

LSS The Laboratory for Student Success

Field Notes

Capturing Conversations of Procedural Knowledge

LSS Field Notes document experiences in context in education, capturing conversations of procedural knowledge.

The Laboratory for Student Success
The Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory
at Temple University Center for Research in
Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Voice: 800-892-5550 Fax: 215-204-5130
E-mail: lss@temple.edu Website: www.temple.edu/lss

PREPARING AND SUPPORTING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Early Insights and Impressions from the School Leadership Learning Community

The U.S. Department of Education's School Leadership Program, a part of the No Child Left Behind legislation, provides funds to 24 grantees across the country to support an array of training opportunities for principals, assistant principals, and aspiring principals. The grantees are collaborative partnerships, comprised of school systems and universities, community organizations, and professional organizations. Their goal is to help local education agencies develop, enhance, and expand pre-service and inservice programs to recruit, train, and mentor the professionals who can provide effective leadership in high-need, low-performing schools in urban, suburban, and rural districts—all with a view toward improving student outcomes.

In January 2003, the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL) established the School Leadership Learning Community (SLLC), a communication and consultation network among the 24 grantees. The SLLC, supported by the Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University, seeks to:

- connect the SLLC members and support shared learning,
- capture lessons learned and promising practices, and
- multiply the impact of the members' policy and practice work.

IEL reviewed information about the grantees to develop an overview of the scope and intent of their programs and then conducted extensive telephone interviews to confirm information about program activities, partners,

and participants. Twenty of the SLLC member programs were funded in October 2002; the remaining four programs were funded in October 2003. Some of the programs are expansions of professional development activities that already existed in districts, while others are brand new. The programs are diverse in geographic location, in the types of school districts they serve—urban, rural, suburban, or a mixture—and in the participants' racial and ethnic backgrounds, job positions and roles, and years of experience.

In mid-November 2003, the SLLC members were convened for face-to-face discussions of their work with one another and with national experts, professional development providers, and prominent researchers on the topics of school leadership and principal development.

This *Field Notes* summarizes those discussions—discussions of the early lessons learned and persistent challenges faced by the 24 leadership programs during their first few years—and references information shared by noted researchers at the face-to-face meeting. Because each program in the SLLC is striving to prepare and support a new breed of school principal, this information and these references should be resources for others who are designing and implementing school leadership development programs and seeking to build the capacity of school leaders to meet the challenge of improved outcomes for all students. In short, this *Field Notes* captures both research-based and practice-based lessons of the SLLC members' work—a rich, albeit young, national resource.



PREPARING AND SUPPORTING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: WHAT PRACTICE TELLS US

The role of a school leader is being transformed. A major report from the Institute for Educational Leadership (2002), “Leadership for Student Learning: Reinventing the Principalship,” asserts that the role of the contemporary (and future) school principal is not at all what it has been historically and that the schools of the 21st century require a new kind of principal, specifically, one who is:

- an instructional leader committed, foremost, to improving, strengthening, and adapting the teaching and learning process to effectively meet the needs of every child, a leader focused on accountability, data-based decision making, and creative, practical professional development;
- a community leader who incorporates understanding and action to make the school part of the larger community, sharing with and engaging a range of stakeholders who can become positive advocates and supporters of the school; and
- a visionary leader who exudes a set of values founded on the belief that every child can learn at high levels and who can then mobilize others to embrace this vision as well.

This kind of school leadership sounds logical in an era of standards-based reform. The rhetoric around the new concepts, however, dealt in lofty generalities until research began to put substance into the discussion and reveal that such leadership requires a broad set of skills which must draw on a number of disciplines. School leadership today is as much about school culture as it is about school curriculum. Consider the following research- and practice-based comments about the role of the principal:

- Principals influence and shape learning by galvanizing effort around ambitious goals and establishing conditions that support teachers and help students succeed.

*Lonnie Wagstaff, Professor Emeritus
University of Texas—Austin*

- The principal is always responsible for instructional leadership, but how that is done depends a lot on the circumstances of the school and the talents of others.

*Paul Hill, Director
Center on Reinventing Public Education
University of Washington*

These variations on the same theme—that school leadership is people leadership—bear little resemblance to what

traditional leadership programs in the not-too-distant past considered essential. It is almost a cliché but also close to reality that the old concept of school leadership focused on the three “Bs”: buses, boilers, and books. In the last decade, the idea of the school principal as an “instructional leader” who also possessed visionary and community leadership skills in large measure has replaced the “B” model in the literature, if not always in fact.

