

INFLUENCE OF A DISTRICT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
ON 2ND, 3RD, AND 4TH YEAR PRINCIPALS

by

Eric D. Tingle, MS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The University of Houston-Clear Lake
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE

DECEMBER, 2016

INFLUENCE OF A DISTRICT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
ON 2ND, 3RD, AND 4TH YEAR PRINCIPALS

by

Eric D. Tingle

APPROVED BY

Michelle Peters, EdD, Chair

Amy Orange, PhD, Committee Member

Antonio Corrales, EdD, Committee Member

Sanee Bell, EdD, Committee Member

RECEIVED BY THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION:

Joan Y. Pedro, PhD, Associate Dean

Mark D. Shermis, PhD, Dean

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people to thank that have helped me along the way. This journey has been a difficult one, and I could not have done it without the love and support of many people. I first want to start with Dr. Michelle Peters. Thank you for serving as my chair and for always giving me the honest and upfront feedback that would only help me to be a better writer and researcher. I really appreciate your support and leadership. You are the best! I would also like to thank Dr. Amy Orange for serving as my methodologist. You are a qualitative genius! Thank you for your support and feedback related to many things, specifically my focus groups, interviews and chapters 3 and 4. To Dr. Saneel Bell, thank you for serving on my committee. I look up to you as a fellow principal and I enjoy following your leadership via Twitter. Lol. Thank you for your leadership! To Dr. Antonio Corrales, thank you! I really appreciate your feedback and support along the way. Lastly, rest in peace Dr. Betty Grigsby. You started this journey with me until your last day with us. We miss you!

To my wife Shirrell, thank you for always believing in me and for pushing me. This journey has indeed required me to step away from some of my obligations and you have always found a way to keep our family afloat, knowing that I needed to spend some time researching, writing and so forth. I love you Mrs. Tingle. To Eric Jr, Nadia, and Elliot, I love you so much. As I type, I cry. I never thought that I would have 3 beautiful children. I am here to support you until the day that I die. I will protect you, advocate for you and lead you. You have my word. Again, daddy loves you.

I also want to thank my Oklahoma family for supporting me from a distance through this process. To Amani, you have been the greatest influence in my life. You helped me write me get my first scholarship, adopted me and always sacrificed yourself for me. I appreciate the love and support that you showed me at a young age and for setting me up for success. If it were not for foster care and for your leadership, I do not know where I would be today. I love you. To Lucrecia, LaShara, LaToya, and LaVonda, I did it! I love each of you. Thank you for being there for me and for always believing in me. I promised that I would get it done and I did. Thank you to the entire Tingle family. There too many to name individual, just know that I love you and thank you for your support throughout my life. A special shout out to the Casey Family Program, Sunbeam Family Services, Foster Care to Success and many other entities that supported me while in Foster Case. You saved my life!

I also want to thank my Houston extended family for supporting me throughout this journey. To Lenora, Cheryl, and Dalphine, thank you. When I began this journey, our kids were really small and we needed a lot of support. You kept the kids when I needed to study, supported Shirrell when I had to be in class, and kept your doors open when I needed you. You are all phenomenal women. Thank you for allowing me to be a part of your family. Thank you to the entire Foster family for your love and support.

Rest in peace Ms. Mildred Tingle. This is always tough for me, no matter how many years have passed. I miss you mother and I hope that you are looking down on me to see this. I have lived my adult life trying to make you proud and I hope that you are. I promise to continue to do so. It is not about me now, I have kids watching me and I hope to be a role model to them like you were to me. Whenever I think about quitting, I think of you and what you would want me to do. You will always be an inspiration to me. This is for all of you!

ABSTRACT

INFLUENCE OF A DISTRICT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
ON 2ND, 3RD, AND 4TH YEAR PRINCIPALS

Eric D. Tingle
University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2016

Dissertation Chair: Michelle Peters, EdD
Co-Chair: Amy Orange, PhD

The purpose of this sequential mixed methods study was to determine the influence of a district leadership development program on 2nd, 3rd and, 4th year principals. A purposeful sample of 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the United States (U.S.) was solicited to provide responses to the *Principal Effectiveness Survey* to assess the influence cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture, and strategic operations had on principal effectiveness as school leaders. The survey data were analyzed using frequencies and percentages, while the focus group and interview data were analyzed using an inductive coding process. Findings obtained from participant responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey* indicated principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Cohort Support* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders; activities related to *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders;

activities related to *Human Capital* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders; activities related to *Executive Leadership* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders; activities related to *School Culture* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders; and activities related to *Strategic Operations* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Findings obtained from the focus groups and interviews identified four themes related to how the leadership development program’s trainings and support influenced principals’ effectiveness as school leaders: (a) principal supervisor and peer support, (b) no recollection of trainings, (c) shortcomings of the program, and (d) ways the program prepared the principals for leadership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	v
List of Tables.....	x
Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Significance of the Study.....	5
Research Purpose and Questions.....	7
Definitions of Terms.....	8
Conclusion.....	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	11
Theoretical Framework.....	12
University-Based Principal Preparation Programs.....	13
District Principal Preparation Programs.....	15
District Leadership Development Program.....	18
Professional Development and Training.....	20
Cohorts and Cohort Models.....	23
Mentors.....	24
Instructional Leadership.....	25
Human Capital.....	26
Executive Leadership.....	27
School Culture.....	28
Strategic Operations.....	29
Principal Effectiveness.....	30
Leader Self-Efficacy.....	32
Relationships.....	33
Summary of Findings.....	34
Conclusion.....	36

III.	METHODOLOGY.....	38
	Overview of the Research Problem.....	38
	Operationalization of Theoretical Constructs.....	39
	Research Purpose and Questions.....	40
	Research Design.....	41
	Population and Sample.....	41
	Participant Selection.....	43
	Instrumentation.....	45
	Data Collection Procedures.....	46
	Data Analysis.....	48
	Validity.....	50
	Privacy and Ethical Considerations.....	50
	Limitations of the Study.....	51
	Conclusion.....	52
IV.	RESULTS.....	54
	Participant Demographics.....	54
	Research Question One.....	55
	Research Question Two.....	68
	Research Question Three.....	75
	Research Question Four.....	86
	Research Question Five.....	95
	Research Question Six.....	102
	Research Question Seven.....	111
	No Recollection of Trainings.....	116
	Instructional Leadership.....	116
	Human Capital.....	117
	Executive Leadership.....	117
	School Culture.....	118
	Strategic Operations.....	118
	Shortcomings of the Program.....	119
	Ways the Program Prepared the Principal for Leadership.....	125
	Summary of Findings.....	129
	Conclusion.....	131
V.	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSION.....	132
	Summary.....	133
	Research Question 1.....	133
	Overall Participants.....	134
	Grade Level.....	134
	Years of Experience.....	135
	Research Question 2.....	135

Overall Participants.....	136
Grade Level.....	136
Years of Experience.....	137
Research Question 3.....	137
Overall Participants.....	138
Grade Level.....	138
Years of Experience.....	139
Research Question 4.....	139
Overall Participants.....	140
Grade Level.....	140
Years of Experience.....	140
Research Question 5.....	141
Overall Participants.....	141
Grade Level.....	142
Years of Experience.....	142
Research Question 6.....	142
Overall Participants.....	143
Grade Level.....	143
Years of Experience.....	143
Research Question 7.....	144
Principal Supervisor and Peer Support.....	144
No Recollection of Trainings.....	145
Shortcomings of the Program.....	146
Ways the Program Prepared the Principals for Leadership.....	146
Implications.....	148
Recommendations for Future Research.....	151
Conclusion.....	153
REFERENCES.....	155
APPENDIX A SURVEY COVER LETTER.....	162
APPENDIX B SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	164
APPENDIX C INFORMED CONSENT.....	172
APPENDIX D FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	176
RÉSUMÉ	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 District Student Demographic Data.....	42
3.2 District Principal Demographic Data.....	43
4.1 Principal Participant Demographic Data.....	55
4.2 Participant Responses to Cohort Support (%).....	57
4.3 Participant Responses to Cohort Support per Grade Level (%).....	60
4.4 Participant Responses to Cohort Support per Years of Experience (%)	65
4.5 Participant Responses to Instructional Leadership (%).....	69
4.6 Participant Responses to Instructional Leadership per Grade Level (%).....	71
4.7 Participant Responses to Instructional Leadership per Years of Experience (%).....	74
4.8 Participant Responses to Human Capital (%).....	77
4.9 Participant Responses to Human Capital per Grade Level (%).....	80
4.10 Participant Responses to Human Capital per Years of Experience (%)	84
4.11 Participant Responses to Executive Leadership (%).....	87
4.12 Participant Responses to Executive Leadership per Grade Level (%)..	89
4.13 Participant Responses to Executive Leadership per Years of Experience.....	93
4.14 Participant Responses to School Culture (%).....	96
4.15 Participant Responses to School Culture per Grade Level (%).....	98

4.16	Participant Responses to School Culture per Years of Experience (%)	101
4.17	Participant Responses to Strategic Operations (%).	104
4.18	Participant Responses to Strategic Operations per Grade Level (%)....	106
4.19	Participant Responses to Strategic Operations per Years of Experience (%).	110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Principal training at many university-based programs is out of touch with the needs of school districts; as a result, graduates leave college unprepared for school leadership positions (Mendels & Mitgang, 2013). The purpose of a university-based principal preparation program is to prepare participants to be successful in their chosen career. However, current research suggests that this objective may not be reached by all participants (Hernandez, Roberts, & Velma, 2012). Prior to principalship, aspiring principals may receive training from university-based institutions but lack the skills and knowledge needed to meet the challenges of the school leadership position (Gentilucci, Denti, & Guaglianone, 2013).

University-based principal preparation programs take place prior to principalship and are designed for aspiring principals. When students leave university-based principal preparation programs unprepared for their role, it represents a failure of the program to provide the requisite skills for effectiveness (Hernandez et al., 2012). Mendels and Mitgang (2013) suggested the quality of the school leader relates to the academic success of students; therefore, school districts should invest in the training and development of their school leaders. Knowing the quality of school principals can make a real difference, why are candidates not being prepared for their roles? What information is missing from the university-based principal preparation programs that result in unprepared candidates?

Lacking certainty in the programmatic preparation of principals new to the role, some districts have moved towards developing their own leadership preparation programs to emphasize their own leadership standards (Taylor, Pelletier, Trimble, & Ruiz, 2014). For the purpose of this study, leadership development programs are referred to as programs created by school districts for principals and their development. As school districts create their own leadership development programs, they should use the criteria related to principal certification within their state (Taylor et al., 2014). This will ensure alignment between the leadership development program's curriculum and the requirements of that state. State requirements and standards present key competencies of a school leader, and many program developers are following these standards when developing programs for school leaders (Mendels & Mitgang, 2013). In Texas, the qualifications for certification as a principal are outlined in the Texas Education Code. Sections b and c of the Texas Education Code (2015) §21.046 states the following:

- (b) The qualifications emphasize instructional leadership; administration, supervision, and communication skills; curriculum and instruction management; performance evaluation; organization; and fiscal management.
- (c) Because an effective principal is essential to school improvement, the board shall ensure that each candidate for certification as a principal is of the highest caliber and multi-level screening processes, validated comprehensive assessment programs, and flexible internships with successful mentors exist to determine whether a candidate for certification as a principal possesses the essential knowledge, skills, and leadership capabilities necessary for success. (p. 4)

Conversely, in one Florida school district, educators must participate in a Level II principal certification program, which requires the educator to complete the school district approved program to be considered eligible to be a principal (Taylor, et al., 2014). Allowing school districts to develop their own district leadership development programs emerges as one possible solution to improve the readiness of new principals (Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). Leadership development programs take place after principals complete their university based principal preparation program. According to Turner (2007), the best leadership development programs embed themselves into the organization. As previously alluded, this approach is taking place in multiple states, including Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and Massachusetts (Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003).

Statement of the Problem

The role of the school leader is critical and consideration must be given to the knowledge and skills that increase student outcomes (Verrett, 2012). Considerable research has been completed regarding the importance of effective preparation of principals as school leaders (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013; Miller, 2013; Verrett, 2012; Versland, 2013). Studies have stated university-based preparation programs may not be sufficiently preparing principals for their roles; as a result, district leadership development programs may be needed to prepare principals to be school leaders (Black, 2011; Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Grissom & Harrington, 2010; MyIntyre, 2001; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). Given the loss of confidence in university based principal preparation programs, “grow your own” leadership development programs have become popular in some large school districts (Versland, 2013). Principal candidates apply for

district leadership development programs; the program is designed to prepare selected candidates for school leadership in their sponsoring school district (Versland, 2013).

Currently, there is a leadership development program in one district that principals enter upon being hired into their role. There is a need to identify which components as part of the leadership development program, prepare principals for school leadership and to what extent those components prepare principals for school leadership, seeing that the content that should be included in preparation programs is so difficult to identify (McIntyre, 2001). Examining the extent to which cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture and strategic operations influence principals' effectiveness as school leaders can provide educational leaders and school districts with important information necessary to understanding the professional development activities principals find important regarding their effectiveness as school leaders.

According to Taylor et al. (2014), the differentiation in a principal preparation program should be made based on the knowledge and goals of assistant principals. This point is relevant to the study because many principals are coming from different instructional backgrounds, some not serving as assistant principals at all. Adults learn best when learning activities are put in real-world contexts and when the learning activities are at the learner's level of skill and interest. Inflexible learning activities do not allow for individual inquiry and exploration (Davis & Leon, 2011). The research suggests that adult learners find value in the activities they can relate to and that are relevant to their work.

Concerns about principal effectiveness and the effort to study and improve

principal preparation programs are not new (Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012). The need of each principal differs depending on his or her level of experience, understanding of curriculum, ability to build relationships, operational and management skills, and the ability to involve parents. Gentilucci, et al. (2013) recount that the most frequently mentioned challenges amongst principals were coping with stress, managing time, and creating positive working relationships. Mendels and Mitgang (2013) suggest that the pathway that leads to principal improvement includes teacher and staff excellence with a focus on continual improvement, professional learning systems that guarantee learning for children, a focus on college and career readiness, community engagement, self-discipline, and leading schools with a vision. With all of the research out stating what professional development activities are effective for principal preparation, school districts do not know which approach to take to prepare their principals for school leadership (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Gentilucci, et al., 2013; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013). There is a need to examine the extent to which cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture and strategic operations influence principal effectiveness as school leaders in the participating school district.

Significance of the Study

There is an abundance of literature published regarding university-based principal preparation programs (Browne-Ferrigno, 2007; Black, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Hernandez, Roberts & Velma, 2012). There is, however, a lack of literature related to district leadership development programs and the components that need to be included in these programs that will effectively prepare principals for their role. More districts are

creating programs that tailor to their district needs that include practical principal experiences (Mendels & Mitgang, 2013). Preparation programs that are able to blend coursework with field experiences provide opportunities for the participant to gain experience handling real problems while learning the theory surrounding the problems (Davis & Leon, 2011). Principals in the participating school district participate in the district leadership development program during their first year of principalship, allowing them to experience coursework with real problems. Furthermore, this study aligns with the strategic plan of the participating school district, which highlights the importance of having an effective principal in every school.

Research has supported the benefits of cohort support related to adult learners and using cohorts as a tool for leadership preparation (McCarthy, Trenga, & Weiner, 2005; Tucker, Henig, & Salmonowicz, 2005; Browne-Ferrigno, 2007). Saban and Wolfe (2009) mention that principals face a daunting task in leading schools and that they require significant support in order to be successful. Some school districts are attempting to provide this support to new principals through mentoring programs. Instructional leadership helps to improve teaching and learning by helping principals to identify a school vision and helping to innovate classroom-based teaching strategies (Mestry, Moonsammy-Koopasammy, & Schmidt, 2013). Kimball (2011) concludes that focusing on human capital can ensure that high quality teachers are on the campus to produce student achievement results. According to Peurach and Gumas (2011), school improvement depends on executives who have knowledge in sustaining and managing new educational systems. Herrington (2013), points out that the principal sets the tone and creates the school culture. School culture is important because it can determine if the

school environment is supportive in nature or hostile and divided (Herrington, 2013).

McKinney, Labat, and Labat (2015) determined that teacher morale is a component of school culture and that the morale of the teacher impacts the instruction given to students.

Although principals serve an important role in developing schools, the knowledge and skills that principals need to achieve this goal is not well developed (Grissom & Harrington, 2010). This study serves to add research showing to what extent principals find cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture and strategic operations influence their effectiveness as school leaders in the participating school district. Based on the data collected from 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals, this study could potentially support the participating school district, as well as other school districts with finding out what professional development activities principals find effective through their first 3 years of principalship. Conducting this study in a large urban school district may provide insight from different cohorts of principals as to what professional development activities principals feel influence their effectiveness related to school leadership.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program had on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in the participating school district. This study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to cohort support?
2. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to instructional leadership?

3. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to human capital?
4. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to executive leadership?
5. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to school culture?
6. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to strategic operations?
7. What factors, including the leadership development program, influenced principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as school leaders?

Definitions of Terms

Beginning Principal – The instructional leader, manager, director, and chief executive officer of the school (Collins & O'Brien, 2011). For the purpose of this study, a beginning principal refers to a principal in his or her second, third, or fourth year of principalship and can serve as an elementary, middle or high school principal.

Cohort – A group of people who start and progress through a degree program together (Collins & O'Brien, 2011).

