internships are done, because sometimes there are principals that, you know, allow you to have the internships but don't really give you all the, the responsibility, and I would think that if, if there were a way that we could just make it that way, that that person has, during their internship are responsible for the whole thing, but with the tutelage of that principal that, that, that has the experience.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Researcher: The fourth one here if, if you could design the ideal preparation of principals for the 21st century what would it look like and how long would it take?

Interview # 5: What would it look like? I, Iike, like I said before, it would, it would probably … I'm thinking, as far as time, almost thinking months. That's just what I'm thinking.

Researcher: Um hmm.

Interview # 5: Okay, so it would start in January with the principal, uh, that we'd be working with the following year, so that, um, from January through June, the, um, assistant principal would be planning and being … look at the whole cycle of the budget process, of, uh, the scheduling process …

Researcher: With the principal mentor, right?

Interview # 5: Yes.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: Yes, the year before the internship.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: Because I call it that, that prep, really, we prep these six months before it begins, and that would … they don't necessarily have to be onsite.

Researcher: Okay.

Interview # 5: But there would be heavily engaged, you know, uh, the email, uh, the, uh, uh, uh, every two weeks visit, but they would have that opportunity to be part of the planning, and looking at how the school improvement plan is going for the year that they're currently in.

Researcher: Just a follow-up just so I can, uh, 'cause I like this, what you're saying, I just want to, uh, make sure I get your thoughts correctly. Would that, you know, 'cause currently, the principal mentors, um, you know, for the PNPP program, some of them are offsite so …

Interview # 5: Correct.

Researcher: So, so it's okay, so that it's, this, this idea, you have this principal mentor who's experienced in all the domains, this principal then, you would be paired up with this AP. They would have this year-long planning from January, um, well, if it's a year long, I don't know, January …

Interview # 5: Well, it's a year and a half.

Researcher: Got … okay …

Interview # 5: A year and a half, because, well, okay, so let's … it would be like this. Uh, right now, we're planning for the year 2013-2014.

Researcher: Right.

Interview # 5: Right? Okay, because you're right in the midst of it. I mean, this is March, but in January, really …

Researcher: Yeah, we start.

Interview # 5: I use to gear up for the following year.

Researcher: Right.

Interview # 5: Okay, so why January? Because we're … um, the, it gives the assistant principal the flavor of what's going to go on and what really can't go on. For example, in January, you're doing your mid-year reports for school improvement plan, so they can see what happened last year and what's going, you know … is it really going on this year? They look at how FCAT is being administered at that school. They get a, a feeling for, um,

uh, uh, the instructional leader's way of doing, um, uh, uh, professional learning community. They're getting a feel for what is normal but they're not in it yet. It's just the cusp of getting, getting, getting a feel for the culture and the system of the school, without having to be responsible for it yet. Then the planning, I mean, comes, starts, like in March, as far as schedules, as far as, okay, we're waiting for the FCAT to come so we, you know, when those, when the results come in in the summer, that assistant principal already has been immersed in, in the, uh, the operations of what was planned a year before.

Researcher: That's, and then, during that internship, then they, then they're in it.

Interview # 5: No, in this, still …

Researcher: Oh, they're still in the planning phase, gotcha.

Interview # 5: They're still in the planning …

Researcher: Gotcha, gotcha.

Interview # 5: So basically, I would say probably would have to be going over to see the, um, uh, principal, probably, um, every two weeks in the afternoon, just seeing how things are going, or when they have their, their staff meetings, or when they have … or maybe they go … they have their leadership meetings once a week, when you go in the morning.

Researcher: And, and, you know, that would be very, uh, you know, I'm really into this. This is … of all the people I've interviewed, this is, this is pretty, pretty, an interesting concept, uh, because it would put accountability … it's just not a regular mentorship where you're just talking about stuff that really, at the end of the day, doesn't even matter. You really are invested in PNPP because, if you're going to that principal, you're going to be doing the internship eventually at that school, you need to know what's going on and so …

Interview # 5: Correct.

Researcher: So, so it would be, uh, yeah, I see that. That's, that's powerful, okay. Wow.

Interview # 5: So, so, you're part of the planning, okay. You're part of also seeing the post, you know, how things gear down, you know, and then, then you're internship would literally be, begin July 1st. So you've seen some planning, now it's, "Let us gear up for when teachers come on."