Because understandings about the transformed roles for school principals are developing as much from experience as from scholarly treatises, the 24 School Leadership Program grantees and their SLLC network are developing a shared expertise through electronic communications, telephone conferences, leadership materials and reports, and the meeting reported in this issue of *Field Notes*. The SLLC members are building new understandings of leadership development growing out of their experiences and helping one another successfully implement innovative programs. Their programs tend to be nontraditional, organized to meet specific demographic needs. Some have emerged from previous initiatives; some are putting research into practice; and some combine both of these. Of particular note, and as a result of the mandate in the federal legislation that funded the programs, all are collaborative, working in conjunction with universities or community-based or professional education organizations. Because they are breaking new ground in many instances, they also must find new ways of evaluating their work.

From opportunities to share what they are learning, bolstered by a growing body of research, the SLLC programs have gleaned some noteworthy insights into the development and support of school-based leaders.

EARLY IMPRESSIONS AND ENDURING CHALLENGES

Working Together

Building, maintaining, and sustaining new relationships and collaborating with new partners in new ways is critical to school leadership training programs in general and is certainly true of the SLLC programs. As the project director of the Principals Excellence Program (KY) observed, “Neither universities nor districts can do what is needed on their own; neither can single-handedly provide the breadth of experience needed to adequately develop and nurture leaders for today’s P–12 schools. Well-functioning university–district partnerships support the collaboration between leadership educators and leadership practitioners in ways that interactively enrich the field.” Collaboration is requiring new levels of communication and engagement. SLLC members, including the School Leadership Project (CA) and the Learner Centered Leadership Program (AZ), have noted that the new collaborations must start at the very beginning of the process, not after the program has been developed, and that “buy in” from all of the partners, especially the school superintendent, is critical. All of the partners involved must view the work in the same manner and share the same vision.

Learning Together

The sharing of information among SLLC members can be a powerful asset to the success of any individual project. A majority of project directors affirmed that the face-to-face meeting of SLLC members was a valuable opportunity to learn, especially, that the challenges they face are similar to the challenges faced by other programs and that peers can often share successful strategies to address problems. Together, the SLLC members learned about promising training strategies, held discussions focused on putting research into practice, and responded to—and occasionally challenged—the national experts on school leadership.

The collaborative SLLC programs also foster new opportunities for partners to learn together. Arizona State University partnered with the Southwest Center for Education and Language Diversity and four high-need metropolitan school districts to prepare leaders who can be effective in linguistically and culturally diverse schools. The Lead New Mexico program, a partnership between the University of New Mexico and the Northern New Mexico Network, addresses the specific needs of principals (and superintendents) in 27 school districts. The program provides comprehensive and sustained professional development focused on instructional leadership, community leadership, and systems management. The program director of the Partnership for School Leadership Program (WA)—a diverse partnership, including the Washington School Principals Education Foundation, 52 school districts, four educational service districts, three universities, the Office of the State Superintendent, and a state association—has noted that the very nature and size of the partnership facilitates learning and sharing and that by working together, these diverse partners have created a “new professional link between mainstream and remote areas of Washington State.” In all SLLC programs, each partner brings particular skills and expertise to bear on the work and, collectively, the partners simultaneously learn from one another and increase their organization’s capacity.

Coaching and Developing Mentors

Mentoring is a major component of a successful and effective leadership development program, and all of the SLLC programs are developing or implementing a well-conceived, comprehensive mentoring program that is multifaceted, tailored, continuous, highly regularized, and contextualized.

SLLC programs are learning that a high level of trust between mentors and the training program participants must be developed to foster open, honest communication and that a culture of constructively challenging each other must

become a natural part of the mentor–mentee relationship. SLLC programs also are learning that mentors need to be carefully selected and given ongoing training and that, in a successful mentoring program, the mentors learn as much as the mentees. The School Leadership Program (NY) utilizes a cadre of mentors who work in a two-tiered process. Twelve veteran principals—“lead principals”—mentor less experienced principals within District Ten. They also serve as mentors to other individuals who are themselves mentoring assistant principals. These “lead principals,” in effect, serve all 53 schools in the district. The project director of Leadership in Border Rural Areas (NM) noted the importance of “understanding that mentoring differs among individuals based on gender, race/ethnicity, and age.” Many SLLC programs—including the Pathways to Leadership project (FL), The 3 R’s of School Leadership: Recruit, Retain, Revitalize (NJ), and the Leadership Development Initiative (NY)—believe mentors should be utilized not only in the training phase but also linked to induction programs as a strategy to deal with retention.