Construct – An idea or theory containing various conceptual elements, typically one considered to be subjective and not based on empirical evidence (Oxford Dictionaries, 2011).

Culture – The symbolic meanings expressed through language, gesture, dress, and so forth, by which the members of a given society communicate with and understand themselves, each other, and the world around them (Collins & O'Brien, 2011).

Effectiveness – A concept of effectiveness in achieving explicit goals or objectives; involves the use of multiple measures or indicators (Collins & O’Brien, 2011).

Elementary School Principal – For the purpose of this study, an elementary school principal refers to a principal who leads a school with grades pre-kindergarten – 5th.

Executive Leadership – The work of the person or group of people who bear ultimate responsibility for establishing, managing, and sustaining the hub organization and the network (Peurach & Gumus, 2011).

High School Principal - For the purpose of this study, a high school principal refers to a principal who leads a school with grades 9th-12th.

Human Capital – The stock of productive skills of an individual (Hanushek, 2009).

Instructional Leadership – A complex process, which differs across settings, based on individual style, school context, and constituents. This form of leadership can take many forms (Costello, 2015).

Mentor – An experienced guide who offers knowledge, insight, support and wisdom that is useful to a protégé over an extended period of time in order to teach necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities the protégé needs to achieve life or career goals (Collins & O’Brien, 2011).

Middle School Principal – For the purpose of this study, a middle school principal refers to a principal who leads a school with grades kindergarten – 8th and grades 6th – 8th.

Principal Effectiveness Survey (PES) – The 48-item survey instrument used in the study to determine the extent the leadership development program influenced a principal’s effectiveness as a school leader related to cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture, and strategic operations.

School Leader – A practicing professional in a leadership position at a P-12 school. The terms “principal,” “educational leader,” and “administrator” are used interchangeably with school leader (Briggs, 2014).

Strategic Operations – In Texas, the principal is responsible for assessing the current needs of their campus, regularly monitoring multiple data points, developing a year-long calendar, aligning resources to school priorities and treating central office staff members as partners in achieving campus goals (Texas Education Code, 2014).

Conclusion

There is little doubt that school principals face a difficult task in leading schools and in order to be effective school leaders, principals need sharper skills and effective professional development (Miller, 2013). In current search of research, there seems to be a dearth of studies that specifically address the influence leadership development programs have on school leadership. Chapter two will present current literature related to adult learning, university-based principal preparation programs, district principal preparation programs, the leadership development program in the participating school district, professional development and training, cohorts, mentors, principal effectiveness and leader self-efficacy.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Principals are held accountable for student achievement, increasing college readiness and working with disadvantaged students. The stakes for principals are high and their jobs are literally on the line (Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012). The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program had on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals. The participating school district has a “grow your own” leadership development program, aimed to prepare its principals for school leadership. This chapter will present a review of current literature regarding adult learning, university-based preparation programs, district leadership development programs, professional development and training, cohorts, mentors, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture, strategic operations, principal effectiveness and leader self-efficacy.

Principals are held accountable for a number of factors, which are continuing to evolve. According to Mendels and Mitgang (2013), the relationships between school districts and the principal are evolving. If we know this, why are principals walking away from university-based preparation programs not receiving the skills they need? The Wallace Family (2005), the researchers suggest that many principals are leaving university based principal preparation programs certified but not qualified to effectively lead schools. Principal preparation programs offered on university campuses do not always partner with the school district, so school districts are forced to create a “grow

your own” approach to ensure that principals are prepared to be effective leaders in their school district, despite which university-based principal preparation program the principal completes (Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). In order for principals to help children develop their skills, they need to have sharper skills and effective professional development (Miller, 2013). Considering the varied backgrounds each new principal enters the profession with, general preparation programs assumedly do not fit the needs of all new principals. Although new principals may receive training at institutes of higher education, they often lack the skills and dispositions needed to meet the challenges created by their leadership roles (Gentilucci, Denti, & Guaglianone, 2013). Duncan, Range, and Scherz (2011) explained that in order for learning processes to be effective, they must relate to how a learner prefers to learn.

Theoretical Framework

Andragogy was introduced by Knowles (1970) who concluded that andragogy is the art and science of helping adults learn. The method in which adults learn in this study is the leadership development program in participating school district and the adult learners are the first year principals. Knowles (1970) reports that andragogy is premised on four assumptions of adult learners. As adult learners mature:

- (a) Their self-concept moves from one of being dependent personality towards being a self-directed human being.
- (b) They accumulate a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich resource for learning.
- (c) Their readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of their social roles.

(d) Their time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly, their orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of performance-centeredness. (44-55)

Holyoke and Larson (2009) suggest that there are three characteristics of adult learners:

(a) the adult learner's readiness to learn, (b) the adult learner's orientation to learn, and (c) the adult learners motivation to learn. Learners want to hear from other individuals who share real-life experiences in order to see how they can apply those some experiences to their situations, as well see flexibility in course requirements and how new knowledge can be applied to their life (Holyoke & Larson, 2009). Principals are adult learners and designers of leadership development programs should be mindful of the characteristics that principals as adult learners possess (Holyoke & Larson, 2009). By surveying and interviewing 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals who participated in the leadership development program in the participating district, this study will determine the influence in which the components of the leadership development program had on their effectiveness as school leaders. The goal is to see if principals were able to take the subject-centered components of the leadership development program and turn them into performance-centered tasks that aid them in being effective school leaders.

University-Based Principal Preparation Programs

Research suggests that critics, including principals, raise concerns about the leadership preparation provided at university based programs (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005). Many university-based principal preparation programs may lack the real world experience aspiring principals need to be successful in their roles.

Although new principals may receive training at institutes of higher education, they often lack the skills and dispositions needed to meet the challenges created by their leadership roles (Gentilucci et al., 2013). Furthermore, participants in many university-based programs are general due to the fact that some of the participants in the program include teachers and other district leaders that want to get a degree as opposed to actually being a principal (Davis et al., 2005).

Davis and Leon (2011) believe that it is essential for programs that are preparing principals for their roles to include certain principles. The researchers mention that adults must feel responsible for their learning and that the learning activities must be problem-based and practical to the skills they are learning (Davis & Leon, 2011). Principal preparation programs should be related to the skills principals will need to be successful in their role and should allow for them to practice by solving problems related to what they may experience in their role (Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). In a study conducted by Davis and Darling-Hammond (2012), five university-based principal preparation programs were analyzed. The authors determined that the key design features of the programs included a rigorous admission process, alignment of problem-based learning with relevant theory, cultivates strong partnerships with school districts, study school improvement strategies, organizational behavior, school management of change, develop self-actualized leaders, interactions with groups on varying levels of the education system, internship activities, leadership competencies, fostering of analytic skills and the development of a portfolio to name a few.

Szal and Williams (2011) examine principals' pre and post self-assessment of their effectiveness on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)

standards. The assessment was given to 11 principals and was designed to have principals reflect on what they already knew about being an effective principal, as it related to the ISLLC standards. This assessment was given to the principals prior to participating in the Principal Residency Program in which they were enrolled. In the final stages of the Principal Residency Program, principals were given the survey again and the principals' perceptions showed a significant increase, showing that principal preparation programs can be beneficial. There is research that shows that principals find their university based preparation programs effective. According to Geer, Anast-May, and Gurley (2014), 97.0% of the survey participants report that the activities they participated in as part of their preparation program prepared them for assuming a role as an educational leader.

District Principal Preparation Programs

Principal preparation programs should reflect current research in school leadership and be linked to state licensing standards (Davis et al., 2005). Stein and Gewirtzman (2003) propose school districts should develop their own district leadership development programs as a solution to solving the issue of principals not being prepared for their roles coming out of university based programs. This leadership development program would take place after principals complete their university-based preparation program. This will allow school districts to train their own principals and not have to rely on the university based preparation programs to train them. This approach is taking place in many states like Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Kentucky, Wyoming, and Massachusetts (Browne-Ferrigno, 2007; Duncan et al., 2011; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003).

Browne-Ferrigno (2007), the author noted that the Principals Excellence Program (PEP) in Kentucky was designed to expand the pool of effective principals and to improve instructional leadership among already practicing principals. The program was designed to support principals holding valid administration certificates (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003). The program included cohorts composed of principals and teachers, succession planning community building, differentiated learning experiences, weekly activities where principals shared their successes based on their experiences, a cohort model and a summer institute which included district administrators and selected teacher leaders (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003). Duncan et al. (2011) concluded that school law, leadership theory, supervision/evaluation, budgeting/finance, instructional leadership, cohort format and the internship experience where the top strengths principals noted related to their preparation programs. Moreover, the authors found some deficits noted by Wyoming principals who had participated in preparation programs from various states and universities, as well as different time frames. Duncan et al. (2011) revealed the following:

Staff issues, discipline, data and dealing with parents were all primary themes exclusively coded as deficits of the programs. Two of these themes, resolving staff issues and working with difficult parents, are associated with communication and interpersonal skills, such as conflict management strategies, consensus building, building a collegial faculty, and respond to upset parents. Additionally, principals identified development in handling student discipline as a deficit in some programs, a finding that needs to be addressed in principal preparation

programs as, in practice, discipline as a “day-to-day” trial that is most time consuming. (p. 10)

In Florida, principals state that instructional leadership and student achievement were the top two domains they felt the most unprepared for related to school leadership. This information is important because instructional leadership and student achievement were the two domains that the superintendent in that district found most important (Taylor, Pelletier, Trimble, & Ruiz, 2014).

Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005) advocate that principal preparation programs should be differentiated to principals based on the demographic areas of the school the principal will lead. The skills needed to lead a low income high school is different from the skills needed to lead a middle income elementary. There could be potential cultural and other technical needs that could be required of each leader, depending on the area they lead (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe & Meyerson, 2005). Additionally, Taylor et al. (2014) determined at the conclusion of their study that completers that served in schools with 50% or less and 75% or more free and reduced lunch students, felt that they were more prepared for school leadership than those completers who served in schools with 51 to 74% free and reduced lunch students. The differences in principals’ perception of preparedness may reflect the differences in skills needed in schools with different demographics.

It is possible that the trainings given during many of the leadership development programs are not differentiating the information given to principals in order for principals to be successful in their roles. For example, Black (2011) reported that some of the responses from principals state that the course sequence as part of their leadership

development program had very few electives and that the program was consistent with some cohort models. Trainers must be equipped with the most up to date practices and theories in order to teach the new principals what is expected as new administrators. In fact, Smith and Addison (2013) concluded that the theories used for developing both teachers and principals have changed and are no longer applicable.

District Leadership Development Program

J. A. Brown claims that the creation of the leadership development program in the participating school district started in 2010, based on the observation of the current Superintendent of Schools that the principals they were hiring were not prepared to be effective school leaders (personal communication, June 24, 2015). J. A. Brown also reported that the Superintendent of Schools observed that there was no systematic way for the school district to prepare principals for their roles and challenged the leadership development department in the participating school district to design a “grow your own” leadership program that would prepare beginning principals for their role, despite the university-based principal preparation program from which they graduated (personal communication, June 24, 2015). The leadership development department in the participating school district did research on The Wallace Foundation, in the Atlanta Public School District, Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP), in Montgomery County, Maryland and the Texas standards for principals, whereby principals in Texas are appraised (Texas Education Code, 2014). From that research, the leadership development program in the participating school district was formed and implemented in 2012, catered towards first year principals and a selected number of assistant principals who the district felt would one day be principals. In 2013, the school district decided to

only cater the leadership development program towards incoming first year principals. J. A. Brown stated that the program currently begins in July and first year principals receive support during their first and second year of principalship (personal communication, June 24, 2015).

The leadership development program in the participating school district includes multiple components and is aligned to the Texas standards for principals, whereby principals in Texas will be appraised (Texas Education Code, 2014). The leadership development program is designed to provide first year principals support in the following areas: (a) cohort support, (b) mentor support, and (c) choice offers, depending on the need of the participant. The monthly cohort meetings as part of this leadership development program is designed to provide participants support in the follow areas: (a) observation & feedback, (b) instructional planning, (c) data-driven instruction, (d) scholar and adult culture, (e) instructional leadership: curriculum, instruction, and assessment, (f) professional development for leadership teams, (g) professional development for teachers, and (h) resources management. The mentors chosen to support the participants as part of this preparation program are district employees. The mentors aim to support participants on a monthly basis in the following areas: (a) instructional leadership, (b) human capital, (c) executive leadership, (d) school culture, and (e) strategic operations. As part of this preparation program, participants are given multiple courses to choose from depending on their need. The choices participants are able to choose from throughout the program experience are of the following: (a) preliminary budget planning, (b) legal updates, (c) staff documentation, (d) leading relevant review, and (e) intentional interventions (personal communication, June 24, 2015).

Professional Development and Training

A problem faced by program designers is that of maintaining a highly planned training sequence that is creative and spontaneous enough to capture unique opportunities and one that can adapt to real life situations that arise (McIntyre, 2001). Specific behaviors that matter most regarding principals and their impact of teaching and learning track back to program components, process and assessments of effectiveness (Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012). The training must be valid to the principal and the learning activities must be problem-based and practical to the skills they are learning (Davis & Leon, 2011). McIntyre (2001) states that the content that should be included in a program is difficult to identify. The author also suggests that if administrators were provided more options for trainings or were able to create their own training based on their needs, as opposed to being directed to go to a particular set of trainings, they could potentially benefit from the trainings.

Grissom and Harrington (2010) focus on the fact that there is a large amount of research that has been done regarding the professional development needs of teachers, but little research has been done regarding what types of professional development principals need. With this being said, it is often hard for researchers to determine a set curriculum for what administrators need to know. Grissom and Harrington suggest that although principals serve an important role in developing schools, the knowledge and skills that principals need to achieve this goal is not well developed. Brown-Ferrigno and Knoepfel (2005), however, present research on a principal program in which the program

includes nearly 200 indicators in the six ISLLC Standards for School Leaders, not limited to a vision for success and a focus on teaching and learning.

The topic of principal preparation and ensuring that principals are provided the appropriate forms of professional development affects student achievement. Gill and Hendee (2010) conclude that, unless leadership capacity becomes the focus in school systems, student achievement may be negatively impacted. Not all modes of professional development for principals improve their performance (Grissom & Harrington, 2010). Unfortunately, educators will receive promotions and get hired as new principals, but it seems to be up to the hiring organizations to train and build capacity within the new leaders with the right things in mind, not knowing or agreeing with what the university-based programs provided. In order for principals to be prepared for success, the district must provide effective trainings, professional development opportunities and the appropriate amount of support.

Another form of professional development for principals is finding the right types of support for them. What constitutes the right type of support? Given the amount of tasks principals have to do, principals have varied perceptions of what the right type of support is (Duncan et al., 2011). Gentilucci et al. (2013) report that study participants were unaware of how demanding the job of the principal was compared to other teaching and administrative roles. Study participants stated that their expectations of the role clashed with the realities of the day-to-day duties. Furthermore, student participants stated that creating relationships and sustaining positive working relationships with staff was a priority for them. Moreover, all participants stated that relationship-building was essential for improving school culture (Gentilucci et al., 2013). Davis, Darling-

Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005), conclude that the role of principal includes multiple task. Principals are expected to be instructional and curriculum leaders, disciplinarians, budget analysts and public relations experts. Additionally, principals are also expected to cater to the needs of students, teachers, parents, community members, teacher unions and state and federal agencies (Davis et al., 2005).

Principals inevitably will enter the field in a variety of settings. According to Ashton and Duncan (2012), assuming the role as a new principal, combined with being inexperienced can be overwhelming. Principals express frustrations with not being able to say “no” to staff members, running around the entire day and not being able to stop (Ashton & Duncan, 2012). Some other challenges for new principals noted in this study included isolation and loneliness, multitasking, managing the school budget, implementing new ideas and initiatives, dealing with the actions and ghost of the last principal and managing multiple staff members and stakeholders (Ashton & Duncan, 2012).

Salazar (2007) reports in a study regarding the professional development needs of rural high school principals, that the professional development needs principals felt would lead to school improvement included building a team commitment, creating a learning organization, sustaining and motivating for continuous improvement, setting instructional direction, communicating effectively and facilitating the change process. Salazar declared that related to the preferred delivery of professional development activities, principals stated that the conference/seminar, field-based and workshops were preferred delivery methods. Principal participants stated that online/self-paced delivery models were the least preferred (Salazar, 2007).

Cohorts and Cohort Models

Collins and O'Brien (2011) define a cohort as a group of people who start and progress through a degree program together. Browne-Ferrigno (2007) reports that principals' perceptions about school leadership were influenced by the interactions they had during cohort meetings. Principals are able to speak opening to their colleagues and get feedback on issues and concerns they may be having on their campuses. Individuals who participate in a cohort do not have to feel as if they are achieving a goal alone and are provided with a network of people to share ideas with and to get support and information from. Brown-Ferrigno noted that cohort members got the most learning from listening and sharing experiences with peers. Working together in collaborative groups, or cohorts, gives principals the opportunity to develop skills from other people and to pose questions to the group for a better understanding related to multiple experiences regarding principalship.