Researcher: So July 1st till the end of the year?

Interview # 5: Right, till June 30th.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: Because now I know what we are planning, okay? We still have some things to do with school improvement, but I can see how you did your mid-year, you know, um, narrative and I can see what you were doing, and it, it's almost like a relay race, you know.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: You're like, okay, I can, I can take the baton because I spent six months in your school culture and how you do your system.

Researcher: What, a quick question, what would the principal be doing?

Interview # 5: The, the principal, I think the principal, um, is more like the eagle-eye, I mean like the eagle, he hovers.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: … but only comes in when necessary. I would think that, um, in from July through the second week of school, that principal and that, um, mentee, are right there planning with each other, okay? And, and, and just making sure that, um, that … how would I say this? That nothing is subject to interpretation.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: So the school doesn't suffer in the process.

Researcher: And it takes a strong principal, experienced principal. That's why you have to take those experienced principals pretty well, because it, it'd take, it'd take a strong principal to make sure that they would follow that, and really be a good mentor like that, you know, and really be able to release the school in a sense where they were just … they'd be that eagle-eye helping that mentee, uh, you know, grow.

Interview # 5: Yeah, yeah, and in fact, that could be a time for the principal to better get to know their own school, from a different angle.

Researcher: Oh, nice.

Interview # 5: Because it's … now the pressure's off of them, but now they could see probably things that they didn't see before, and, and, do more community things, while that, that person is doing the day-to-day operation. Well, this is your opportunity to go visit all those people that, you know, keep saying, "You know, I wish, you know, you'd come and do partnerships

with us," or … I mean, that's your time that you can take, as a principal, and create partnerships in the community for your school, while the other principal is taking care of the business of the day-to-day operation. Um, yes that mentee, that mentee will … you know, you can take once in a while, but really, they're going to have their hands full. This is your time to build community, so when you get back into the principal, uh, saddle, you've got … your school is running but now you have a strong, strong, strong community base.

Researcher: I like that.

Interview # 5: So during that year of your internship, you're seeing the 10-day recap. You're looking at how you're going to, uh, you know, hire teachers. You, you're going to work with employee relations, but you're under the tutelage of an experienced principal. It's just like coaching, you know.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interview # 5: Um, and I'm talking about sports, you know. I mean, you, your, your head coach is just, just, you know, running, you're running the routines. You're running the routines, and if they don't do well, okay then, you just go there and you do some, some, um, specific coaching. But they've been with you for six months.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interview # 5: You're meeting, not all day, but in a strategic time, so you have already built that trust that you can give this person the, uh, the baton. And then by the time January comes, they've seen this already.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: And there we go again, you know, until the end of the school year, which they've seen, also, since becoming familiar to that as assistant principal. Uh, and they'd be ready for their own school, I would say, in, uh, you know, was, was, in a perfect world, so 18 months.

Researcher: One, one last follow-up question to that, which is great, so the time before, uh, they're doing that internship, that, that January till June where they're just planning with the principal, um, so that's an 18-month process, pretty much, for that internship piece, like you had mentioned. Are they doing anything in the PNPP prior to that January, um, that you would foresee, in terms of getting ready or …

Interview # 5: You know, um, I have, and, and, right, whatever I say, it doesn't matter because this is just … you're doing a, a, a study.

Researcher: Right.

Interview # 5: So I'm just going to let rip on this one.

Researcher: Exactly, yeah, yeah.

Interview # 5: Okay, these people have leadership, okay? They've gone to school in the 21st century.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interview # 5: The leaders … if,if we respect what's going on at higher ed, and, you know, that, that's one thing that we'd have to see. If we, like, for example, what the University of Central Florida teaches their leadership, then, to get at leadership, then I don't see why we have to, on top of that, layer it with more stuff.

Researcher: Gotcha.

Interview # 5: Okay? So I, I would say is, if we believe that the three top universities are this, these universities then we hire our assistant principals from there.

Researcher: And that's what my literature review says, not … and you already answered so I can just, uh, you know, give you a little info but, you know, the district, district and university-based programs that are paired up and have a partnership together are the, are the schools that have a strong program within PNPP or whatever. They prepare their principals because there is that partnership together. They're getting that, they're getting those courses to become an AP there at the university, because it is that 21st century, those type of, you know, things that they need to get. Um, the only things that they may not be getting is where the district can supplement are those, like, the Marzano-type trainings, where the teacher evaluations are specific to the actual district. But you hit it on the, the head with that, so I appreciate you throwing that in there.