The director of the Leadership for Learning Project, a partnership among three urban New Jersey districts and the Center for Evidence-Based Education, noted a “need for follow-up for the participants through transition periods as they acquire new positions.... Several of our cohort members who were assistant or vice principals while they were in the program are now principals, and they now have a desire for direct support.”

SLLC members are located in 16 states: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington.

A complete list of the 24 leadership programs in the SLLC Network, their partnering organizations, and contact information can be accessed at

www.temple.edu/lss

Changing the Curriculum

The curriculum for a successful training program must be research-based, comprehensive, and linked to standards. Most SLLC programs base their curriculum on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium standards. Some, however, also design their curriculum around research that has been conducted by partner organizations. For example, the Southwest Michigan Educational Leadership Consortium (MI) bases much of its curriculum on 20 years of research conducted at Western Michigan University. The New School Leadership Project (CO) emphasizes a conceptual framework, entitled “Framework for School Leadership Accomplishments,” based on work done at the University of Colorado at Denver.

Program curricula must be flexible and able to provide individualized attention, including developing individualized education plans (IEPs), to help meet participants’ specific leadership development needs. The No Leader Left Behind program of the Southern Arizona Educational Leadership Consortium (AZ) uses IEPs to address individual “expectations of growth” in conjunction with a variety of training

—continued

programs, including group “intensives” focused on instructional leadership, community relations, systems management, and technology leadership. The director of the Leadership in Border Rural Areas project (NM) also stresses the importance of individualization, noting that in the program “each participant is considered unique and warrants careful attention to individual developmental stages.”

Programs’ curricula must be considerate of the time constraints on participants and have practical applicability in the real world of school leadership. Several SLLC members note the importance of designing and implementing programs that are balanced; equal consideration must be given in the design to the learning content, “high expectations,” and practical, interactive opportunities for participants.

Members also have learned that it is critical for the curriculum to be context-based, using community engagement and community mapping to familiarize participants with a school’s larger context. The director of the Urban Leadership Development Project (PA) noted, “It is critical to focus on helping the candidates understand the uniqueness of each school environment and community...to engage them in conversations about the community and about the resources...to help children and their families. Skills are necessary to do community profiling...local community leaders need to be involved in the teaching component of the preparation program.”

Several SLLCs focus on the community context and have had success promoting principals as community organizers, helping empower parents, who, in turn, support and participate in the school life. The Urban Leadership Development Program (MI) emphasizes community issues and helps participants map community resources to support children and their families. The project director of the Leadership in Border Rural Areas (NM) notes that the program training encourages principals to be community organizers who “understand power and empowering.” The Metropolitan Center for Urban Education (NY) also focuses on community leadership, giving participants tools to assess school and community needs in collaboration with school staff and school leadership teams.

In addition, many members have discovered that their programs work best when coordinated with other professional development activities in the district. It helps if the district is engaged in systemic reform focused on improved student outcomes. SLLC programs that lead to degree attainment, licensure, or certification have learned that staff need to remain abreast of state policies as well as pending legislation which may impact school leaders.

Using New Tools and New Technology

E-mail serves as the primary communication tool in the SLLC programs, even in those that offer participants

frequent opportunities to meet. In some programs, members have received assistance in developing electronic communications protocols. The Pathways to Leadership project (FL) uses e-portfolios, video conferencing, and online assessment tools for training practicing and aspiring administrators. The Rural Education in Administrative Leadership program (OR) conducts online training and dialogue groups. The No Leader Left Behind program of the Southern Arizona Educational Leadership Consortium (AZ) has developed an interactive website, conducts electronic visits to other cooperating districts and to state resources, provides handheld computers (PDAs) to all participants, and enrolls all participants in a 5-day training session, “Leadership in Technology,” sponsored by the Gates Foundation.