Govender and Dhunpath (2011) assert that students in a cohort benefit from contributions given by their peers. Principals who participated in the study stated that they could depend on other people in the cohort for emotional support and to relieve academic and personal stress. Furthermore, McCarthy, Trenga, and Weiner (2005) contends that the culture that a cohort develops is important to the personal lives of the members, as is a critical factor to the educational environment of the cohort. Huang et al. (2012) found that the only program feature that was associated with principals being prepared in the core leadership areas was cohort support. Additionally, the cohort structure was reported to be the most appreciated program feature amongst participants (Huang et al., 2012). Within the cohort structure, participants indicated that program

strengths included the reflective nature of the program, instructional rounds, and experienced principals who visited class through the year to offer practical advice (Huang et al., 2012).

Mentors

It is no secret that principals across the nation face a difficult task in leading schools. One of the ways suggested to support principals in this difficult task is by providing them with a mentor (Saban, 2009). The leaders must trust each other in order to share the instructional tasks (Gill & Hendee, 2010). These key leaders, or mentors, would be there as someone to talk to, would provide support and guidance and would help problem solve some of the issues first year principals take on. Principals can benefit from a mentor that ask questions, gives feedback and provides trust. School leadership is collaborative and social, which is why the leaders must trust each other. In fact, no one person can lead an effective school. It is not a solitary endeavor by one person, it takes a team (Davis & Leon, 2011).

Saban (2009), analyzed data for 106 principals related to leadership practices involving mentors. Of the 106 principals who participated in the study, 80.1% of those principals were given a mentor, where 19.9% of those principals had no mentor experience at all. The results of the study showed that the mentored group of principals engaged in leadership practices more frequently than the group of principals that had no mentor experience at all. Additionally, Saban (2009) reports that principals value the opportunity to be reflective with their mentors, as well as for their mentors to affirm that they are doing their jobs. Mentors provide feedback to principals regarding their jobs and provide an outlet for principals to share and reflect on their practice. Mentors serve the

purpose of problem solving with a learner and being there to close the gap between what a learner knows and the potential developmental level of the learner (Davis, et al., 2005).

As part of the principal preparation program in the participating school district, principals are given a mentor. The mentors chosen to support the participants as part of this preparation program are district employees. The mentors aim to support participants on a monthly basis in the following areas: (a) instructional leadership, (b) human capital, (c) executive leadership, (d) school culture, and (e) strategic operations. In a study done by Della Sala et al. (2013), a group of principals were matched to mentors based on the principals' needs and the mentors' expertise. Similar to the principal preparation program in the participating school district, this study was conducted on a program designed to meet the needs of each principal's short and long term goals. As part of this study, principals worked with their mentors to identify strategies that could highlight their strengths and that could improve their weaknesses. The findings of the study showed that principals found the program relevant to their individual needs and to their school improvement efforts (Della Sala et al., 2013).

Instructional Leadership

The role and definition of instructional leadership is hard to explain. It is a complex process and varies based on individuals, their setting and context of the particular school. Researchers cannot come up with one concrete way to define instructional leadership (Costello, 2015). Because of the multiple definitions and meanings related to instructional leadership, principals are left to create their own definition of what it looks like and struggle to implement instructional leadership in an effective manner (Costello, 2015). Regardless of the definition of instructional

leadership, principals find it difficult to implement it due to a number of other daunting tasks that the role encompasses. Student issues, administrative tasks, parent issues, dealing with stakeholders, meeting district deadlines and paperwork are all things that can keep the principal from focusing on being an instructional leader in the school (Costello, 2015; Mestry, Moonsammy-Koopasammy, & Schmidt, 2013).

The role of the principal has changed from being a manager to now being an instructional leader (Mestry et al., 2013). The authors reported that instructional leadership encompasses multiple themes for principals, including but not limited to balancing their administrative and instructional roles, managing the instructional program on their campus and promoting positive school climate. Primary principals participated in a study conducted in South Africa and mentioned that their main foci related to instructional leadership involved setting clear goals, managing the curriculum and the evaluation of teaching and learning on their campus.

Human Capital

According to Hanushek (2009), virtually every government is concerned about investing in human capital. Although the role of the principal has shifted from being a manager to an instructional leader, principals must also learn and be able to be effective managers of talent. Principals must develop their staff, as well as provide the atmosphere that will allow the staff to fully commit to the vision of the principal (Kimball, 2011). Kimball (2011) reports that principals not only have to hire the best talent, but they need to plan for staff turnover, have a message to recruit new talent, use their professional contacts and be sure to have a system for their selection process. Being an effective

manager over human capital is important and requires a lot of steps in order to be done correctly.

Kimball (2011) states that goal setting from both principals and teachers motivates performance and they should be communicated. Teachers are one example of the human capital in a school setting. Avidov-Ungar (2016) reports that teachers are able to increase their pedagogical knowledge, as well as engage in the construction of their professional identity. If teachers are effective, then the school has a better chance of being effective. This process can be streamlined by setting goals. The students in a school should set their goals based on the teachers' goals, the teachers in a school should set their goals based on the principals' goals, the principals should set their goals based on the school districts' goals and the school districts should set their goals based on the state's goals. Once those goals are set, principals, teachers, students and other school leaders must effectively monitor those goals (Kimball, 2011). This approach will not only assist principals in connecting school improvement with the retention of effective human capital, but will also help to ensure that a talented organization is in place for students (Kimball, 2011).

Executive Leadership

Turner (2007) reports that effective leaders enable organizations to respond to change, address challenges and creates culture that engages employees. It is that leadership that helps executives when they need to wrestle new challenges (Turner, 2007). Similar to the issues researchers have with finding the specific things principals need to be successful, researchers have not investigated practice and knowledge of executives to note the differences between their roles in different school improvement

networks, thus not being able to support the professional development of executives (Peurach & Gumus, 2011). There is no question that school improvement is important, but without a clear definition of what components make up executive leadership, executives or principals cannot receive the most effective professional development in order to make the significant gains in schools. Turner (2007) asserts that the research surrounding executive leadership places emphasis on an executive having self-knowledge, personal accountability, strategy setting, engaging others and harnessing insights. Peurach and Gumus (2011) propose four things regarding executive leadership itself. Executive practice, knowledge, learning and variation are all mentioned related to executives working in school improvement networks (Peurach & Gumus, 2011).

School Culture

Collins and O'Brien (2011) assert that culture is expressed through language, gesture and dress, by which people in a community understanding each other. In a school setting, a positive school culture can be described as one where the staff and students support each other, they share common goals and values and the atmosphere of the building allows for all parties to feel a sense of belonging (Barr & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2009). Turan and Bektas (2013) suggest that forming the culture of an organization is complex and includes variables including socialization, language, rituals and influence to name a few.

McKinney, Labat, and Labat (2015) conclude that teacher morale is a component of school culture and that the morale of the teacher impacts the instruction given to students. Sparks (2013) expounded upon school climate stating that placing focus on it can lead to long-term school improvement. An important factor in teacher morale and

the overall culture of a school is the school principal. A principal is responsible for setting the tone of the school and motivating the staff in a positive way in order to lead to student achievement (McKinney et al., 2015). However, Turan and Bektas (2013) argue that this responsible is not only of the principal, but of multiple stakeholders. School culture encompasses many people, an individual goals are more likely to be accomplished with the support of many people (Turan & Bektas, 2013).

Strategic Operations

In the participating school district, a component of strategic operations is the relationship between the central office employees and the employees on the school level. One goal is for the school principal to treat central office employees as partners in achieving goals. McAdamis (2010) reports that in Rockwood Independent School District a 1999 program evaluation related to professional development showed that the campus employees did not know what high-quality professional development looks like and the central office employees did not know what professional learning communities look like, which are typically held on the campus level. District employees and school leaders in that district had to come together and have conversations regarding professional development in order to make a sound decision as to what it would look like on a campus level (McAdamis, 2010). This suggests that the relationship between central office and campus employees is important in order for alignment to take place. As a result of the conversation between central office and campus employees, the students improved in traditional academic measures, the enrollment in high school AP classes and the number of National Merit Schools increased and all of the high schools in the district

were placed on the list of 1,000 top U.S. high schools in the Newsweek magazine (McAdamis, 2010).

Another component of strategic operations is the ability of the campus principal to assess the needs of the school. Watkins (2005) suggests that “needs” should be defined as those things that are causing the gap between the desired results and the results that are currently being accomplished. A comprehensive needs assessment has three different levels of focus, one being the societal level, which focuses on outcomes and contributions of the organization, the second being the organizational level, which focuses on the outputs of the organization and the third being the individual/small group level, which focuses on the products of the organization (Watkins, 2005). Yang et al. (2015) indicate that a needs assessment is conducted so that the target audience can find gaps and discrepancies between what already exists to make decisions regarding what is needed. A needs assessment provides information for the decision-makers to identify appropriate decision alternatives (Yang et al., 2015).

Principal Effectiveness

According to Khan and Iqbal (2013), little is known about the contribution and overall success of a school as it relates to effective principalship. Principals are indeed considered as one of the important factors to school effectiveness, but the exact things that lead to a principal being effective are unknown. However, some research suggests that some characteristics of effective principals include principals who are purposeful and involved, maintain student discipline, maintain effective parental involvement and principals who provide effective monitoring and supervision (Khan & Iqbal, 2013).

Reynolds and O'Dwyer (2009) conducted a study that explored the relationships of effective leadership skills, emotional intelligence, and coping mechanisms for stress among middle school principals. The results of the study suggests that as principals' use of coping strategies related to stress increases, so does their effectiveness as a leader. Although the role as principal is demanding, principals must find ways to cope with stress in an effort to aid towards their effectiveness.

As principals leave and retire from the profession, managerial tasks, among others, drown out the appeal of principalship that would bring assistant principals and classroom teachers into the role (Chirichello, 2004). Instead of the focus being on managerial duties, the principalship should focus on leadership (Chirichello, 2004). In a study conducted in June 2001, 2002, and 2003, 77 principals and 123 teachers were each asked to make a list of three things they felt principals spent the most time doing and three things they felt principals spent the least amount of time doing. Chirichello (2004) pointed out that what teachers would like principals to do and what principals would like to do needs to be clarified.

Principal participants in this study mentioned that school management, supervision of staff and discipline/management of students were the three things they felt they spend the most time doing, where teachers felt that school management, responsibilities assigned by district office including special projects and discipline/management of students were the three things principals spend their time doing. Principals stated that they would like to spend most of their time with curriculum development and instructional issues, where teachers stated that they would like principals to spend most of their time interacting with staff other than supervision. With

these inconsistencies, it is difficult to define principal effectiveness, which could vary depending on a number of factors. Having a vision, collective leadership related to principals being collaborators and building a trusting relationship with teachers and stakeholders are all important relating to principal effectiveness (Chirichello, 2004).

Leader Self-Efficacy

According to Versland (2013), the loss of efficacy for aspiring principals can be incapacitating and that leaders who have a loss of efficacy could potentially be weakening their development or growth. This is important when evaluating a program because the leader's perception of his or her abilities could affect how the program assists them in their development. With this in mind, principals who believe that they can learn and achieve, could potentially gain more knowledge from a leadership development program than a principal who believes they cannot learn and achieve. The right mindset or belief in what a person can achieve or do can make the difference if a person achieves in a certain context (Federici & Skaalvik, 2012). Self-efficacy theory can be positive or negative and the theory provides a framework that can examine factors of school leadership that can enhance school success (Versland, 2013).

Federici and Skaalvik (2012) expounded upon self-efficacy, stating that in order for principals to handle all of the many responsibilities they have as school leaders, principals have to have the expectation to cope successfully (self-efficacy) in many different areas of functioning. People can affect their own actions, control their own thoughts and create their own guidelines for behavior (Federici & Skaalvik, 2012). In a study conducted by Federici and Skaalvik (2012), the researchers determined that there was a strong correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction and that self-efficacy

was important to a principals' well-being. Federici and Skaalvik reported that low self-efficacy partnered with low job satisfaction could lead to stressful work conditions when high levels of burnout is also present. Over time low self-efficacy, low job satisfaction and high levels of burnout can lead to motivation to leave the profession. Given the responsibilities that principals have, it is important that principals develop high levels of self-efficacy (Federici & Skaalvik, 2012).

Relationships

Positive relationships between mentors and their mentees could affect the outcome of the mentees work. In a study done by Huang et al. (2012), mentees were able to seek out relevant data and reach logical and high-quality decisions based on how supportive their mentor was perceived. New principals come in contact with a number of stakeholders and having positive relationships could have an impact on how they perform. Principals going through a principal preparation program in the School District of Philadelphia expressed satisfaction in being able to work with a host principal and working full-time in a host school (Huang et al., 2012). So, being able to actually see what the role of the principal looks like from principals currently in the role seems to work for new principals. Relationships with peers has also been found to be important to new principals as they are developing into school leaders. In fact, Huang et al. reported that principal mentees reported that the most appreciated program feature was the cohort model, where participants were able to receive peer support. Principal participants in a cohort structure with a group of aspiring principals can continue to network with this group of individuals through the relationships that they have built and keep in contact with them as they develop as school leaders. The cohort structure has been viewed as

one of the most supportive program features within a principal preparation program (Huang et al., 2012).

Fisher and Carlyon (2014) suggest that relational leadership is a trait of an insightful leader. Additionally, this type of leadership can create opportunities for people to encourage understanding amongst each other and to work together in harmonious ways (Fisher & Carlyon, 2014). The relationship between co-workers, principal and teachers, mentor and mentee and etc., is very important. In fact, in a study conducted by Bradshaw and Golbart (2013), they found that a key factor between service workers and staff members was building a relationship that included setting limits and boundaries. The relationship between employees was important in providing effective support and developing their knowledge of working with each other (Bradshaw & Golbart, 2013).

Summary of Findings

There has been much research completed regarding the importance of principals being effectively prepared for their roles as school leaders (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013; Miller, 2013; Verrett, 2012; Versland, 2013). There is research that has been completed stating that university-based preparation programs may not be preparing principals for their roles and a district leadership development program may be needed to prepare principals effectively for their roles as school leaders (Black, 2011; Davis et al., 2005; Grissom & Harrington, 2010; MyIntyre, 2001; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). With the doubt that university based principal preparation programs are preparing principals for leadership roles, “grow your own” leadership development programs have become popular in some large school districts (Versland, 2013).

Grissom and Harrington (2010) focus on the fact that there is a large amount of research that has been done regarding the professional development needs of teachers, but little research has been done regarding what types of professional development principals need. Brown-Ferrigno and Knoepfel (2005), however, present research on a principal program in which the program includes nearly 200 indicators in the six ISLLC Standards for School Leaders, not limited to a vision for success and a focus on teaching and learning. Research also suggests that principal preparation programs should be related to the skills principals will need to be successful in their role and should allow for them to practice by solving problems related to what they may experience in their role (Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). In a study conducted by Davis and Darling-Hammond (2012), five university-based principal preparation programs were analyzed. The authors determined that the key design features of the programs included a rigorous admission process, alignment of problem-based learning with relevant theory, cultivates strong partnerships with school districts, study school improvement strategies, organizational behavior, school management of change, develop self-actualized leaders, interactions with groups on varying levels of the education system, internship activities, leadership competencies, fostering of analytic skills and the development of a portfolio to name a few.

A problem faced by program designers is that of maintaining a highly planned training sequence that is creative and spontaneous enough to capture unique opportunities and one that can adapt to real life situations that arise (McIntyre, 2001). Additionally, McIntyre (2001), states that the content that should be included in a program is difficult to identify. Given the results found in previous studies, principal preparation program

designers and district personnel who train and support principals might consider a focus on cohort models, providing principals with mentors, teaching principals to focus on teacher morale, supporting principals with a needs assessment of their school, and teaching the principal to focus on relational leadership as viable solutions (Brown-Ferrigno, 2007; Fisher & Carlyon, 2014; Govender & Dhunpath, 2011; McKinnery, Labat & Labat, 2015; Saban, 2009; Yang et al., 2015).

Conclusion

Principals are under pressure to make improvements in schools and the stakes have never been higher (Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012). Principals are asked to be prepared for their roles as school leaders, but there are so many questions related to what components actually go into a university-based program and it is difficult to identify them (Davis, et al., 2005). With this uncertainty, more states are moving towards creating their own leadership development programs to ensure that their principals are prepared for the role of school leader (Browne-Ferrigno, 2007; Duncan, et al., 2011; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). The participating school district developed a leadership development program in 2010 that seeks to prepare its principals for the role of school leader. The program components include cohort support, mentor support and choice offerings. This study determined the influence the district leadership development program in the participating school district has on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals related to cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture and strategic operations. Chapter three presents methodology of the study: overview of the research problem, the operationalization of theoretical constructs, the research purpose and questions, the research design, the population and sample, the

instrumentation, the data collection procedures, the data analysis, the privacy and ethical consideration, and the limitations of the study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program had on 2nd, 3rd and 4th year principals in the participating school district. A purposeful sample of 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the U.S. was solicited to provide responses to the *Principal Effectiveness Survey*. The quantitative component was analyzed using frequencies and percentages, while an inductive coding process was used to analyze the qualitative data. This chapter presents an overview of the research problem, operational definitions of the theoretical constructs, the purpose of the research and the corresponding research questions, the research design, the population and sampling of the participants, instrumentation, how the data were collected and analyzed, ethical considerations, and the limitations of this study.