Interview # 5: You're welcome. Yeah, because what you do is, if you keep layering, it's frustrating. It becomes … excuse me, but it just becomes a bunch of just nonsense, just busy work.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interview # 5: You know, when that, when the real work is done on the site, you know. And yes, the Marzano, uh, that's fine, but the … if you were a teacher, you'd be getting Marzano on your end, so it's just learning the, the leadership piece.

Researcher: Yeah.

Interview # 5: So that's fine, but I would not layer upon layer, no, no, no. So I would say, um, have a college or university that you're hiring your talent from, because it's aligned to what you believe as a school system. Then take them from there and put them in your, um, um, um, internship. And you know, by the first six months, I would think that, if they don't show up to meetings, if they don't contribute, if, if they're not able to do different, you know, help with the school improvement plan, I mean things like that, then they don't move into the next level of internship for the full, full year, until we believe that they can really, you know, do it, so …

Researcher: Got you. Well, that's awesome, thank you.

Interview # 5: You're welcome.

Researcher: And the last one, you may have already hit a few things on this, but if there's anything else you wanted to add let's see is what other insights would you like to offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for our school district that would result in more effective principals? You may have already added a lot of that. I like that whole piece you said before, but anything else or other things on a scope of, as I type up this qualitative piece and we present back? Obviously, it'll be anony …you know, uh, confidential, but the comments will be put in there. What would be, do you think, beneficial to assist in development of this PNPP?

Interview # 5: Although we're a public organization, I think it would be beneficial to look at some of the top, um, Fortune 500 organizations and see how they train their top performers.

Researcher: To train their …

Interview # 5 Their, their, their leaders.

Researcher: Their top … gotcha.

Interview # 5: You know? How is it that they do it, cost aside, because any, the first thing they'll say, "Well, we don't have the money."

Researcher: Right.

Interview # 5: It's not when … I want, I always look at it with, if money were not the factor, then what is it that they're doing that we're not? And then, you run it parallel, and then see what you can do.

Researcher: Gotcha. Well, thank you so much. I appreciate your time. I know you're busy and definitely, this will definitely help me wrap it up, so I, I can't thank you enough.

Interview # 5: Oh, you're welcome. I'm so proud of you. I mean just, I wish you the best and oh, I'm just, just so proud that you're, you're, um, in the, uh, ending stages of your doctoral program. I'm very proud of you.

Researcher: Oh, totally excited, so, um, let me turn this off for one second, so I can say one more thing. That concludes the interview.

Researcher: Interview with Interviewee #6, March 15, 2013th. You have just signed the release form saying, that you agree to be interviewed and have filled out the survey for senior level district school administrators, is it okay to also record this this interview?

Interview #6: That is correct.

Researcher: Great, the first question for you, from your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three most beneficial components of the school district's PNPP?

Interview #6: I think exposure to not only the school board district policies and procedures, but the state policy and procedures, um, making sure that we're all on the same page and adhering to it. I think the, um, definitely, uh, a new … they may all … doesn't mean that there's an order of importance. I think instructional leadership, the guidance for instructional leadership, um, has to go hand-in-hand with that. And I think the third thing would be networking. Um, sometimes you don't know what you don't know until you're exposed to others and have those conversations, and I think the exchange of ideas as part of the PNPP program, along with seasoned professionals, um, provides a good framework.

Researcher: Beautiful, the second one, what … from your experience in supervising principals, what do you think are the three least beneficial components of the PNPP, as you know it? It may not be the least beneficial but, you know, if you're looking at the whole component of PNPP, what do you think is, probably if you're ranking them, is toward the bottom?

Interview #6: Well, it's almost difficult to say. I think that when you get to the PNPP that, um, although managing the store is very important, um, however, I think that, um, uh, there's a more appropriate place for managing a store. I think more hands-on with assistant principals deans, and teacher leaders who want to become, uh, principals. That would be where we help them with managing the store. Um, such things like, um, property inventory, I think, why it's important, you need to know it. Um, I think spending your time on how to do it is not beneficial. I think that, uh …

Researcher: So I've been sort of … I just want to clarify, like if you're having a PD as part of how to do all these different things that are managing the store …

Interview #6: Right.