Some SLLC programs are using technology to create simulations, give assessments and provide feedback, and collaboratively construct discussions around “hard” resources.

Paying Attention to Diversity

SLLC members recognize the critical importance of paying attention to diversity in all aspects of the program. Given our nation’s demographics, school leaders need to be diverse; therefore, the process for selecting the individuals to participate in programs must be deliberate to ensure the participation of women and minorities. In addition, the curriculum, the leadership program design, the resource persons employed, the training materials used, the activities conducted, and the mentors enlisted must all

reflect a careful consideration of the issues of diversity—race and ethnicity, gender, language, age, culture, religion, and personal values.

Many SLLC programs give special attention to these issues. The Austin Independent School District’s Leadership Development Project (TX) includes a component that provides administrators with Spanish language and Hispanic culture training. The Learner-Centered Leadership for Language and Culturally Diverse Schools in High Needs Urban Settings (AZ) and its many partners pay special attention to finding and retaining administrators who understand the issues and dynamics associated with high-needs urban districts. The Leadership in Border Rural Areas (NM) includes cross-border field trips and notes that sensitivity to context, border issues, culture, race, and linguistic diversity are very important program issues. The School Leadership Program (AL) focuses on increasing the number of women and minority administrators who are certified.

Recruiting and Selecting Program Participants

School districts must select the most promising candidates to participate and then encourage their administrators and prospective administrators to participate. Some SLLC

Contrary to the perception of principals as harried, one-person bands, case studies of principals show that they are “diagnosticians and delegators.” “They are not the lone instructional leader within a school. Leadership is actually widely shared.”

—Paul Hill

programs have attracted candidates because of the participation of their superintendents in the planning process or even in the program. The Three R's program (NJ) and the Boston Public School Leadership Institute (MA) are but two SLLC programs that pay special attention to strategies to engage the school district. The New School Leadership Project (CO) focuses attention on district engagement and reports that a successful strategy has been to establish clear policies outlining the district and university responsibilities for supporting the program's work.

Retaining Participants and Sustaining SLLCs

For the SLLC programs, sustainability has several dimensions. One dimension is retaining leaders-in-training in the projects. This issue is reliant on three factors: a careful selection process, constant support, and job assignments that are relevant to participants' interests. Several programs, including the Southwest Michigan Educational Leadership Consortium (MI) and the Principal Leadership Program (MA), build sustainability into their programs by promoting participants into coaches.

A second dimension is sustaining the SLLC program. The programs represent an array of models for principal preparation through district–university collaborations, but the models will only be useful if they can operate beyond the implementation stage and begin to build a research and knowledge base. Much depends on the commitment of university faculty, mentors, and local superintendents to a long-term investment in creating knowledge. The director of the Leadership for Learning Project (NJ) notes that it is a major asset to have a superintendent who is closely involved with the program and who views it and, in fact, uses it as a key element in districtwide systemic reform.

Beginning, Amending, Building, Continuing

SLLC program developers need to assess, evaluate, review, and amend their work continually. Many of the SLLC programs are learning as they go, adapting available research and best practices to their particular circumstances. Program missions, goals, and strategies need to be constantly revisited. Opportunities to do this should be built into the implementation process for the developers and partners. Many SLLC members remarked that circumstances often change and leadership programs must be able to make constant adjustments. Early in the development of their programs, several SLLC programs, in New Jersey and New Mexico, for example, saw superintendency changes, district instability, and recruitment challenges—all factors that had to be dealt with prior to beginning their work.

WHAT NEW RESEARCH TELLS US ABOUT SCHOOL LEADERS

Principal Profiles

Contrary to the perception of principals as harried, one-person bands, case studies of principals show that they are “diagnosticians and delegators,” according to Paul Hill of

the University of Washington. “They are not the lone instructional leader within a school. Leadership is actually widely shared.” Studies at the university's Center on Reinventing Public Education (CRPE), summarized in the report *Making Sense of Leading Schools*, found seven common areas of leadership in both public and private schools: instructional, cultural, material, human resources, strategic, external development, and micropolitical (dealing with conflicts inside the school). While these are universal, the weight given to an area of leadership and to whom it is delegated depend on the particular situation and needs of the school.