Overview of the Research Problem

There has been much research completed regarding the importance of principals being effectively prepared for their roles as school leaders (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013; Miller, 2013; Verrett, 2012; Versland, 2013). In addition, there is research that has been completed stating that university-based preparation programs may not be preparing principals for their roles and a district leadership development program may be needed to prepare principals effectively for their roles as school leaders (Black, 2011; Davis, Darling-Hammond,

LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Grissom & Harrington, 2010; MyIntyre, 2001; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). In current research, few studies specifically state the influence that leadership development programs have on school leadership. Examining the extent to which cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture and strategic operations influence principals' effectiveness as school leaders can provide educational leaders and school districts with important information necessary to understanding the professional development activities principals find important regarding their effectiveness as school leaders.

Operationalization of Theoretical Constructs

This study consisted of six constructs: (a) cohorts, (b) school culture, (c) executive leadership, (d) instructional leadership, (e) human capital, and (f) strategic operations. A cohort is defined as a group of people who start and progress through a degree program together (Collins & O'Brien, 2011). Culture is defined as the symbolic meaning expressed through language, gesture, dress and so forth, by which the members of a given society communicate with and understand themselves, each other and the world around them (Collins & O'Brien, 2011). Executive leadership is defined as the work of the person or group who bear ultimate responsibility for establishing, managing, and sustaining the hub organization and the network (Peurach & Gumus, 2011). Instructional leadership is defined as a complex process, which differs across settings, based on individual style, school context, and constituents (Costello, 2015). Human capital is defined as the stock of productive skills of an individual (Hanushek, 2009). Strategic operations is defined as a principal being responsible for assessing the current needs of their campus, regularly monitoring multiple data points, developing a year-long

calendar, aligning resources to school priorities and treating central office staff members as partners in achieving campus goals (Texas Education Code, 2014). The above listed constructs were measured using the *Principal Effectiveness Survey*.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program had on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals. This study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to cohort support?
2. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to instructional leadership?
3. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to human capital?
4. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to executive leadership?
5. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to school culture?
6. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to strategic operations?
7. What factors, including the leadership development program, influenced principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as school leaders?

Research Design

The research design for this study was a sequential mixed methods approach. The quantitative portion collected using survey data was followed by a qualitative phase that included interviews and a focus group. A purposeful sample of 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the U.S. was solicited to provide responses to the *Principal Effectiveness Survey*, to participate in a focus group, and to participate in individual interviews, to assess the influence that cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture, and strategic operations had on principal effectiveness as school leaders. Quantitative data were analyzed using frequencies and percentages, while the qualitative data were analyzed using an inductive thematic coding process.

Population and Sample

The population of the study consisted of a large urban school district in the southwestern region of the U.S. The participating school district serves over 200,000 students and has 262 schools (166 elementary schools, 49 middle schools, and 47 high schools). This school district is one of the 10 largest school districts in the United States. Table 3.1 displays the student population of the participating school district and shows the race/ethnicity and socio-economic status of students for the previous 2013-2014 academic school year (TEA, 2015).

Table 3.1
District Student Demographic Data

	Frequency (<i>n</i>)	Percentage (%)
1. Race/Ethnicity		
African American	53,063	25.2
Hispanic	130,566	62
White	17,566	8.2
American Indian	481	0.2
Asian	7,375	3.5
Pacific Islander	201	0.1
Two or More Races	1,849	0.9
2. Socioeconomic Status		
Economically Disadvantaged	169,856	80.6
At-Risk	144,594	68.6
Special Education	15,906	7.5
English Language Learners	62,413	29.6

The participating school district has a total of 262 principals. There are 166 elementary school principals who lead schools consisting of grades pre-kindergarten – 5th, 49 middle school principals who lead schools consisting of grades 6-8 and K-8, and 47 high school principals who lead schools consisting of grades 9-12. Of the 262 school principals, 179 are female and 83 are male. Forty eight of the principals are 2nd year principals, 39 are 3rd year principals, and 27 are 4th year principals. Table 3.2 displays the principal demographics for the participating school district and shows the gender, race/ethnicity, years of experience in the school district, and age. A purposeful sample of elementary, middle, and high school principals in their 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year of principalship were solicited to participate in the study.

Table 3.2

District Principal Demographic Data

	Frequency (<i>n</i>)	Percentage (%)
Total Principals	262	100
Total Elementary School	166	63.4
Total Middle School	49	18.7
Total High School	47	17.9
Male	83	31.7
Female	179	68.3
African American	96	36.6
Hispanic	90	34.4
White	64	24.4
Asian	9	3.4
Two or More Races	3	1.1
1-5 Years of Experience	158	60.3
6-10 Years of Experience	49	18.7
11-19 Years of Experience	52	19.8
20+ Years of Experience	10	3.8
20-29 Years of Age	6	2.3
30-39 Years of Age	67	25.6
40-49 Years of Age	109	41.6
50-59 Years of Age	58	22.1
60-69	17	6.5
70 or Older	5	1.9

Participant Selection

Principals (13 elementary school, 6 middle school, 6 high school) working in schools located in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the U.S. were sent an email soliciting their participation in a focus group. Due to the low number of

middle and high school participants who initially completed the survey, the decision was made to merge the middle and high school principal participants into one secondary focus group. The above-mentioned group of principals were selected to provide a wide range of experience, race and ethnicity in the focus groups. Of the 13 elementary school principals selected, five were 2nd year, five were 3rd year, and three were 4th year principals. Eight were African-American, four were Hispanic, and one was White. Seven of the participants were female and the other six were male. Of the 13 elementary school principals selected and contacted, six female elementary school principals responded to the request to participate in the focus group. Of the six female elementary school principals, two were 2nd year principals, three were 3rd year principals, and one was a 4th year principal. Three were African-American, two were Hispanic, and one was White.

Of the six middle school principals selected, three were 2nd year principals and three were 3rd year principals. One was African-American, one was Asian, two were Hispanic, and one was White. Five of the participants were female and the other one was male. Of the six High School principals selected, one was a 2nd year principal, four were 3rd year principals and one was a 4th year principal. Two were African-American, one was Asian, and three were Hispanic. Three female middle school principals and one male high school principal responded to the focus group request. Of the 3 female middle school principals, one was a 2nd year principal and two were 3rd year principals. One was Asian, one was African-American and one was White. The high school principal was a 3rd year principal and was African-American.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using the *Principal Effectiveness Survey*, which was designed to assess the influence that cohort support, mentor support, and choice offerings had on the effectiveness of assistant principals and principals. This survey was designed in 2014, by the leadership development department in the participating school district and is aligned to the Texas standards for principals, whereby principals in Texas will be appraised (Texas Education Code, 2014). The survey instrument was developed to align with the criteria included in the leadership development program within the school district. The survey instrument was piloted using 54 assistant principals and principals during the 2014–2015 school year. Participants are asked to rank their responses using a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 representing the least influence to their effectiveness and 10 representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness. This 48-item survey instrument consists of four major components: (a) demographics, (b) cohort support, (c) mentor support, and (d) choice offerings.

The cohort support portion of the survey instrument is broken down into 8 subscales: (a) observation & feedback, (b) instructional planning, (c) data-driven instruction, (d) scholar and adult culture, (e) instructional leadership: curriculum, instruction, and assessment, (f) professional development for leadership teams, (g) professional development for teachers, and (h) resources management. The mentor support portion of the survey instrument is broken down into five subscales: (a) instructional leadership, (b) human capital, (c) executive leadership, (d) school culture, and (e) strategic operations. The choices offerings portion of the survey instrument is

broken down into five subscales: (a) preliminary budget planning, (b) legal updates, (c) staff documentation, (d) leading relevant review, and (e) intentional interventions.

Participants are asked to rank their responses using a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 representing the least influence to their effectiveness and 10 representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness. Responses 1-3 means that the item had low influence on the participant's effectiveness as a school leader. Responses of 4-7 means that the item had medium influence on the participant's effectiveness as a school leader. Responses 8-10 means that the item had high influence on the participant's effectiveness as a school leader. Cronbach's alphas were calculated to measure internal consistency/reliability: (a) cohort support (.968), (b) instructional leadership (.977), (c) human capital (.978), (d) executive leadership (.983), (e) school culture (.983), (f) strategic operations (.961), and (g) choice offerings (.942).

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher obtained permission to conduct the study from the University of Houston-Clear Lake (UHCL) Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (CPHS) and the participating school district's Institutional Review Board (IRB) before collecting data. After permission was granted, the researcher solicited the names and email addresses of all 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals from the research and accountability department within the participating school district.

Second, third, and fourth year principals (78 elementary school, 17 middle school, 19 high school) working in schools located in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the U.S. were sent an email soliciting their participation in the study. In addition to a link to the survey, the email invitation included the timeline for

completing the survey, a survey cover letter, and instructions regarding the data collection process.

Of the 113 principals contacted, 80 completed and submitted the survey via SurveyMonkey and 59 (44 elementary school principals, 7 middle school principals, 8 high school principals) participants surveys were used in the study. All responses were imported from SurveyMonkey to an Excel document and saved to the researcher's computer hard drive as well as the researcher's flash drive. The flash drive containing the stored data was locked in a safe in a storage room and will remain there for five years before being destroyed.

Twenty-five 2nd, 3rd and 4th year principals (13 elementary school, 6 middle school, 6 high school) working in schools located in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the U.S. were sent an email soliciting their participation in a focus group. Of the 13 elementary school principals contacted, six elementary school principals participated in the focus group. The elementary school principals were given two dates to choose from related to their participation in the focus group. The date was chosen and the focus group was held, lasting about 60 minutes. Each participant was asked the same interview questions and the responses were audio recorded and transcribed by the researcher.

Individual emails were sent out to 12 secondary school principal participants, requesting participation in a phone interview. Three middle school principals and one high school principal participated in a phone interview. The dates for the individual phone interviews were chosen and held, with each phone interview lasting about 20 minutes. Each participant was asked seven questions and the responses were audio

recorded and transcribed by the researcher. The flash drive containing the stored data was locked in a safe in a storage room and will remain there for five years before being destroyed.

Data Analysis

Research questions 1-6, were answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness). The responses were collapsed: (a) responses of 1-3 meaning the item had “low” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader, (b) responses of 4-7 meaning the item had “medium” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader, and (c) responses of 8-10 meaning the item had “high” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader.

The qualitative data analysis in this portion of the study consisted of an inductive coding process of one focus group of six elementary school principals and four individual interviews of middle and high school principals. The themes consisted of four categories: (a) principal supervisor and peer support, (b) no recollection of trainings, (c) shortcomings of the program, and (d) ways the program prepared the principals for leadership. A repeated reflection from the principal participants was that their principal supervisor was very helpful in their development as school leaders. Principal supervisor was an obvious theme based on the coding from principal participants, but peer support was later added to this theme due to the additional comments from principal participants related to their peers being influential in their development as school leaders throughout

the cohort experience. Principal participants many times used principal supervisors and peer support as being effective and influential in their development as school leaders in conversation, so the two codes were merged into one theme. Additionally, repeatedly reading through the transcriptions from the focus group and interviews allowed me to realize that many principal participants did not recall trainings relevant to the topics I was asking them about. Principal participants remembered receiving support from multiple places including their principal supervisor, peers, and central office employees, but not from the trainings provided to them when participating in the leadership development program.

The analysis of the transcriptions also revealed that many of the trainings received were recalled by principal participants, some preparing them as school leaders and some not preparing them as school leaders. Principal participants repeatedly shared their experiences going through trainings that were irrelevant to them due to the timing of the training or the way that the training was delivered to them to name a few. These reflections were themed as shortcomings of the program due to aspects of the trainings being there, but not very effective or influential in the principal participants' development as school leaders. Lastly, there were many things that principal participants found effective, or ways the program prepared the principals for leadership, when participating in the leadership development program. Principal participants shared multiple aspects of their trainings that prepared them for to be school leaders and these aspects were all merged into one theme. After assigning all of the codes to a theme, the themes were connected to research literature to increase the validity of the findings and examined by the researcher to describe the participants' experiences.

Validity

Validity was strengthened by triangulating the results across the quantitative and qualitative data. Focus group and interview responses were organized into themes by focusing on redundancy. Peer review was performed by having content area experts in the School of Education at UHCL review the findings. Member checking of the data was established by having the focus group and interview participants review the findings to ensure that their responses were accurately documented during the transcription phase.

Privacy and Ethical Considerations

The researcher obtained permission to conduct the study from the UHCL's CPHS and the participating school district's IRB before collecting data. The name of the school district the study was conducted in was not mentioned in the study, nor are the individual names of the principal participants. A survey cover letter was attached to the survey instrument stating the purpose of the study, ensuring that participants were aware that their participation was voluntary, and that their responses and identities would remain completely anonymous. Each principal was given a participant number and all data taken from each participant were reflected within their individual participant number. All quantitative data were transferred from SurveyMonkey to an Excel document and then verified to ensure it was transferred correctly.

The researcher used methods to protect confidentiality during the qualitative component of the study. The researcher shared with all focus group participants that confidentiality could not be guaranteed due to the participants' ability to share responses outside of the focus group. While confidentiality could not be guaranteed to focus group participants, the researcher assigned a participant number to all interview and focus group

participants to help protect confidentiality. Each participant filled out consent forms and the data collected will be locked up and kept for 5 years before being destroyed.

Limitations of the Study

There are a few limitations regarding this study. First, this study reported results from principals who lead schools on the elementary, middle and high school levels, however, the number of principal participants for each grade level, as well as principal participants with varying years of experience was disproportional. Additionally, the study may not be able to be replicated in other areas due to the lack of principal turnover, meaning little to no new principals are hired each year. For this reason, caution should be considered when thinking about the implementation of this study in other school districts as the results may not be generalizable to other school districts.

Second, the research was primarily collected two to five years after the principal participated in the leadership development program. Principals may not remember the leadership development program and its components due to the profession development sessions they have participated in after becoming a school leader. Future studies may vary based on the timeline of collecting the research. Collecting the data immediately after the leadership development program in the participating school district, as opposed to collecting the data years after a principal completes the leadership development program, may vary the results.

Third, this study does not take into account experience a participant has prior to becoming a principal. Answers to the survey, interview and focus group questions will vary based on training and support a participant receives prior to becoming a first year principal. Principals who report that the components of the leadership development

program influenced their effectiveness as a school leader could be unintentionally drawing on past experiences. The lack of training as an assistant principal, teacher and other roles can play a factor in a principal's perception regarding the influence of the leadership development program. This is also the case in the event a principal was successfully trained as an assistant principal, teacher or a different role prior to becoming a principal. This can also play a factor in the principals' perception regarding the influence of the leadership development program. Future studies could make a determination between support and trainings given during a leadership development program and past experiences of the participant. Fourth, the study is limited to beginning principals in the participating school district. Results may vary by district and the leadership development program in other districts. This study may only apply to the participating school district. Generalizability may be questionable.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program had on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in the participating school district. This chapter provided an overview of the research problem, operationalization of theoretical constructs, research purpose, questions, research design, population and sampling selection, instrumentation to be used, data collection procedures, data analysis, privacy and ethical considerations, and the research design limitations of the study. For the study, the quantitative component was analyzed using frequencies and percentages, while an inductive coding process was used to analyze the qualitative data. The next chapter presents a detailed description of the demographic characteristics of the participants,

followed by the findings illustrated in Research Questions One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, and Seven.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program had on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in the participating school district. This chapter begins by presenting a detailed description of the demographic characteristics of the participants followed by the findings illustrated in Research Questions One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, and Seven. The chapter will conclude with a summary of the study's findings.

Participant Demographics

Principals (78 elementary school, 17 middle school, 19 high school) working in schools located in a large urban school district in the southwest region of the U.S. were sent an email soliciting their participation in the study. Of the 113 principals contacted, 80 completed and submitted the survey via SurveyMonkey, 21 respondents were deleted due to missing data and not meeting the requirement of participating in the leadership development program prior to filling out the survey; leaving 59 eligible participants (44 elementary school principals, 7 middle school principals, 8 high school principals).

Elementary school principals lead schools consisting of grades Pre-K-5th, middle school principals lead schools consisting of grades 6-8th, and high school principals lead schools consisting of grades 9-12th. Table 4.1 displays participant demographics regarding grade level, gender, age classification, and race/ethnicity. The majority of the study participants were elementary school principals (74.6%, $n = 44$). The rest of the

participants were middle school principals (11.9%, $n = 7$), and high school principals (13.6%, $n = 8$). The majority of the principals were female (67.8%, $n = 40$) and the rest were male (32.2%, $n = 19$).

Table 4.1

Principal Participant Demographic Data

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
1. Principal Participants		
Total Principals	59	100.0
Elementary School Principals	44	74.6
Middle School Principals	7	11.9
High School Principals	8	13.6
2. Gender		
Female	40	67.8
Male	19	32.2
3. Age Classification		
20-29 Years of Age	0	0.0
30-39 Years of Age	25	42.4
40-49 Years of Age	28	47.5
50-59 Years of Age	5	8.5
60 or Older	1	1.7
4. Race/Ethnicity		
African American	20	33.9
Hispanic	24	40.7
White	9	15.3
Asian	4	6.8
Two or More Races	2	3.4

Research Question One

Research question one, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to cohort support?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their

effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness).

The responses were collapsed: (a) responses of 1-3 meaning the item had “low” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader, (b) responses of 4-7 meaning the item had “medium” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader, and (c) responses of 8-10 meaning the item had “high” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader. The 12-items in this section of the survey pertained to activities in which participants participated in during their leadership development program related to *Cohort Support*.