Researcher: … you'd say is probably …

Interview #6: Right, I think it's, um, while it's important when you, you know, you can get in a lot of trouble, uh, if you don't know it. I think that, um, I think

that you can be … if you're at that level, you've got the capacity. All you have to do is, um, be given the tools, read the documents, do it online, um, something like that. Hard to come up with three. It seems like they're all important, and important in their own way. Um, I think it's difficult enough in a PNPP, also, when you do the, um, the professional learning communities, while that's very important, I think that, um, it needs a lot more than just being part of a PNPP. I think that has to be, uh, expanded much further.

Um, third one, um, I would say whereas data, uh, data-driven decision making is one of the most important, um, elements that we do. I think how we present it in PNPP is, um, important in the fact that, if you're looking at your data, it needs to be real data. It doesn't need to be manufactured data that everyone looks at, because I don't think that, um, that's a real concept. I think that it needs to go in more in-depth, so I think within your groups, you may have to break it down and look at specific data for schools. Um, but just looking at examples, and this is how you look at data, is not a very good example. I think it needs to be real data.

Researcher: Third one, what items or experiences should be added to the PNPP, in your experience, uh, in your opinion?

Interview #6: These items may already be added in certain, um, elements. Um, I think, uh, because a lot of my job right now is working with principals in, and they really don't have, um, a good overall concept of it. It's not just about money. Of course, you don't get money, you don't pay the bills, but it's not about money.

It's about, um, knowing what to do and doing the right thing. Um, just, you know, going through the motions for ELL, doing the testing and all this kind of stuff, doing the testing for ESE, going through the motions, your paperwork's good, that's not enough. We have to take that and put it in practice. I think if we say that this is what we're doing and that I think the right thing is to do it, and we need to monitor and make sure that it's done. And I think that sometimes, um, we need to make sure that we get that across, not just in some ethical, um, component, but how do you make sure that your, I guess, crossing the T's and dotting all the I's. Um, I would, I would like to see that, uh, be more of, um, do the right thing kind of a concept.

Researcher: All right, number four, if you could design the ideal preparation of principals for the 21st century, what would it look like and how long would it take? So now, you're the creator. Tell me how it would look, this PNPP process, in your eyes, regardless of what we have in place now.

What … if you could do it, what would it look like and how long would it take?

Interview #6: I think we would do a good screening process of preparing our assistant principals, because at any given point, they need to be able to step in, and sometimes they have to take on that role, depending on what happens in the school. But, besides going through all the PNPP components and making sure that, uh, that an aspiring principal has mastery, I really think we need to look at a model that, before we move a principal into another school, especially if it's a new principal, they must be a co-principal for a year with that principal; at least for one semester, but preferably an entire year. I can't imagine turning over the education of, of a K-6, K-5 school, um, to a brand-new person and saying, "Have at it." I think that we need to look at a model of a co-principal before one is transitioned in and one is transitioned out. It's not very cost-effective, I'm sure, but in the long run it might be, if that school tanks, you know, after a year, right?

Interview #6: It's too quick.

Researcher: Least effective, going back, so, so, uh, least beneficial.

Interview #6: I think where is the job setting. Um hmm, the one day at this school, the one day there, or even a couple of hours, you know, both on how brief it actually becomes.

Researcher: Gotcha. The fifth question, and the last one, what other insights, besides what you've said already, if you want to add anything, would you like to offer to assist in the development of a PNPP for our school district that would result in more effective principals?

Interview #6: I'd like to see it broken up in components. In other words, the first one would deal with the lower level, like the, um, the managing the store. Not that safety and security is not very, is, is, is not important, it is, but the, you now, the safety and security of the school. Um, all the things that can get you into trouble, learn those up front, um, and break into components, like the managing the store. Then next, I think that, um, developing, you know, study groups, learning, because these are all things that need modules and need interaction.

And then I think you go on to the, um, the third one, about how you develop your vision, even the instructional leader, and develop your vision based on the vision of the district and the mission of the district. Um, developing your vision as, uh, using data, uh, real data to drive your decision-making. And, uh, where do you go from here? And there should be mastery of that and, um, in some respects, I know that we have the, uh, the feeling, but I think there needs to be some pre and post; if nothing else,

just for the aspiring principal to go online and take the little pre and post, and give them some automatic feedback. Let them know when they, where they stand.