Comparing public school principals with principals in less controlled schools, such as charters and private schools, the CRPE documented clear differences in how the principals delegated authority in each of the seven universal leadership functions. On creating a sense of unity/shared culture, 67% of principals under less control delegated this to others; 14% of traditional principals did so. In most of the functions, traditional principals kept tighter control.

Contexts

Priorities within a school often change, sometimes resulting in a good match becoming a dysfunctional one. Districts that are the most satisfied with their school leadership and have the least turnover among principals tend to be good at matching principals' strengths with schools' needs.

Another way to describe the situational aspect of school leadership is to see it as “context specific.” What Lonnie Wagstaff and Pedro Reyes found in their studies of high-achieving, high-poverty schools is that “each school must forge its own approach to academic success for all of its students.” And context-specific leadership “can only be provided by those who are deeply knowledgeable about the school, the community, the professional and non-professional staff of the school, the student population, and the relationship between the school and the central office.”

Wagstaff describes a successful leader of a school beating the odds thusly:

- They want to be accountable.
- They understand there are no “generic” students, but rather individuals who bring assets to the school and must be helped to fit into the aspirations of school life.
- They have no “bag of tricks”; instead, they work collaboratively to give direction to their school.
- They have taken the mystery out of teaching and know what is going on in each classroom.
- Their focus on teaching and learning is persistent and visible.

Pedro Reyes added some characteristics about principals who beat the odds:

- They not only believe every child can meet high learning expectations, they also create a culture of

— continued

learning for everyone in the school, including parents.

- They build “networks of social capital” in the community to support children.
- They encourage teaching and learning environments “that are dynamic, innovative, and integrated with real-world expectations.”

Stress

Effective school leaders know how to maintain an appropriate level of stress that leads people to adapt in the right direction, according to Ron Ferguson of Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government. His work emphasizes building trust in schools, work which builds on literature in psychology and business describing stages in developing relationships. Teachers view a trustworthy leader—one who can successfully get away with imposing stress—in several ways. They want to know a leader’s motives. They want the leader to be competent to do what needs to be done. They want dependability. And they want a leader to be respectful and collegial.

Principals need to be prepared to work effectively with a central office they cannot trust. The lack of authority over what happens in a school and authority from “above” that cannot be trusted take a personal toll. They also affect the way a school leader conducts his or her work. In Ferguson’s opinion, when this happens, school leaders become renegades.

WHAT DOES THE RESEARCH MEAN FOR PREPARING PRINCIPALS?

School environments are moving away from authoritarian structures to more collaborative ones. Coupled with the emphasis on instruction and on building strong, external community support for schools, current and aspiring school leaders need to learn skills appropriate for the new structures. The SLLC programs continue to explore what those skills should be and how best to transmit them. Research studying what principals do, especially those leading high-performing, high-poverty schools, already gives direction to what the changes in principal preparation and professional development ought to be.

If principal preparation programs have deviated from standard fare, most often they have drawn upon business literature. The programs looking for support for new skills still rely on organizational behavior literature, but they also draw from psychology, sociology, political science, and other fields. School leadership development programs can draw from a number of areas, Lonnie Wagstaff of the University of Texas points out, but the important factor is

that the concepts must be applied realistically. If a school principal adopts the strategy of “managing by walking around,” then “we need to prepare our principals to know what to look for while they are walking around.” A principal needs to know whether the observed teaching and learning are good enough and diagnose the problems if they are not. Wagstaff says, “Diagnosing means that you are able to perceive. You are able to tease out. You are able to make some distinctions among things that are going on. Then, on the basis of that, you have the ability to put things together in a way so that you can say, ‘If we move in this

direction, then we can address the issues, and we can make certain that we do the things that need to be done.’” In Wagstaff’s opinion, preparation programs need to focus school leaders’ attention on school improvement.

In light of the transformation of school leadership preparation underway, campus-based programs have a specific challenge: How do they remain relevant? (Conversely, a program not university-based must work to remain current in its knowledge of research on effective practices.) Wagstaff’s colleagues at the University of Texas decided that any university-based program must be collaborative. It should draw on research and scholarship at the university but, at the same time, make certain that it is connected to schools and districts.