Table 4.2 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals’ responses. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Cohort Support* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that principals believe had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include instructional leadership/assessment (61.0%, $n = 36$). The highest item that principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include professional development for teachers (28.8%, $n = 17$). Principals indicated that instructional leadership/assessment was the lowest item that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders (44.1%, $n = 26$). Over half of the principals (54.2%, $n = 32$) indicated that overall cohort support had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.2

Participant Responses to Cohort Support (%)

Survey Item	Low	Medium	High
1. Observation and feedback	11.9 (n = 7)	59.3 (n = 35)	28.8 (n = 17)
2. Instructional planning	22.0 (n = 13)	55.4 (n = 33)	22.0 (n = 13)
3. Data-driven instruction	22.0 (n = 13)	52.5 (n = 31)	25.4 (n = 15)
4. Scholar and adult culture	15.3 (n = 9)	54.2 (n = 32)	30.5 (n = 18)
5. Instructional leadership	16.9 (n = 10)	45.8 (n = 27)	37.3 (n = 22)
6. Curriculum (district curriculum)	25.4 (n = 15)	57.6 (n = 34)	16.9 (n = 10)
7. Instructional leadership: Instruction (TADS)	15.3 (n = 9)	44.1 (n = 26)	40.7 (n = 24)
8. Instructional leadership: Assessment (benchmark/EOC)	23.7 (n = 14)	61.0 (n = 36)	15.3 (n = 9)
9. Professional development for leadership teams	25.4 (n = 15)	44.1 (n = 26)	30.5 (n = 18)
10. Professional development for teachers	28.8 (n = 17)	52.5 (n = 31)	18.6 (n = 11)
11. Resources management	23.7 (n = 14)	40.1 (n = 24)	35.6 (n = 21)
12. Overall ranking	16.9 (n = 10)	54.2 (n = 32)	28.8 (n = 17)

Table 4.3 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by grade level. The majority of 6-8th grade principals indicated that observation and feedback (85.7%, $n = 6$), instructional planning (85.7%, $n = 6$), data-drive instruction (85.7%, $n = 6$), and instructional leadership/assessment (85.7%, $n = 6$) had "medium" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Some of the activities posed a difference of opinion. For instance, 9-12th grade principals indicated that observation and feedback (25.0%, $n = 2$), instructional planning (25.0%, $n = 2$), data-driven instruction (25.0%, $n = 2$), and instructional leadership/assessment (25.0%, $n = 2$) had "medium" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that instructional leadership (38.6%, $n = 17$) and instructional leadership/tads (38.6%, $n = 17$) were the 2 highest items on the survey that had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *Cohort Support*.

Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that observation and feedback, instructional planning, data-driven instruction and instructional leadership/assessment had "medium" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that observation and feedback, instructional planning, data-drive instruction and instructional leadership (assessment) were split equally between having "low" and "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that curriculum (district curriculum) and professional development for teachers had "medium" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that curriculum (district curriculum) and professional development for teachers had "low" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated

that professional development for leadership teams and resources management had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, 6-8th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams and resources management had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, and 9-12th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams and resources management had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.3

Participant Responses to Cohort Support per Grade Level (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Observation and feedback	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (<i>n</i> = 4)	61.4 (<i>n</i> = 27)	29.5 (<i>n</i> = 13)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	85.7 (<i>n</i> = 6)	14.3 (<i>n</i> = 1)
	9-12	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)
2. Instructional planning	Pre-K - 5	22.7 (<i>n</i> = 10)	56.8 (<i>n</i> = 25)	20.5 (<i>n</i> = 9)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	85.7 (<i>n</i> = 6)	14.3 (<i>n</i> = 1)
	9-12	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)
3. Data-driven instruction	Pre-K - 5	22.7 (<i>n</i> = 10)	52.3 (<i>n</i> = 23)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 11)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	85.7 (<i>n</i> = 6)	14.3 (<i>n</i> = 1)
	9-12	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Scholar and adult culture	Pre-K - 5	15.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	54.5 (<i>n</i> = 24)	29.5 (<i>n</i> = 13)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	42.9 (<i>n</i> = 3)	57.1 (<i>n</i> = 4)
	9-12	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	62.5 (<i>n</i> = 5)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)
5. Instructional leadership	Pre-K - 5	18.2 (<i>n</i> = 8)	43.2 (<i>n</i> = 19)	38.6 (<i>n</i> = 17)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	57.1 (<i>n</i> = 4)	42.9 (<i>n</i> = 3)
	9-12	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	50.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)
6. Curriculum (district curriculum)	Pre-K - 5	22.7 (<i>n</i> = 10)	61.4 (<i>n</i> = 27)	15.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)
	6-8	14.3 (<i>n</i> = 1)	71.4 (<i>n</i> = 5)	14.3 (<i>n</i> = 1)
	9-12	50.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)
7. Instructional leadership: Instruction (TADS)	Pre-K - 5	13.6 (<i>n</i> = 6)	47.7 (<i>n</i> = 21)	38.6 (<i>n</i> = 17)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	42.9 (<i>n</i> = 3)	57.1 (<i>n</i> = 4)
	9-12	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
8. Instructional leadership: Assessment (Benchmark/EOC)	Pre-K - 5	25.0 (n = 11)	63.6 (n = 28)	11.4 (n = 5)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	85.7 (n = 6)	14.3 (n = 1)
	9-12	37.5 (n = 3)	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)
9. Professional development for leadership teams	Pre-K - 5	25.0 (n = 11)	50.0 (n = 22)	25.0 (n = 11)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	42.9 (n = 3)	57.1 (n = 4)
	9-12	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)
10. Professional development for teachers	Pre-K - 5	29.5 (n = 13)	56.8 (n = 25)	13.6 (n = 6)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	71.4 (n = 5)	28.6 (n = 2)
	9-12	50.0 (n = 4)	12.5 (n = 1)	37.5 (n = 3)
11. Resources management	Pre-K - 5	22.7 (n = 10)	52.3 (n = 23)	25.0 (n = 11)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	50.0 (n = 4)	12.5 (n = 1)	37.5 (n = 3)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
12. Overall ranking	Pre-K - 5	13.6 (<i>n</i> = 6)	56.8 (<i>n</i> = 25)	29.5 (<i>n</i> = 13)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	71.4 (<i>n</i> = 5)	28.6 (<i>n</i> = 2)
	9-12	40.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)

Table 4.4 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by years of experience. As illustrated in Table 4.4, 30.5% (*n* = 18) of the principal participants consisted of 2nd year principals, 55.9% (*n* = 33) of the principal participants consisted of 3rd year principals, and 13.6% (*n* = 8) of the principal participants consisted of 4th year principals. Of the 2nd year principals, 72.2% (*n* = 13) are elementary principals, 22.2% (*n* = 4) are middle school principals, and 5.6% (*n* = 1) is a high school principal. Of the 3rd year principals, 75.8% (*n* = 25) are elementary principals, 9.1% (*n* = 3) are middle school principals, and 15.2% (*n* = 5) are high school principals. Of the 4th year principals, 75.0% (*n* = 6) are elementary principals, 25.0% (*n* = 2) are middle school principals, and 0.0% (*n* = 0) are high school principals. The highest item that 2nd year principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include instructional leadership/tads (55.6%, *n* = 10). The highest items that 3rd year principals believe had "high" influence on their development as school leaders include resource management and instructional leadership (39.4%, *n* = 13). The 4th year principals tended to believe that items related to cohort support had "medium" influence on their development as school leaders. The highest items that 4th year principals believe had "high" influence on their development as school leaders include professional

development for leadership teams, instructional leadership: tads, and observation and feedback (25%, $n = 2$).

The 2nd and 4th year principals indicated that instructional leadership and resource management had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 3rd year principals who indicated that instructional leadership and resource management had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 3rd and 4th year principals indicated that instructional leadership (tads) had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 2nd year principals who indicated that instructional leadership (tads) had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals indicated that observation and feedback, instructional planning, data-driven instruction, scholar and adult culture, curriculum (district), instructional leadership (assessment & benchmark/EOC), professional development for leadership teams, professional development for teachers, and overall ranking of *Cohort Support* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.4

Participant Responses to Cohort Support per Years of Experience (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Observation and feedback	2 nd year	5.6 (<i>n</i> = 1)	72.2 (<i>n</i> = 13)	22.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
	3 rd year	18.2 (<i>n</i> = 6)	48.5 (<i>n</i> = 16)	33.3 (<i>n</i> = 11)
	4 th year	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	75.0 (<i>n</i> = 6)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)
2. Instructional planning	2 nd year	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)	66.7 (<i>n</i> = 12)	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)
	3 rd year	27.3 (<i>n</i> = 9)	45.5 (<i>n</i> = 15)	27.3 (<i>n</i> = 9)
	4 th year	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)	75.0 (<i>n</i> = 6)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)
3. Data-driven instruction	2 nd year	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)	66.7 (<i>n</i> = 12)	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)
	3 rd year	27.3 (<i>n</i> = 9)	39.4 (<i>n</i> = 13)	33.3 (<i>n</i> = 11)
	4 th year	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)	75.0 (<i>n</i> = 6)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Scholar and adult culture	2 nd year	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	55.6 (<i>n</i> = 10)	44.4 (<i>n</i> = 8)
	3 rd year	24.2 (<i>n</i> = 8)	48.5 (<i>n</i> = 16)	27.3 (<i>n</i> = 9)
	4 th year	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)	75.0 (<i>n</i> = 6)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)
5. Instructional leadership	2nd year	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	61.1 (<i>n</i> = 11)	38.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)
	3rd year	24.2 (<i>n</i> = 8)	36.4 (<i>n</i> = 12)	39.4 (<i>n</i> = 13)
	4th year	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	50.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)
6. Curriculum (district curriculum)	2nd year	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)	66.7 (<i>n</i> = 12)	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)
	3rd year	36.4 (<i>n</i> = 12)	45.5 (<i>n</i> = 15)	18.2 (<i>n</i> = 6)
	4th year	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	87.5 (<i>n</i> = 7)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)
7. Instructional leadership: Instruction (TADS)	2nd year	5.6 (<i>n</i> = 1)	38.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	55.6 (<i>n</i> = 10)
	3rd year	18.2 (<i>n</i> = 6)	45.5 (<i>n</i> = 15)	36.4 (<i>n</i> = 12)
	4th year	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	50.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
8. Instructional leadership: Assessment (benchmark/EOC)	2nd year	11.1 (<i>n</i> = 2)	77.8 (<i>n</i> = 14)	11.1 (<i>n</i> = 2)
	3rd year	30.3 (<i>n</i> = 10)	51.5 (<i>n</i> = 17)	18.2 (<i>n</i> = 6)
	4th year	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	62.5 (<i>n</i> = 5)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)
9. Professional development for leadership teams	2nd year	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)	55.6 (<i>n</i> = 10)	27.8 (<i>n</i> = 5)
	3rd year	30.3 (<i>n</i> = 10)	39.4 (<i>n</i> = 13)	30.3 (<i>n</i> = 10)
	4th year	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	50.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)
10. Professional development for teachers	2nd year	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)	66.7 (<i>n</i> = 12)	16.7 (<i>n</i> = 3)
	3rd year	33.3 (<i>n</i> = 11)	45.5 (<i>n</i> = 15)	21.2 (<i>n</i> = 7)
	4th year	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)	50.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)
11. Resources management	2nd year	22.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)	44.4 (<i>n</i> = 8)	33.3 (<i>n</i> = 6)
	3rd year	27.3 (<i>n</i> = 9)	33.3 (<i>n</i> = 11)	39.4 (<i>n</i> = 13)
	4th year	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)	75.0 (<i>n</i> = 6)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
12. Overall ranking	2nd year	11.1 (<i>n</i> = 2)	66.7 (<i>n</i> = 12)	22.2 (<i>n</i> = 4)
	3rd year	21.2 (<i>n</i> = 7)	42.4 (<i>n</i> = 14)	36.4 (<i>n</i> = 12)
	4th year	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)	75.0 (<i>n</i> = 6)	12.5 (<i>n</i> = 1)

Research Question Two

Research question two, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to instructional leadership?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Table 4.5 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses to the 6-items considering *Instructional Leadership*. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Instructional Leadership* had "medium" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Prioritize instruction and student achievement (54.2%, *n* = 32), implementing rigorous curriculum (57.6%, *n* = 34), analyze of the curriculum (61.1%, *n* = 36), and develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction (50.8%, *n* = 30) all had "medium" influence on their development as school leaders. About half of the principals (49.2%, *n* = 29) indicated that overall instructional leadership had "medium" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that principals believe had "low" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning (25.4%, *n* = 15). Principals

indicated that analyze of the curriculum was the lowest item that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as a school leader (16.9%, $n = 10$).

Table 4.5

Participant Responses to Instructional Leadership (%)

Survey Item	Low	Medium	High
1. Prioritize instruction and student achievement	15.3 ($n = 9$)	54.2 ($n = 32$)	30.5 ($n = 18$)
2. Implementing rigorous curriculum	20.3 ($n = 12$)	57.6 ($n = 34$)	22.0 ($n = 13$)
3. Analyze of the curriculum	22.0 ($n = 13$)	61.1 ($n = 36$)	16.9 ($n = 10$)
4. Model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning	25.4 ($n = 15$)	49.2 ($n = 29$)	25.4 ($n = 15$)
5. Develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction	22.0 ($n = 13$)	50.8 ($n = 30$)	27.1 ($n = 16$)
6. Overall ranking	22.0 ($n = 13$)	49.2 ($n = 29$)	28.8 ($n = 17$)

Table 4.6 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals’ responses broken down by grade level. The majority of the 6-8th grade principals indicated that prioritize instruction and student achievement (71.4%, $n = 5$), implementing rigorous curriculum (71.4%, $n = 5$), model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning (71.4%, $n = 5$), develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction (71.4%, $n = 5$), and instructional leadership overall (71.4%, $n = 5$) had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 6-8th grade principals didn’t believe that any of the

items had “low” influence (0.0%, $n = 0$) on their development as school leaders related to instructional leadership. Some of the activities posed a difference of opinion. For instance, half of 9-12th grade principals indicated that instructional leadership overall (50.0%, $n = 4$) had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K – 5th grade principals indicated that prioritize instruction and student achievement (31.8%, $n = 14$) and instructional leadership overall (29.5%, $n = 13$) were the 2 highest items on the survey that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *Instructional Leadership*.

Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that implementing rigorous curriculum, analyze of the curriculum, and develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that implementing rigorous curriculum, analyze of the curriculum, and develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction were split equally between having “low” and “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicted that model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning and overall ranking of *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning and overall ranking of *Instructional Leadership* had “low” influence on their development as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade, 6-8th grade and 9-12th grade principals indicated that prioritize instruction and student achievement had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.6

Participant Responses to Instructional Leadership per Grade Level (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Prioritize instruction and student achievement	Pre-K - 5	18.2 (n = 8)	50.0 (n = 22)	31.8 (n = 14)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	71.4 (n = 5)	28.6 (n = 2)
	9-12	12.5 (n = 1)	62.5 (n = 5)	25.0 (n = 2)
2. Implementing rigorous curriculum	Pre-K - 5	20.5 (n = 9)	59.1 (n = 26)	20.5 (n = 9)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	71.4 (n = 5)	28.6 (n =)
	9-12	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)	25.0 (n = 2)
3. Analyze of the curriculum	Pre-K - 5	22.7 (n = 10)	65.9 (n = 29)	11.4 (n = 5)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	57.1 (n = 4)	42.9 (n = 3)
	9-12	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)	25.0 (n = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning	Pre-K - 5	25.0 (n = 11)	50.0 (n = 22)	25.0 (n = 11)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	71.4 (n = 5)	28.6 (n = 2)
	9-12	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)
5. Develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction	Pre-K - 5	22.7 (n = 10)	50.0 (n = 22)	27.3 (n = 12)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	71.4 (n = 5)	28.6 (n = 2)
	9-12	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)	25.0 (n = 2)
6. Overall ranking	Pre-K - 5	20.5 (n = 9)	50.0 (n = 22)	29.5 (n = 13)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	71.4 (n = 5)	28.6 (n = 2)
	9-12	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)

Table 4.7 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by years of experience. The 2 highest items that 2nd year principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders include prioritize instruction and student achievement and instructional leadership overall (38.9%, $n = 7$). The highest items that 3rd year principals believe had "high" influence on their development as school leaders include develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction and instructional leadership overall (27.3%, $n = 9$). Half of the 4th year principals believe that

prioritize instruction and student achievement, model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning and develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction (50.0%, $n = 4$) had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders related to *Instructional Leadership*.

The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals indicated that prioritize instruction and student achievement, implement rigorous curriculum, analyze of the curriculum, model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning, develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction, and overall ranking of *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals indicated that prioritize instruction and student achievement, model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning, and develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, however, some of the 9-12th grade principals indicated that these items were split equally between having “low” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals believe had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders include prioritize instruction and student achievement.