I think we also need to relook at our plans. I think we're requiring, um, way too much … I don't mean to call it busy work, but written work, a lot more of, uh, of that. We're requiring too much, whereas I think if we had, uh, like, kind of like we do with our, our students. We ask them to, uh, do an activity, read a, read a, uh, a piece of literature and respond to the literature. Have an activity, um, read, uh, some abstracts, read articles, do a book study, respond to it. I think that we would get more out of that, making that part of a plan, than we do writing objectives and carrying it through. And it's just another layer that our, our, our poor people there in the school don't have time for.

Researcher: All right, that concludes the interview. Thank you very much.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Anderson, C., & Louh, R. (2005). Leadership development for urban schools. *Principal, 84*(5), 26-29.

Borgemenke, A. (2011). School administrators sound off: Perceived efficacy of principal preparation programs from select focus group responses. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. *2*(22), 15-22.

Bottoms, G., & Fry, B. (2009). *The district leadership challenge:Empowering principals to improve teaching and learning.* Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL = http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct = true&db = eric&AN = ED505975&site = ehost-live; http://www.sreb.org/publications/2009/09V11_District_Leadership_Challenge.asp

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2011). The influence on school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*. DOI: 10.3102/0002831210380788

Branch, G., Hanushek, E., & Rivkin, S. (2009). *Estimating principal effectiveness.* CALDER Working Paper. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Fusarelli, B.J. (2005). The Kentucky principalship: Model of school leadership recognifgured by ISLLC standards and reform policy implementation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*, 127-156. DOI: 10.1081/15700760590965587

Corcoran, S., Schwartz, A.E., & Weinstein, M. (2009). *A New York City aspiring principals program: A school level evaluation*. Institute for Education and Social Policy, New York University, NY.

Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute. Retrieved from http://selistanford.edu

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 Educational Leadership Institute.& Foley, P. (2001). Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership. *Public Agenda.* Retrieved from http://www.publicagenda.org/files/pdf/ahead_of_the_game.pdf.

Dillman, D. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored-design method*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dillman, D., Smyth, J., & Christain, L. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.: Hoboken, New Jersey.

Florida Department of Education. (2012). *History of Florida principal leadership standards.* Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/fplsrevisions.asp

Florida Department of Education (2010). *Florida's race to the top application for initial funding* (CFDA 84.395A). Retreived from: http://www.fldoe.org/arra/pdf/rttt-apbud.pdf.

Florida School Leaders. (2006). *Florida principal leadership standards*. Retrieved from https://www.floridaschoolleaders.org/fpls.aspx

Fry, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2005). *The principal internship: How can we get it right?* The Wallace Foundation: Atlanta, GA. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-training/Documents/Principal-Internship-Get-it-Right.pdf

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

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY. Routledge.

Hess, F., & Kelly, A. (2007). Learning to lead: What gets taught in principal-preparation programs. *Teachers College Record, 109*, p. 244-274.

Horng, E., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010). *Principal's time use and school effectiveness*. Institute for Research on Educational Policy & Practice. Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Jacob, S.A, & Furgerson, S.P. (2012). Writing interview protocols and conducting interviews: Tips for students new to the field of qualitative research. *The*

Qualitative Report, 17(6), 1-10. Retrieved from http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/jacob.pdf

Johnson, J., Arumi, A.M., & Ott, A. (2006). Reality check 2006. *Public Agenda*. http://www.publicagenda.org/files/pdf/rc0604.pdf

Knox, S., & Burkard, A. (2009). Qualitative Research interviews. *Psychotherapy Research 19*(4). DOI 10.1080/10503300802702105

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (4th). (2007). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Kowal, J., Hassel, E.A., and Hassel B.C., (2009). *Successful school turnarounds: Seven steps for district leaders*. The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. Retrieved from http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/CenterIssueBriefSept09.pdf

Krathwohl, D. R. (2009). *Methods of educational and social science research: The logic of methods* (3rd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610.

LaPointe, M., & Davis, S. H. (2006). Effective schools require effective principals. *Leadership, 16-19,* 34-38.

LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Preparing and supporting principals for effective leadership: Early findings from Stanford's school leadership study*. San Francisco, CA.

Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007). An array of qualitative data analysis tools: A call for data analysis triangulation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 22(4), 557-584. DOI 10.1037/1045-3830.22.4.557

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. Learning from Leadership Project.

Linn, G., Sherman, R., & Gill, P. (2007). Making meaning of educational leadership: The principalship in metaphor. *NASSP Bulletin 91*(2), 161-171. DOI 10.1177/0192636507302095

Lomax, R. G. (2007). *An introduction to statistical concepts* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press

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

Mitgang, L. D. (2007, March). *Getting principal mentoring right: Lessons from the field*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-training/Documents/Getting-Principal-Mentoring-Right.pdf

Mitgang, L. D. (2008, June). *Becoming a leader: Preparing school principals for today's schools.* New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from

http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school leadership/principal-training/Pages/Becoming-a-Leader-Preparing-Principals-for-Todays Schools.aspx

New Leaders for New Schools. (2009). *Principal effectiveness: A new principalship to drive student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and school turnarounds*. New York, NY. Retrieved from http://www.newleaders.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/princpal_effectiveness_executive_summary_nlns.pdf

Orange County Public Schools [OCPS]. (2008). *Preparing new principals program*. Retrieved from https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/leadership/PNPP/Pages/default.aspx

Orr, M.T., King, C., & LaPointe, M. (2010). *Districts developing leaders: Lessons on consumer actions and program approaches from eight urban districts*. Education Development Center. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/districts-developing-leaders-executive-summary.pdf

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. DOI: 10.1177/0011000010378610

Petzko, V. (2008). The perceptions of new principals regarding the knowledge and skills important to their initial success. *NASSP Bulletin, 92*(3), 224-250.

Quinn, T. (2005). Leadership development: The principal-university connection. *Principal, 84*(5), 12-16.

Robinson, V. (2011). *Student-centered leadership*. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

Simmons, J., Grogan, M., Preis, S., Matthews, K., Smith-Anderson, S., Walls, B., & Jackson, A. (2007). Preparing first time leaders for an urban public school district: An action research study of a collaborative district-university partnership. *Journal of School Leadership, 17*, 540--569.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2006). *Schools can't wait: Accelerating the redesign of university principal preparation programs*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved from http://publications.sreb.org/2006/06V04_Schools_Cant_Wait.pdf.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2007). *Schools need good leaders now: State progress in creating a learning-centered school leadership system*. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2009). *The district leadership challenge: Empowering principals to improve teaching and learning.* Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved from http://publications.sreb.org/2009/09V11_District_Leadership_Challenge_color.pdf

Taylor-Powell, E., & Renner, M. (2003). Analyzing qualitative data. Program Development & Evaluation. University of Wisconsin-Extension. Retrieved from http://learningstore.uwex.edu/assets/pdfs/G3658-12.PDF

The Florida Senate. (2012). Summary of CS/CS/SB 736 — Educational Personnel. Retrieved from http://www.flsenate.gov/Committees/BillSummaries/2011/html/0736ED

The Wallace Foundation (2011, March). *Research findings to support effective educational policymaking: Evidence and action steps for state, district and local policymaker*s (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Findings-to-Support-Effective-Educational-Policy-Making.pdf

The Wallace Foundation. (2012, January). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning.* New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principal-leadership/Documents/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning.pdf

University of Virginia Darden School of Business. (2011). School turnaround curriculum. Retrieved from http://www.darden.virginia.edu/web/Darden-Curry-PLE/UVA-School-Turnaround/Curriculum

Vanderhaar, J., Munoz, M., & Rodosky, R. (2007). Leadership as accountability for learning: The effects of school poverty, teacher experience, previous achievement, and principal preparation programs on student achievement. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 19,* 7-33. DOI 10.1007/s11092-007-9033-8

Waters, T., Marzano, R., and McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* McREL. Retrieved from http://www.educationalleaders.govt.nz/Pedagogy-and-

assessment/Pedagogical-leadership/Balanced-Leadership-What-30-Years-of-Research-Tells-Us-About-the-Effect-of-Leadership-on-Student-Achievement

Whitaker, K. (2001). Where are the principal candidates: Perceptions of superintendents. *NASSP Bulletin*, *85*(625), 82-92.