Drawing on the University of Washington’s studies of what principals actually do, Paul Hill advises universi-

ties to construct preparation programs more empirically, making them immediately relevant to principals’ functions. Some of the seven functions of principals teased out of the surveys by CRPE, such as entrepreneurial and micropolitical, “are not...encompassed by the single-minded attention to evaluating instruction,” according to Hill. Principals participating in the survey strongly indicated that what counted most for them was on-the-job training. When asked how they acquired specific skills, they usually answered, “I learned them on the job” or “I learned them from somebody else.” Not that their preservice preparation was all bad; rather, it did not anticipate what they would actually be doing.

Another finding from the research is that school leadership is as much of an inservice issue as a preservice one. As principals move from school to school, they face new situations that may require an application of knowledge, such as budgeting, first learned many years before. Or they may need to draw knowledge from disciplines that were never part of their preparation, such as “human capital development”—issues of personnel.

This just-in-time learning requirement challenges districts to shape their own school leadership preparation efforts in order to anticipate what principals will need to

I see a lot of principals who don't like stress. They tend to not want to push people to face up to things that they don't want to think about....You can overdo it and kill the organism by stressing it too much, but if you don't stress it enough, it's going to be hard to achieve much change.

—Ron Ferguson

know in a new situation. The researchers also advised districts to “grow their own” principals, recruiting individuals with potential rather than relying only on the “self-starters.” According to Hill, those districts that were the most satisfied with their principal leadership had built their own inservice preparation and recruitment programs.

Finally, the importance of matching principals’ strengths to schools’ needs calls for changes in the professional development for the central office, including the superintendent.

Drawing from her years of experience in helping build quality instruction and promoting better outcomes in the Houston, TX, schools, Susan Sclafani puts a reality check on school leadership preparation. Formerly senior advisor to the U.S. Secretary of Education, Sclafani wants to see principals who can transform schools. Nothing less will enable students to be prepared for an economy that only has room for highly skilled citizens.

Sclafani contends, like the researchers, that the basic preparation and redevelopment of current principals must take place as collaborations with districts and schools. Principals must know, she says, instruction well enough to help teachers and teaching continuously improve, must understand assessment and how to use school-based assessments to capture the full range of learning, must be able to understand and use data, and must know how to create teamwork and develop leadership among teachers.

EPILOGUE

Several developments resulting from the work of the SLLC members are particularly noteworthy.

The project director of Southwest Michigan Educational Leadership Consortium (MI) invited state officials to visit the program. Later, the state requested a presentation about the program be made in the state capital. As a result, funds were provided to four additional sites to allow the training of 40 administrators in each site.

The Boston Public School Leadership Institute (MA) requires a half-year or full-year residency on a school campus during the year-long program. Program participants who successfully complete the program obtain a master’s degree from the University of Massachusetts–Boston. The Boston program has also worked with the Massachusetts Department of Education to obtain approval of an agency that can certify principals.

In looking to the future, almost all of the SLLC members expect to improve their evaluation strategies in the coming months. One program will draw correlations between the leadership styles of their participants and their performance. Another is preparing case studies of intra-district leadership development.

What is most important about the future of the SLLC, however, is its growing capacity to elevate the importance of the principalship. Instead of principal licensure being a routine step in an education career, the selection, preparation, placement, and retention of principals are becoming critical choices for school districts and university-

based programs. That is why most of the SLLC members invigorate their programs with rich discussions of issues, organize broad-based conversations between scholars and practitioners, and recognize that there will be a continuing need for learning by and support for school leaders.

Ron Ferguson puts the challenge well. According to Ferguson, more than 40 years ago, Ron Edmonds’ research pointed the way to effective schools for all children and said that the knowledge base existed, but the collective will to act did not. Closing the achievement gap is still on the agenda, but now it is a matter of “mobilizing will and collective efforts,” Ferguson says. The SLLC’s efforts to improve school leadership are part of a movement, he said, that is “trying to inspire people and help push resources in their direction.”