Table 4.7

Participant Responses to Instructional Leadership per Years of Experience (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Prioritize instruction and student achievement	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	61.1 (n = 11)	38.9 (n = 7)
	3 rd year	18.2 (n = 6)	54.5 (n = 18)	27.3 (n = 9)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
2. Implement rigorous curriculum	2 nd year	11.1 (n = 2)	61.1 (n = 11)	27.8 (n = 5)
	3 rd year	24.2 (n = 8)	54.5 (n = 18)	21.2 (n = 7)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
3. Analyze of the curriculum	2 nd year	11.1 (n = 2)	61.1 (n = 11)	27.8 (n = 5)
	3 rd year	27.3 (n = 9)	60.6 (n = 20)	12.1 (n = 4)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning	2 nd year	11.1 (n = 2)	61.1 (n = 11)	27.8 (n = 5)
	3 rd year	33.3 (n = 11)	42.4 (n = 14)	24.2 (n = 8)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
5. Develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction	2nd year	12.5 (n = 1)	66.7 (n = 12)	27.8 (n = 5)
	3rd year	30.3 (n = 10)	42.4 (n = 14)	27.3 (n = 9)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
6. Overall ranking	2nd year	12.5 (n = 1)	55.6 (n = 10)	38.9 (n = 7)
	3rd year	30.3 (n = 10)	42.4 (n = 14)	27.3 (n = 9)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)

Research Question Three

Research question three, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to human capital?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Table 4.8 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses to the items considering *Human Capital*. Principals tend to feel that the items related to *Human*

Capital had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that principals believe had “high” influence on their development as school leaders include treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource (55.9%, $n = 33$). Over half of the principals (52.5%, $n = 31$) indicated that overall human capital had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders include be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates (13.6%, $n = 8$). Principals indicated that use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluations was the lowest item that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as a school leader (49.2%, $n = 29$).

Table 4.8

Participant Responses to Human Capital (%)

Survey Item	Low	Medium	High
1. Treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	32.2 (<i>n</i> = 19)	55.9 (<i>n</i> = 33)
2. Ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	35.6 (<i>n</i> = 21)	52.5 (<i>n</i> = 31)
3. Be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates	13.6 (<i>n</i> = 8)	33.9 (<i>n</i> = 20)	52.5 (<i>n</i> = 31)
4. Ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty, and staff	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	33.9 (<i>n</i> = 20)	54.2 (<i>n</i> = 32)
5. Facilitate professional learning communities	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	37.3 (<i>n</i> = 22)	50.8 (<i>n</i> = 30)
6. Create opportunities for leadership roles	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	37.3 (<i>n</i> = 22)	50.8 (<i>n</i> = 30)
7. Use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluations	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	39.0 (<i>n</i> = 23)	49.2 (<i>n</i> = 29)
8. Overall ranking	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	35.6 (<i>n</i> = 21)	52.5 (<i>n</i> = 31)

Table 4.9 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by grade level. The majority of the 6-8th grade principals indicated that ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty and staff (85.7%, *n* = 6), create opportunities for leadership roles (85.7%, *n* = 6), use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluations (85.7%, *n* = 6), and human capital overall (85.7%, *n* = 6) had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 6-8th grade principals didn't

believe that any of the items had “low” influence (0.0%, $n = 0$) on their development as school leaders related to human capital. Half of 9-12th grade principals indicated that human capital overall (50.0%, $n = 4$) had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource (56.8%, $n = 25$) and be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates (54.5%, $n = 24$) were the 2 highest items on the survey that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *Human Capital*.

Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource, ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations, ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty, and staff, facilitate professional learning communities, and create opportunities for leadership roles had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource, ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations, ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty, and staff, facilitate professional learning communities, and create opportunities for leadership roles were split equally between having “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluation and overall ranking of *Human Capital* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluations and overall ranking of *Human Capital* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that ensure the growth and development of administration,

faculty and staff had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty, and staff were split equally between having “low” and “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.9

Participant Responses to Human Capital per Grade Level (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	31.8 (n = 14)	56.8 (n = 25)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
2. Ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	36.4 (n = 16)	52.3 (n = 23)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
3. Be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	34.1 (n = 15)	54.5 (n = 24)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)	25.0 (n = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty, and staff	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	36.4 (n = 16)	52.3 (n = 23)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
5. Facilitate professional learning communities	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	38.6 (n = 17)	50.0 (n = 22)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
6. Create opportunities for leadership roles	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	40.9 (n = 18)	47.7 (n = 21)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
7. Use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluations	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	40.9 (n = 18)	47.7 (n = 21)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
8. Overall ranking	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (<i>n</i> = 5)	36.4 (<i>n</i> = 16)	52.3 (<i>n</i> = 23)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	14.3 (<i>n</i> = 1)	85.7 (<i>n</i> = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	50.0 (<i>n</i> = 4)	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)

Table 4.10 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by years of experience. The highest item that 2nd year principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders include ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty and staff (77.8%, *n* = 14). The highest item that 3rd year principals believe had "high" influence on their development as school leaders include treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource (57.6%, *n* = 19). The 4th year principals indicated the same percentage of "low" influence (25.0%, *n* = 2), "medium" influence (62.5%, *n* = 5), and "high" influence (12.5%, *n* = 1) on all 8 of the items related to *Human Capital*. The 2nd year principals didn't believe that any of the items had "low" influence (0.0%, *n* = 0) on their development as school leaders related to *Human Capital*.

The 2nd and 3rd year principals indicated that treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource, ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations, be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates, ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty and staff, facilitate professional learning communities, create opportunities for leadership roles, use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluations and

overall ranking of *Human Capital* had “high” influence on their development as school leaders, compared to the 4th year principals who indicated that those same items had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders. Two of the highest items 3rd and 4th year principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders include treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource and ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty, and staff, compared to the 2nd year principals who did not believe that these items had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 2nd and 4th year principals indicated that all 8 items had the same percentage of “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.10

Participant Responses to Human Capital per Years of Experience (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	18.2 (n = 6)	27.3 (n = 9)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
2. Ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	33.3 (n = 11)	51.5 (n = 17)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
3. Be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	18.2 (n = 6)	30.3 (n = 10)	51.5 (n = 17)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Ensure the growth and development of administration, faculty, and staff	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	22.2 (n = 4)	77.8 (n = 14)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	33.1 (n = 11)	51.5 (n = 17)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
5. Facilitate professional learning communities	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	36.4 (n = 12)	48.5 (n = 16)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
6. Create opportunities for leadership roles	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	38.9 (n = 7)	61.1 (n = 11)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	30.3 (n = 10)	54.5 (n = 18)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
7. Use multiple data sources for accurate appraisals and evaluations	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	33.3 (n = 6)	66.7 (n = 12)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	36.4 (n = 12)	48.5 (n = 16)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
8. Overall ranking	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	33.3 (n = 11)	51.5 (n = 17)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)

Research Question Four

Research question four, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to executive leadership?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Table 4.11 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses to the 9 items considering *Executive Leadership*. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Executive Leadership* had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include be committed to ensuring the success of the school (64.4%, $n = 38$). The highest item that principals believe had "medium" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include view unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities (39.0%, $n = 23$). The highest items that principals believe had "low" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include be committed to ensuring the success of the school, motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence and inspire and keep staff focused on the end goals (11.9%, $n = 7$).

Table 4.11

Participant Responses to Executive Leadership (%)

Survey Item	Low	Medium	High
1. Be committed to ensuring the success of the school	11.9 (n = 7)	23.7 (n = 14)	64.4 (n = 38)
2. Motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence	11.9 (n = 7)	32.2 (n = 19)	55.9 (n = 33)
3. Be reflective in their practice and strive for continuous improvement	10.2 (n = 6)	28.8 (n = 17)	61.0 (n = 36)
4. View unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities	10.2 (n = 6)	39.0 (n = 23)	50.8 (n = 30)
5. Inspire and keep staff focused on the end goals	11.9 (n = 7)	30.5 (n = 18)	57.6 (n = 34)
6. Possess strong communication skills	10.2 (n = 6)	28.8 (n = 17)	61.0 (n = 36)
7. Be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback	10.2 (n = 6)	27.1 (n = 16)	62.7 (n = 37)
8. Treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships	10.2 (n = 6)	27.1 (n = 16)	62.7 (n = 37)
9. Overall ranking	10.2 (n = 6)	30.5 (n = 18)	59.3 (n = 35)

Table 4.12 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by grade level. Despite the grade level, more principals indicated that each of the items had "high" influence on their development as school leaders, as opposed to

“medium” or “low” influence on their development as school leaders related to *Executive Leadership*. The 6-8th grade principals didn’t believe that any of the items had “low” influence (0.0%, $n = 0$) on their development as school leaders related to *Executive Leadership*. The majority of Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that executive leadership overall had “high” influence (61.4%, $n = 27$) on their development as school leaders compared to 6-8th grade principals (71.4%, $n = 5$) and 9-12th principals (37.5%, $n = 3$).

Pre-K-5th grade, 6-8th grade and 9-12th grade principals indicated that be committed to ensuring the success of the school, motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence and inspire and keep staff focused on the end goals had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that be reflective in their practice and strive for continuous improvement, possess strong communication skills, be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback, treat all members of community with respect through positive relationships and overall ranking of *Executive Leadership* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to the 9-12th grade principals who indicated that those items were split equally between having “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that view unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to the 9-12th principals who indicated that this item had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.12

Participant Responses to Executive Leadership per Grade Level (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Be committed to ensuring the success of the school	Pre-K – 5	11.4 (n = 5)	22.7 (n = 10)	65.9 (n = 29)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)
2. Motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	27.3 (n = 12)	61.4 (n = 27)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	42.9 (n = 3)	57.1 (n = 4)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)
3. Be reflective in their practice and strive for continuous improvement	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (n = 4)	27.3 (n = 12)	63.6 (n = 28)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. View unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (n = 4)	38.6 (n = 17)	52.3 (n = 23)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
5. Inspire and keep staff focused on the end goals	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	31.8 (n = 14)	56.8 (n = 25)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)
6. Possess strong communication skills	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (n = 4)	29.5 (n = 13)	61.4 (n = 27)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
7. Be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (n = 4)	27.3 (n = 12)	63.6 (n = 28)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
8. Treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (<i>n</i> = 4)	27.3 (<i>n</i> = 12)	63.6 (<i>n</i> = 28)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	14.3 (<i>n</i> = 1)	85.7 (<i>n</i> = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)
9. Overall ranking	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (<i>n</i> = 4)	29.5 (<i>n</i> = 13)	61.4 (<i>n</i> = 27)
	6-8	0.0 (<i>n</i> = 0)	28.6 (<i>n</i> = 2)	71.4 (<i>n</i> = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (<i>n</i> = 2)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)	37.5 (<i>n</i> = 3)

Table 4.13 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by years of experience. The 2nd year principals didn't believe that any of the items had "low" influence (0.0%, *n* = 0) on their development as school leaders related to executive leadership. The highest item that 2nd year principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include possess strong communication skills (77.8%, *n* = 14). The highest item that 3rd year principals believe had "high" influence on their development as school leaders include be committed to ensuring the success of the school (72.7%, *n* = 24). The 4th year principals tended to believe that items related to *Executive Leadership* had "medium" influence on their development as school leaders. The highest items that 4th year principals believe had "medium" influence on their development as school leaders include be committed to ensuring the success of the

school, view unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities, possess strong communication skills, and executive leadership overall (62.5%, $n = 5$)

The 2nd and 3rd year principals indicated that be committed to ensuring the success of the school, motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence, be reflective in their practice and strive for continuous improvement, view unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities, inspire and keep staff focused on the end goals, possess strong communication skills, be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholder to provide feedback, treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships, and overall ranking of *Executive Leadership* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, compared to the 4th year principals who indicated that these items had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Additionally, although more 4th year principals indicated that motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence, be reflective in their practice and strive for continuous improvement, be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback, and treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, some 4th year principals indicated that these items were split equally between having “low” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest items 3rd year principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders include be committed to ensuring the success of the school, motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence, and inspire and keep staff focused on the

end goals, compared to the 2nd and 4th year principals who indicated that all 6 items had the same percentage of “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.13

Participant Responses to Executive Leadership per Years of Experience (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Be committed to ensuring the success of the school	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	12.1 (n = 4)	72.7 (n = 24)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
2. Motivate school community through the pursuit of excellence	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	33.3 (n = 6)	66.7 (n = 12)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	27.3 (n = 9)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
3. Be reflective in their practice and strive for continuous improvement	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	12.1 (n = 4)	24.2 (n = 8)	63.6 (n = 21)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. View unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	38.9 (n = 7)	61.1 (n = 11)
	3rd year	12.1 (n = 4)	33.3 (n = 11)	54.5 (n = 18)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
5. Inspire and keep staff focused on the end goals	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	44.4 (n = 8)	55.6 (n = 18)
	3rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	15.2 (n = 5)	69.7 (n = 23)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
6. Possess strong communication skills	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	22.2 (n = 4)	77.8 (n = 14)
	3rd year	12.1 (n = 4)	24.2 (n = 8)	63.6 (n = 21)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
7. Be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n =)
	3rd year	12.1 (n = 4)	21.2 (n = 7)	66.7 (n = 22)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
8. Treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3rd year	12.1 (n = 4)	21.2 (n = 7)	66.7 (n = 22)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
9. Overall ranking	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3rd year	12.1 (n = 4)	24.2 (n = 8)	63.6 (n = 21)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)

Research Question Five

Research question five, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to school culture?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Table 4.14 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses to the 6 items considering *School Culture*. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *School Culture* had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest items that principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include establish and implement a shared vision and establish and communicate consistent expectations (55.9%, $n = 33$). The highest items that principals believe had

“medium” influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include focus on students’ social and emotional development and treat families as key partners in supporting student learning (42.0%, $n = 25$). The highest item that principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include treat families as key partners in supporting student learning (13.6%, $n = 8$). Principals indicated that treat families as key partners in supporting student learning was the lowest item that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as a school leader (44.1%, $n = 26$).

Table 4.14

Participant Responses to School Culture (%)

Survey Item	Low	Medium	High
1. Leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes	11.9 ($n = 7$)	33.9 ($n = 20$)	54.2 ($n = 32$)
2. Establish and implement a shared vision	11.9 ($n = 7$)	32.2 ($n = 19$)	55.9 ($n = 33$)
3. Establish and communicate consistent expectations	10.2 ($n = 6$)	33.9 ($n = 20$)	55.9 ($n = 33$)
4. Focus on students’ social and emotional development	11.9 ($n = 7$)	42.4 ($n = 25$)	45.8 ($n = 27$)
5. Treat families as key partners in supporting student learning	13.6 ($n = 8$)	42.4 ($n = 25$)	44.1 ($n = 26$)
6. Overall ranking	11.9 ($n = 7$)	37.3 ($n = 22$)	50.8 ($n = 30$)

Table 4.15 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals’ responses broken down by grade level. The 6-8th grade principals didn’t believe that any of the items had

“low” influence (0.0%, $n = 0$) on their development as school leaders related to *School Culture*. Half of Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that school culture overall had “high” influence (50.0%, $n = 22$) on their development as school leaders. The majority of 6-8th grade principals indicated that school culture overall had “high” influence (71.4%, $n = 5$) on their development as school leaders. The 9-12th grade principals indicated that school culture overall had “high” influence (37.5%, $n = 3$) on their development as school leaders. The Pre-K – 5th grade principals indicated that treat families as key partners in supporting student learning (13.6%, $n = 6$) was the highest item on the survey that had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *School Culture*.

Pre-K-5th grade, 6-8th grade, and 9-12th grade principals indicated that leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes, establish and implement a shared vision, and establish and communicate consistent expectations had “high” influence on their development as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 9-12th grade principals indicated that treat families as key partners in supporting student learning was split equally between having “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, compared to 6-8th grade principals who indicated that treat families as key partners in supporting student learning had “high” influence on their development as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that overall ranking for *School Culture* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to the 9-12th grade principals who indicated that overall ranking of *School Culture* was split equally between having “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.15

Participant Responses to School Culture per Grade Level (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	40.9 (n = 18)	47.7 (n = 21)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	12.5 (n = 1)	62.5 (n = 5)
2. Establish and implement a shared vision	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	34.1 (n = 15)	54.5 (n = 24)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)
3. Establish and communicate consistent expectations	Pre-K - 5	9.1 (n = 4)	36.4 (n = 16)	54.5 (n = 24)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Focus on students' social and emotional development	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	47.7 (n = 21)	40.9 (n = 18)
		0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	6-8	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)
	9-12			
5. Treat families as key partners in supporting student learning	Pre-K - 5	13.6 (n = 6)	43.2 (n = 19)	43.2 (n = 19)
		0.0 (n = 0)	42.9 (n = 3)	57.1 (n = 4)
	6-8	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
	9-12			
6. Overall ranking	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	38.6 (n = 17)	50.0 (n = 22)
		0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	6-8	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
	9-12			

Table 4.16 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by years of experience. The 2nd year principals didn't believe that any of the items had "low" influence (0.0%, $n = 0$) on their development as school leaders related to *School Culture*. The highest item that 2nd year principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include establish and implement a shared vision

(72.2%, $n = 13$). The highest items that 3rd year principals believe had “high” influence on their development as school leaders include leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes and establish and communicate consistent expectations (57.6%, $n = 19$). The 4th year principals tended to believe that items related to *School Culture* had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders. The highest item that 4th year principals believe had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders include leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes (62.5%, $n = 5$).

The 2nd and 3rd year principals indicated that leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes, establish and implement a shared vision, establish and communicate consistent expectations, focus on students’ social and emotional development, and overall ranking of *School Culture* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to the 4th year principals who indicated that those items had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Additionally, although more 4th year principals indicated that establish and communicate consistent expectations, focus on students’ social and emotional development, and overall ranking of *School Culture* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, some 4th year principals indicated that these items were split equally between having “low” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 2nd year principals indicated that treat families as key partners in supporting student learning had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to the 3rd and 4th year principals who indicated that treat families as key partners in support student learning was split equally between having “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.16

Participant Responses to School Culture per Years of Experience (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	33.3 (n = 6)	66.7 (n = 12)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	27.3 (n = 9)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
2. Establish and implement a shared vision	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	30.3 (n = 10)	54.5 (n = 18)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
3. Establish and communicate consistent expectations	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	33.3 (n = 6)	66.7 (n = 12)
	3 rd year	12.1 (n = 4)	30.3 (n = 10)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Focus on students' social and emotional development	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	44.4 (n = 8)	55.6 (n = 10)
	3rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	39.4 (n = 13)	45.5 (n = 15)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
5. Treat families as key partners in supporting student learning	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	44.4 (n = 8)	55.6 (n = 10)
	3rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	42.4 (n = 14)	42.4 (n = 14)
	4th year	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)	25.0 (n = 2)
6. Overall ranking	2nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	38.9 (n = 7)	61.1 (n = 11)
	3rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	33.3 (n = 11)	51.5 (n = 17)
	4th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)

Research Question Six

Research question six, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to strategic operations?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Table 4.17 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses to the 6 items considering *Strategic Operations*. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Strategic Operations* had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

The highest item that principals believe had “high” influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals (61.0%, $n = 36$). The highest items that principals believe had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time (39.0%, $n = 23$). The highest items that principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders include develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time and deliberately allocate resources/staff time dollars, and tools (13.6%, $n = 8$). Principals indicated that develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time was the lowest item that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as a school leader (47.5%, $n = 28$).

Table 4.17

Participant Responses to Strategic Operations (%)

Survey Item	Low	Medium	High
1. Assess the current needs of the school	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	32.2 (<i>n</i> = 19)	55.9 (<i>n</i> = 33)
2. Meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	27.1 (<i>n</i> = 16)	61.0 (<i>n</i> = 36)
3. Develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time	13.6 (<i>n</i> = 8)	39.0 (<i>n</i> = 23)	47.5 (<i>n</i> = 28)
4. Deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools)	13.6 (<i>n</i> = 8)	28.8 (<i>n</i> = 17)	57.6 (<i>n</i> = 34)
5. Treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	35.6 (<i>n</i> = 21)	52.5 (<i>n</i> = 31)
6. Overall ranking	11.9 (<i>n</i> = 7)	35.6 (<i>n</i> = 21)	52.5 (<i>n</i> = 31)

Table 4.18 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by grade level. Despite the grade level, principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Strategic Operations* had "high" influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The 6-8th grade principals didn't believe that any of the items had "low" influence (0.0%, *n* = 0) on their development as school leaders. Half of Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that strategic operations overall had "high" influence (50.0%, *n* = 22) on their development as school leaders. The majority of 6-8th grade principals indicated that strategic operations overall had "high" influence (71.4%, *n* = 5) on their development

as school leaders. Half of 9th-12th grade principals indicated that strategic operations overall had “high” influence (50.0%, $n = 4$) on their development as school leaders.

Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that assess the current needs of the school, develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time, and deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools) had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that assess the current needs of the school, develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time, and deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools) were split equally between having “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Pre-K-5th grade, 6-8th grade, and 9-12th grade principals indicated that meet with leadership teams regularly, monitoring multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals, treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals, and overall ranking of *Strategic Operations* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. A small percentage (11.4%, $n = 5$) of Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that meet with leadership teams regularly monitoring multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to no (0.0%, $n = 0$) 6-8th grade and 9-12th grade principals indicating that meet with leadership teams regularly monitoring multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.18

Participant Responses to Strategic Operations per Grade Level (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Assess the current needs of the school	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	31.8 (n = 14)	56.8 (n = 25)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
2. Meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	31.8 (n = 14)	56.8 (n = 25)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	0.0 (n = 0)	12.5 (n = 1)	62.5 (n = 5)
3. Develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time	Pre-K - 5	13.6 (n = 6)	40.9 (n = 18)	45.5 (n = 20)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools)	Pre-K - 5	13.6 (n = 6)	29.5 (n = 13)	56.8 (n = 25)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	37.5 (n = 3)	37.5 (n = 3)
5. Treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	40.9 (n = 18)	47.7 (n = 21)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	14.3 (n = 1)	85.7 (n = 6)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)
6. Overall ranking	Pre-K - 5	11.4 (n = 5)	38.6 (n = 17)	50.0 (n = 22)
	6-8	0.0 (n = 0)	28.6 (n = 2)	71.4 (n = 5)
	9-12	25.0 (n = 2)	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)

Table 4.19 illustrates the collapsed results of the principals' responses broken down by years of experience. The highest items that 2nd year principals believe had "high" influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include assess the current needs of the school, meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress towards goals, and deliberately allocate resources/staff time, dollars, and tools (72.2%, $n = 13$). The highest items that 3rd year principals believe had "high"

influence on their development as school leaders include meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress towards goals (63.6%, $n = 21$). The 4th year principals tended to believe that items related to *Strategic Operations* had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders. The highest items that 4th year principals believe had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders include assess the current needs of the school and treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals (62.5%, $n = 5$).

The 2nd and 3rd year principals indicated that assess the current needs of the school, meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals, develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time, deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools), treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals, and overall ranking of *Strategic Operations* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, compared to the 4th year principals who indicated that these items had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Additionally, although more 4th year principals indicated that meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals, develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time, deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools), and overall ranking of *Strategic Operations* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, some 4th year principals indicated that these items were split equally between having “low” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest items 3rd year principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as

school leaders include develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time and deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools), compared to the 2nd and 4th year principals who indicated that all 6 items had the same percentage of “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

Table 4.19

Participant Responses to Strategic Operations per Years of Experience (%)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
1. Assess the current needs of the school	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	27.3 (n = 9)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
2. Meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	27.8 (n = 5)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	21.2 (n = 7)	63.6 (n = 21)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
3. Develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time	2 nd year	5.6 (n = 1)	44.4 (n = 8)	50.0 (n = 9)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	33.3 (n = 11)	51.5 (n = 17)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)

Survey Item		Low	Medium	High
4. Deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools)	2 nd year	5.6 (n = 1)	22.2 (n = 4)	72.2 (n = 13)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	27.3 (n = 9)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)
5. Treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	39.9 (n = 7)	61.1 (n = 11)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	27.3 (n = 9)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	62.5 (n = 5)	12.5 (n = 1)
6. Overall ranking	2 nd year	0.0 (n = 0)	44.4 (n = 8)	55.6 (n = 10)
	3 rd year	15.2 (n = 5)	27.3 (n = 9)	57.6 (n = 19)
	4 th year	25.0 (n = 2)	50.0 (n = 4)	25.0 (n = 2)

Research Question Seven

Research question seven, *What factors, including the leadership development program, influenced principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as school leader?*, was answered using an inductive thematic coding process of one focus group of six elementary school principals and four individual interviews of middle and high school principals. Participants had the opportunity to speak openly about how the trainings and

support through the leadership development program influenced their effectiveness as school leaders. However, larger themes emerged from the data and were assigned to four categories, often overlapping across all seven research questions: (a) principal supervisor and peer support, (b) no recollection of trainings, (c) shortcomings of the program, and (d) ways the program prepared the principals for leadership.

Principal Supervisor and Peer Support

The first theme, *principal supervisor and peer support*, included perspectives from principals related to their supervisor and peers preparing them for leadership throughout the leadership development program and the principal supervisor being a mentor to the principal participant. In this particular school district, principal supervisors serve as mentors for beginning principals as opposed to being the principals' appraiser. So, the term "mentor" is often used by participants and refers to the principal supervisor. Across elementary, middle and high school participants, common characteristics emerged related to the principal supervisor having positive influence on principals' development as school leaders.

Participant 1, an elementary school principal, commented on the success she experienced during her first year as a principal and she contributed some of it to the support she experienced from her principal supervisor. She summarized, "I think a lot of my success from being a first year principal, I do give that to my principal supervisor who was always available as a support to answer questions." Participant 1 also said, "I didn't get any of these items out of [the trainings] but I do feel like assessing the needs in terms of setting up a schedule, calendar, things like that primarily came from my principal supervisor." Similarly, Participant 3, an elementary school principal, articulated

that certain aspects of the leadership development program were not learned by the trainings received, but rather from the principal supervisor. Participant 3 explained, “School culture, most of that information came from our principal supervisor instead of the cohort.” Participant 2, an elementary school principal, commented on the training sessions received during her first year as a principal and while going through the leadership development program. Although she couldn’t “really remember the majority of the meetings that [she] attended,” she mentioned that she has built close relationships with the people in her cohort and received support from her principal supervisor. She explained:

And it had a lot to do with the principal supervisor, the way that the principal supervisor group was set up. It was a small amount of principals per principal supervisor group and we were all right there together so we knew each other.

Participant 4, an elementary school principal, expressed similar thoughts related to the principal supervisor helping to provide her with most of her knowledge. She stated, “I feel like most of my knowledge came from prior experience and just from mentor principals that I gave myself that I would call on and even my principal supervisor.”

Some of the principals expressed disapproval of the support given during the leadership development program, but expressed approval of the support given to them from their principal supervisor. For example, Participant 6, an elementary school principal, expressed a bit of frustration related to the leadership development program and the support received during her first year and explains that many people, as opposed to the leadership development program, were beneficial in her getting the support she needed. She explained:

If we had to base being successful in our roles on the effectiveness of the trainings alone, I wouldn't be in this meeting right now. So, needless to say, if it had not been for a strong principal supervisor, strong mentor principals, cohort support, other principals in the cohort, our chief's meetings, prior life experiences, working on other campuses and being allowed to do a portion of the work that we're tasked with now, I cannot say that this cohort experience was beneficial at all.

Participant 4, an elementary school principal, expressed similar frustration with the trainings received during the leadership development program and how the relationships built with other individuals, as well as her principal supervisor, were helpful. She expressed:

So, with all the information that they gave us, they gave us some information but the relationships were not built from the cohort, the relationships were built from the day to day calls to each other in the middle of the night and during the days and the principal supervisors were the saving grace and also being able to call the departments.

Regardless of the grade level, principal participants continued to give similar praise related to the support given from their principal supervisor. In fact, participant 8, a high school principal, mirrored the responses of some of the elementary school principals. Related to being prepared to be an executive leader, he explained that the leadership development program didn't help him in that particular area, but that his principal supervisor played an important role in giving him advice that assisted him during his first year as a principal. He articulated:

My cohort experience really didn't help me with that area, but I was assigned a mentor, my principal supervisor, he gave me my first lesson, and [he stated that] in certain communities, you have to count on people that are key in your community and make sure that you introduce yourself to them, make sure they know what's going on in your school and etc. So I was really able to learn that, having a strong mentor to help me out my first year.

Participant 7, a middle school principal, shared her experience related to receiving support from her principal supervisor. She stated, "The principal supervisor was very supportive in assessing the needs of the campus and addressing those needs, as well as other gaps." Similarly, Participant 9, a middle school principal, commented on her experience having a mentor. She said:

Having a mentor was helpful, especially a mentor that had done this work and had actually been a middle school principal. So having that component was one of the most helpful for me, having that mentor that you could talk to in a way that wasn't threatening because they're not your appraiser, just there for support.

Overall, elementary, middle, and high school principals reported that their principal supervisor influenced their development as a school leader. Principal participants expressed satisfaction with having a positive and working relationship with the principal supervisor. Even principals that were not particularly fond of the training and information given during the leadership development program still noted that their principal supervisor was essential to them as a first year principal. Having a principal supervisor or mentor gave principals a person to talk to in a non-threatening way,

someone to talk to that has done the job before them, someone to help the principal assess the needs of their school, and someone to give them advice regarding school culture.

No Recollection of Trainings

The second theme, *no recollection of trainings*, included perspectives from principals related to not recalling the trainings being given to them at all or expressing that they didn't receive support in a particular construct. Common characteristics across elementary, middle and high school principals emerged related to the principal not recalling the trainings being given to them or expressing that they didn't receive support in a particular construct. A principal not recalling a training or support in a particular construct could mean that the training and support was not particularly helpful to the principal or that the training and support given happened so long ago that the principal just does not remember it occurring. *Cohort Support* is not included in this theme due to all participants being able to recall trainings in that area.

Instructional leadership. Participant 5, an elementary school principal, explained her experiencing receiving trainings related to instructional leadership. She explained, "I don't recall any instructional leadership trainings," when asked about the influence instructional leadership had on her development as a school leader. Participant 10, a middle school principal, commented on her experience receiving training and support related to instructional leadership. She said:

Honestly, I don't remember getting support in those areas, so I don't know that I did or did not [get influenced]. I feel like maybe it's because I felt like I was already proficient in those areas so it's very possible that the support was offered at a session that I did not attend.

Similarly, Participant 7, a middle school principal, shared her experience related to instructional leadership and explained that “I’m not really sure that was critical in terms of this and what we could use.” She went on to say that she did not receive modeling on how to assess teachers and was not shown tools that she could use related to observations for teachers.

Human capital. Participant 3, an elementary school principal, commented on her experience receiving information related to human capital. She stated, “I don’t remember any meetings either. I remember reading it in a manual.” She went on to say that she primarily got the information related to policies and procedures from the website. She mentioned that the information received from the website was “more than anything she got from the cohort.” Similarly, Participant 2, an elementary school principal, also expressed her lack of recall related to trainings by stating the following: “I don’t remember any trainings or meetings that I went to that discussed human capital.”

Participant 6, an elementary school principal, summarized, “For my cohort, I don’t recall any trainings specifically related to human capital.” Participant 10, a middle school principal, stated, “I am trying to think back to the type of support we got in that. Honestly, I know it’s probably not the best answer, but I just don’t remember a lot in that.” Participant 10 goes on to say that she did not remember a lot about human capital training other than learning about documentation for teachers related to coaching them.

Executive leadership. Participant 1, an elementary school principal, articulated, “I would say that in terms of executive leadership, there is nothing that I can recall at this time that affected my effectiveness as a leader.” Similarly, Participant 5, an elementary school principal stated, “I don’t recall having any training on executive leadership.”

Participant 10, a middle school principal, mentioned that executive leadership was another construct that she didn't remember receiving training in. She mentioned, "The same thing with that. I don't necessarily remember the support piece in that area."

School culture. Participant 2, an elementary school principal, articulated that she did not "recall having any trainings during cohort meetings regarding school culture." She goes on to say, "I can't really remember the majority of the meetings that we attended, so I can't say that they had a big impact on me as a leader on my campus." Additionally, Participant 6, an elementary school principal, commented on her experience overall being prepared as a school leader during her first year and included school culture in her comment. She stated, "All of the areas that we've responded to questions around were not really addressed as far as I can recollect so school culture would also fall into that category." Similarly, Participant 10, a middle school principal, expresses her lack of recall related to training or support related to school culture. She articulated, "I'm going to say it didn't [influence her development as a school leader], because I don't remember anything in regards to school culture in that first year. I don't remember that at all."

Strategic operations. Participant 8, a high school principal, mentioned where he got most of his experience related to strategic operations. He said:

I didn't learn anything directly with that from the leadership cohort, those are some things I kind of picked up as I was going through the principal certification process and you learn as an AP [Assistant Principal]. I learned those experiences from being an AP going to other kinds of professional developments, not a lot was gained from my cohort experience. They [the leadership development

department] did probably touch on it, but it wasn't just anything that stands out at the moment.

Participant 5, an elementary school principal, articulated her recollection regarding strategic operations and how she missed this information during her first year as a school leader. She said, "I was hired in late August, so I'm assuming based on the topic, these were things that were discussed in the summer, so I didn't get any of this." Similarly, Participant 9, a middle school principal, stated, "I wasn't [influenced as a school leader related to strategic operations]. I have to be honest, the leadership development didn't influence that aspect of my work."

Overall, elementary, middle and high school principals expressed not remembering trainings or receiving support in five of the six constructs they were asked questions about. Notably, of the six constructs, nobody stated a lack of recall of trainings and support related to construct one, cohort support. All participants were able to recall trainings and support related to this construct. Of the other five constructs, at least three participants per construct were able to comment on the lack of recall related to receiving support or training in each of those constructs. When asked to summarize the support offered through the leadership development during their first year as a school leader, only Participant 2, an elementary school principal, stated that she does not remember the majority of the meetings that she attended.

Shortcomings of the Program

The third theme, *shortcomings of the program*, included perspectives from principals related to the principal receiving the training or support during the leadership development program related to the 6 constructs, but neither the training nor the support

adequately prepared the principal for school leadership. Across participants, common characteristics amongst elementary, middle and high school principals emerged related to the principal remembering the topic of the various constructs coming up and the principal being exposed to them via training or other forms of support, but the influence of it was very low related to preparing them for school leadership. Lastly, when asked about the influence of the program on their development related to specific constructs, some principals stated that the components included in that construct didn't prepare them for school leadership, but added examples (past experiences as an assistant principal, outside trainings, and support from the principal supervisor, to name a few) that did help to prepare them for school leadership. The following examples illustrate participants' perceptions of the shortcomings of the leadership development program.