SUGGESTED READINGS FOR LEADERS

- Balfanz, R., & Legters, N. (2004, June). *Locating the dropout crisis*. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins Univ.
- The Broad Foundation & the Thomas B. Fordham Institute. (2003, May). *Better leaders for America’s schools: A manifesto*. Washington, DC: Authors. Retrieved June 23, 2005, from <http://www.edexcellence.net/doc/manifesto.pdf>
- Charlotte Advocates for Education. (2004, February). *Role of principal leadership in increasing teacher retention: Creating a supportive environment*. Charlotte, NC: Author.
- Colgan, C. (2003). Inviting the outside in. *Principal Leadership: High School Edition*, 4(4), 26–31.
- Dukess, L. F. (2001). *Meeting the leadership challenge: Designing effective principal mentor programs: The experiences of six New York City community school districts*. New York: New Visions for Public Schools.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., & Foleno, T. (2001, November). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Ferguson, R. (2003, November). *The leader’s role in teaching and learning*. Paper presented at the School Leadership Learning Community National Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Gates, S. M., Ringel, J. S., Santibañez, L., Ross, K. E., & Chung, C. H. (2003). *Who is leading our schools? An overview of administrators and their careers*. Arlington, VA: RAND Education.
- Gimbel, P. A. (2003). *Solutions for promoting principal–teacher trust*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Hale, E. L., & Moorman, H. N. (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Washington, DC: IEL. Retrieved June 23, 2005, from <http://www.iel.org/pubs/preparingprincipals.pdf>
- Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. (2004, January). A matter of principals: The kindergarten to grade 12 school leaders Maryland needs, and how to get them. *The Abell Report*, 17(1). Baltimore: The Abell Foundation.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Joftus, S., & Maddox-Dolan, B. (2003, April). *Left out and left behind: NCLB and the American high school*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Leithwood, K. (2004, rev. 2005). *Educational leadership*. A Review of the Research. Philadelphia: The Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University. Retrieved June 23, 2005, from <http://www.temple.edu/lss/pdf/leithwood.pdf>
- Mednick, A. (2003, Fall). *Conversations—The principal’s new role: Creating a community of leaders*. Boston: Center for Collaborative Education.

— continued

- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2003). *K-12 principals guide to No Child Left Behind*. Washington, DC: Author.
- O'Neill, K., Fry, B., Hill, D., & Bottoms, G. (2003). *Good principals are the key to successful schools: Six strategies to prepare more good principals*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach, L. (2003). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the school principalship*. Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.
- Reeves, D. B. (1998). Holding principals accountable. *School Administrator*, 55(9), 6-9.
- Reid, K. S. (2004, February 11). Poll finds differing views of school leaders' main tasks. *Education Week*, 23(22), 6. Retrieved June 23, 2005, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/02/11/22metlife.h23.html>
- Reyes, P., & Wagstaff, L. (2003, April). *Leadership, diverse students, and successful teaching and learning*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Chicago, IL. Retrieved June 23, 2005, from <http://www.cepa.gse.rutgers.edu/Division%20A%20Papers%202003/Reyes%20Wagstaff4-28.pdf>
- Richard, A. (2004, June 23). Hard-pressed rural school is "chartering" a new course. *Education Week*, 23(41), 10. Retrieved June 23, 2005, from <http://www.educationweek.org/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug=41Rural.h23>
- Roza, M., Celio, M. B., Harvey, J., & Wishon, S. (2003, January). *A matter of definition: Is there truly a shortage of school principals?* Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.
- Science Media Group at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University (Producers). (1999). *Principles for principals* [Video: An eight-part professional development workshop series for K-12 principals]. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement* (A Working Paper). Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Barbara McCloud and Betty Hale of IEL contributed significantly to the development of this issue of *Field Notes*.

LSS Staff:

Marilyn Murphy, Director of Outreach and Dissemination
Stephen Page, Managing Editor
Robert Sullivan, Senior Editor; *Lydia Hoag*, Editor



LSS *Field Notes* is a product of the **Laboratory for Student Success (LSS)** at Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education. LSS is the mid-Atlantic regional educational laboratory, one of ten regional educational laboratories funded by the Institute of Education Sciences of the U.S. Department of Education, and seeks to provide research-based information to significantly improve the educational capacity of the region, including Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, DC, and the nation. Inquiries about the work of LSS should be sent to LSS, Outreach and Dissemination Unit, Temple University, 1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, Philadelphia, PA, 19122-6091, 1-800-892-5550, lss@temple.edu, or visit the website at <http://www.temple.edu/LSS>. Copyright © 2005 Laboratory for Student Success.



The Laboratory for Student Success
 The Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory
 at Temple University Center for Research in
 Human Development and Education
 1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
 Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091

Non-Profit
 U.S. Postage Paid
 Philadelphia, PA
 Permit No. 1044