Participant 1, an elementary school principal, explained her exposure to some of the constructs including instructional leadership, human capital and relationships she gained during her support given from the leadership development program. However, she expressed frustration with the exposure and how it prepared her for leadership. She articulated, "Other than some insightful professional articles, I don't feel like attending the cohort meetings providing me with any type of influence in terms of my effectiveness." Related to how the leadership development department was able to influence her effectiveness as a school leader related to human capital, she stated the following:

I felt like it was minimal influence in terms of human capital, because I felt like it was after the fact. I'm not exactly sure what month of the year that particular session took place but I recall thinking it was after the fact. Staff was in place and

the year had started. So it wasn't much to do with the information [they gave us]. Notably, Participant 1 also mentioned the same feelings related to school culture. She went on to elaborate on the fact that this session was also given late, therefore not allowing her to utilize the information for her campus. She mentioned:

I think in terms of school culture, I vaguely recall a session regarding school culture. What does pop up immediately is that I recall thinking that it was too late in the year and that it should have been done before so that there was an opportunity to go ahead and work on leveraging the school and the mission and vision because that comes at the very beginning of the year.

When asked to summarize the support with leadership development during her first year as a principal, Participant 1 was able to articulate some of the things that she did find helpful related to her development, but spent some time focusing on some things that were not helpful or did not have a high influence on her development. She stated:

I think that the biggest takeaway that I have in terms of the meetings for year 1 cohort and the leadership development team is not so much the content but the relationships that I was able to build with some of the people that were in the cohort. It was very obvious that as the meetings progressed, the attendance dwindled in size, and I do recall at some point being told that although these were not mandatory, that the higher ups looked at the list, looked at who was in attendance and basically, if you hadn't been there and you failed, then it was your fault because you didn't attend the meetings and the trainings. I did not have the experience that Participant 2 did in terms of being able to reach out to the leadership development team. I felt like it was more my principal supervisor and

I'm pretty sure that the meetings covered some of this content, but I do not recall many of the meetings. That would suggest that it was either not relevant at that time and it was disregarded due to major pressing things that were on my plate at the time, or they just were not of value and so they were discarded.

Prior to Participant 1 sharing her experience, Participant 2 made reference to her experience with the leadership development team and how she was able to pick up the phone and call members of the leadership development team when she needed them; Participant 1 mentioned that she did not have that same experience.

Participant 3, an elementary school principal, shared similar experiences related to the things that did not prepare her for school leadership. Notably, the participant recalled a lot of information being given through articles and the trainings not going into enough detail for her. Related to being prepared in the area of instructional leadership, she began by saying that "the influence of instructional leadership was no more than giving me the vision and the mission and it could have been said in one sentence and I'd know what to do from there." She continued to say, "The cohort had a lot to do with policies, procedures, and programs and it was just a touch and run. There wasn't anything further than that." Participant 3 suggested that she didn't necessarily need to sit in some of the meetings due to how the information was presented to her. She expressed:

We spent time on this [getting information related to strategic operations], basically about how you organize yourself and move forward. I will never forget we got this wonderful handout, I could have gotten everything from the handout and then out the door I would have gone.

Participant 3 continued to provide examples of how information presented to her wasn't

specific enough and lacked details. She said, “In our cohort, executive leadership was a big focus point, but it was the 800 feet view down on to something. There wasn’t any details, there wasn’t any meat.”

Participant 6, an elementary school principal, expressed frustration with the meetings and trainings given within the leadership development program designed to prepare her for school leadership. She said, “If we had to base being successful in our roles on the effectiveness of the trainings alone, I wouldn’t be in this meeting right now.” Similar to her previous statement, she also expressed the non-relevance of the information presented to her related to cohort support. She articulated:

I can’t honestly say that any of these I was really supported completely in, other than the appraisal system. And mostly because I went through a different preparation program prior to just going into the cohort beginning principals. So none of these things [related to cohort support] I felt I was supported in.

Participant 6 did mentioned a few things that she recalled being of relevance during her development training, but discounted them due to the fact that she ended up not finding the information useful as a school leader. She explained:

The closest training that we had related to executive leadership would have been the [principal appraisal] experience and I use the term experience loosely. It was more so an overview to prep us to meet with our superiors in order to determine what areas we’d focus on for an appraisal system that we really don’t use in the way it was designed.

She also commented, “Other than meeting and being able to walk campuses and give feedback to other principals’ teachers, I don’t really see any benefit of the process as it

was designed when we went through the cohort.” When asked to summarize her support with leadership development during her first year as a school leader, she summarized, “...I cannot say that this experience in our cohort, through our cohort meetings, was beneficial at all.”

Regardless of the grade level, principal participants continued to provide similar responses related to the support given and trainings not preparing them for school leadership. In fact, all 3 middle school principals shared experiences outside of the leadership development support that prepared them for school leadership. Participant 9 mentioned, “Honestly, the bulk of my instructional impact came from experiences prior to leadership development; I was an assistant principal.” Similarly, Participant 10 explained, “I got a lot of that training as an assistant principal, so I feel like I didn’t get much in the instructional leadership piece from the cohort.” When asked how the leadership development given related to human capital influenced her effectiveness as a school leader, Participant 7 shared an alternate experience that prepared her. She said:

This is talking about leadership training us to do that? They did not do that. I went to an entire day of training with the Haberman and I think that was good, learning how to select teachers using the Haberman.”

Haberman (1995) suggests that 80% of getting a good teacher for students is not the training of the teacher, rather the selection process. The test created by Haberman that the participant mentioned above assesses the ideology of potential teachers, which allows employers to choose the teacher that has the ideology that fits their school district. This test is given to teachers in the participant school district prior to them being considered for hire. In a similar example, Participant 8, a high school principal, described how the

preparation related to school culture did not help him with his development, but then shared something that did help him. He stated, “Nothing specific [being prepared related to school culture], but the biggest thing I guess I can say is that being part of a cohort allowed me to hear best practices on what to do.”

Overall, elementary, middle, and high school principals reported that while they could recall multiple components of the leadership development program, it did not adequately prepare them for school leadership. Additionally, principal participants were able to elaborate on additional experiences that did prepare them for school leadership, not addressed during the leadership development program. Furthermore, the relevance of the training sessions, the way the information within the training sessions was delivered, and the lack of addressing essential things the principals needed were all things noted from participants as to why the leadership development program did not adequately prepare them for school leadership, related to the constructs discussed above.

Ways the Program Prepared the Principals for Leadership

The fourth theme, *ways the program prepared the principals for leadership*, included perspectives from principals related to what components of the leadership development program actually prepared the principal to be a school leader. It should be noted that the principal supervisor as a mentor was brought up by multiple principal participants and in multiple constructs as something that principals found helpful in their development as a school leader, but because principal supervisors were brought up and noted in a previous section, they will not be addressed in this section. Across participants, common characteristics amongst elementary, middle and high school

principals emerged related to multiple components of the leadership development program having positive influence on their development as school leaders.

When analyzing the responses related to the components of the leadership development program that had an influence on the effectiveness of the principal participants as school leaders, there was an overwhelming response related to relationships. Participant 2, an elementary school principal, explained:

...what I can say from the leadership development team, having their telephone numbers, I could text or call them, email them at any point and time and always get a response back from my first year up until now. That has been the biggest support that I've received from the department not so much the meetings that we've had. I've built a close relationship with the people in my cohort.

She went on to say, "...some of the support that I received just came from being able to contact members of the leadership development team and just having those individual conversations about things that I may need, but nothing so much on this page [survey questions regarding strategic operations].

Similarly, Participant 3, an elementary school principal, said, "I think the biggest takeaway from the cohorts is just building the relationships and finding your new network." Participant 4, an elementary school principal, also commented on the importance of principals being able to meet and share ideas, as well speaking to specific people about specific things needed. She commented:

I think it's always good for principals to meet and be able to share ideas because sometimes we feel like we're all alone at this. So that was definitely a positive for the few meetings that I did attend. But when we talk about just the leadership

department, one member in particular use to do a lot of trainings and I attended the majority of her trainings which were under this department, which were really good and helped me my first year as a principal, so I did get that support.

Participant 9, a middle school principal, elaborated on being able to dialogue with individuals and networking with other principals. She explained:

I guess one of the big takeaways was when curriculum personnel were able to present to us, because they were able to share resources that you may not necessarily know about or you may have forgotten about. So, being able to have dialogue with curriculum personnel was the most helpful.

As far as my experience, it was helpful to have a cohort of people you knew were experiencing the same things that you were experiencing as a first year principal, the same fears, and the same aspects of our work that's new to us. So that part was helpful and being able to have a network of people that you could go to as far as your mentor, leadership development staff members, just establishing a sense of comfort in terms of taking on this challenging new role.

Participant 8, a high school principal, was asked how the leadership development program influenced his effectiveness as a school leader related to cohort support and he was able to describe his experience being a part of the cohort while going through the leadership development program. He articulated:

Overall, I believe that the best thing about this whole cohort thing is based on relationship building in general. You're getting so much information when you go through the trainings with them, but the fact that you have other people that are going through the same process that you are, you're able to build on the same

struggles that they may have or that they may have overcome as you learn. So, being part of a cohort, you can also call on those same people because they can be an ally. They can see how your day is going or either give you the opportunity to use what they have so that you don't have to reinvent anything to get your job done. So, just being able to have a long lasting relationship with the same people doing the same work that you're doing because you just learn together.

He went on to speak about the influence of instructional leadership provided to him during his first year of principalship through the leadership development program. He said:

It's the same thing [importance of relationships with other principals]. The best part I like about it that resonated this year is when a new cohort member came to me for a part of their training to get advice about the principalship. You can't do a lot by yourself, but if you know somebody else that did it with you, you can always go back to them. So, it's just best to build bridges to find people to help you out and that you can relay best practices to, because that's what it's all about.

Overall, elementary, middle, and high school principals elaborated on program components such as having a cohort of principals to share ideas with, being able to call the central office employees, giving feedback to principals while on their campuses, and the idea of having a network of principals that could help them when needed, as being effective related to preparing them as school leaders. Principals indicated that being able to contact and network with cohort members, being able to dialogue with the facilitators, and asking department representatives specific questions (as opposed to sitting through a training) were examples of things that influenced their development as a school leader.

Building positive relationships was a common theme that prepared principals as school leaders. Principal participants elaborated on having positive relationships with other principals within the cohort by stating that having another person to go through the trainings and share ideas with was helpful, as well as having someone to talk to who is going through similar experiences related to being a new principal.

Summary of Findings

This chapter presented the results of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis of this study. Overall, principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Cohort Support* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Middle school and 4th year principals reported at the highest rate that *Cohort Support* had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Middle school and 4th year principals reported at the highest rate that *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders.

Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Human Capital* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Middle school and 2nd year principals reported at the highest rate that *Human Capital* had “high” influence on their development as school leaders. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Executive Leadership* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Middle school and 2nd year principals reported at the

highest rate that *Executive Leadership* had “high” influence on their development as school leaders. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *School Culture* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Middle school and 2nd year principals reported at the highest rate that *School Culture* had “high” influence on their development as school leaders. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Strategic Operations* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Middle school and 3rd year principals reported at the highest rate that *Strategic Operations* had “high” influence on their development as school leaders.

When comparing principal responses toward support and trainings provided to them during the leadership development program that influenced their development as school leaders, the qualitative analysis found that four themes emerged, which were evident across all seven research questions: *principal supervisor and peer support, no recollection of trainings, shortcomings of the program, and ways the program prepared the principals for leadership.*

Overall, principals indicated that being able to contact and network with cohort members, being able to dialogue with the facilitators, and asking department representatives specific questions (as opposed to sitting through a training) were examples of things that influenced their development as a school leader. Additionally, across grade levels and years of experience, principals indicated that their principal supervisor influenced their development as a school leader. Even principals that were not particularly fond of the training and information given during the leadership development

program still noted that their principal supervisor was essential to them as a first year principal.

Conclusion

Overall, principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Cohort Support* and *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. Principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Human Capital, Executive Leadership, School Culture, and Strategic Operations* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, determined by their responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*. The qualitative analysis found that four themes emerged, which were evident across all seven research questions: *principal supervisor and peer support, no recollection of trainings, shortcomings of the program, and ways the program prepared the principals for leadership*. In the next chapter, this study’s findings will be compared and contrasted with prior studies documented in the research literature. Additionally, the implications of this study’s results will be discussed with considerations toward factors that principals feel influence their effectiveness as school leaders.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program had on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in the participating school district. There has been much research regarding the importance of principals being effectively prepared for their roles as school leaders (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013; Miller, 2013; Verrett, 2012; Versland, 2013). With the uncertainty that aspiring principals are being adequately prepared for the principal role, some school districts have moved towards developing leadership preparation programs within their school districts that are focused on their own leadership standards (Taylor et al., 2014). However, with all of the research stating what professional development activities are effective for principal preparation, school districts do not know which approach to take to prepare their principals for school leadership (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Gentilucci, Denti, & Guaglianone, 2013; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013). There is a need to examine the extent to which cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture and strategic operations influence principal effectiveness as school leaders in the participating school district, seeing that the goal of the “grow your own” leadership program is to prepare beginning principals for their roles.

To quantify the influence that the leadership development program had on school leaders, 59 principals (44 elementary school principals, seven middle school principals,

eight high school principals) completed the Principal Effectiveness Survey to address research questions one through six. The responses were collapsed: (a) responses of 1-3 meaning the item had “low” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader, (b) responses of 4-7 meaning the item had “medium” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader, and (c) responses of 8-10 meaning the item had “high” influence on the participant’s effectiveness as a school leader. The participant responses were broken down by overall participants, by grade level, and by years of experience for each of the six research questions. Additionally, 10 principals (six elementary school principals, three middle school principals, one high school principal) participated in semi-structured focus groups and interviews that allowed the researcher to gain qualitative data pertaining to how the constructs within the leadership development program influenced their development as school leaders to address research question seven. Within this chapter, the findings of this study are contextualized in the larger body of research literature. Implications for school districts and principals as well as recommendations for future research are also included.

Summary

Research Question 1

Research question one, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to cohort support?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness).

The participant responses were then broken down by overall participants, by grade level, and by years of experience.

Overall participants. Overall, principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Cohort Support* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that principals felt had “medium” influence on their development was instructional leadership/assessment. This finding is consistent with prior researching that states the role of the principal has changed from being a manager, to now being an instructional leader (Mestry, Moonsammy-Koopasammy, & Schmidt, 2013). Principals have conversations about the things that are deemed to be the most important. Within the cohort structure, principals in the participating school district work with other principals, mentors, central office personnel and other stakeholders as they prepare for school leadership.

Grade level. Related to Cohort Support overall, 9-12th grade principals felt that Cohort Support had “low” influence on their development as school leaders, contradicting Browne-Ferrigno (2007), whose research found that principals’ perceptions about school leadership were influenced by the interactions they had during cohort meetings. Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, 6-8th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, and 9-12th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The disparities in this finding agrees with prior research presented by Grissom and Harrington (2010) suggesting that although principals serve an

important role in developing schools, the knowledge and skills that principals need to achieve this goal is not well developed.

Years of experience. Based on the years of experience, principals indicated different items that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. As a principals gains more experience in their role as a school leader, the skills a principal needs is different. For example, 2nd year principals indicated that information regarding the appraisal and development system had “high” influence on their development. The newer principals felt that this information was more useful to them because it is the basis of supporting a teacher. However, 3rd year principals indicated that resource management and instructional leadership had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Having more experience with the appraisal system, 3rd year principals felt that something else was more helpful to their effectiveness. Having more experience with the appraisal system and managing resources, 4th year principals indicated that professional development and observation and feedback had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Years of experience could be tied to self-efficacy. A 4th year principal may feel more comfortable and find more success in aspects of school leadership that a 2nd year principal will not. In a study conducted by Federici and Skaalvik (2012), the researchers determined that there was a strong correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction and that self-efficacy was important to a principals’ well-being.

Research Question 2

Research question two, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to instructional leadership?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness*

Survey, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness). The participant responses were then broken down by overall participants, by grade level, and by years of experience.

Overall participants. Overall, principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. The highest item that principals felt had “medium” influence on their development was instructional leadership/assessment. The highest item that principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as a school leaders include model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning (25.4%, $n = 15$). Principals indicated that analyze of the curriculum was the lowest item that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as a school leader (16.9%, $n = 10$). Mestry, et al. (2013) report that instructional leadership encompasses multiple themes for principals, including but not limited to balancing their administrative and instructional roles, managing the instructional program on their campus and promoting positive school climate. This finding is alarming seeing that principals should find success in being prepared in the areas of managing their instructional program based on prior research (Mestry, et al., 2013).

Grade level. Pre-K – 5th grade principals indicated that prioritizing instruction and student achievement (31.8%, $n = 14$) and instructional leadership overall (29.5%, $n = 13$) were the 2 highest items on the survey that had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *Instructional Leadership*. Pre-K-5th grade and

6-8th grade principals indicated that implementing rigorous curriculum and analyze of curriculum had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Mestry, et al. (2013) similarly discovered that principals reported that their main foci related to instructional leadership involved setting clear goals, managing the curriculum and the evaluation of teaching and learning on their campus. Half of 9-12th grade principals indicated that instructional leadership overall had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This could be related to the research conducted by Costello (2015), reporting that researchers cannot come up with one concrete way to define instructional leadership. What Pre-K-5th grade principals consider instructional leadership could be different from what 9-12th grade principals consider instructional leadership, which could be why many of the 9-12th principals felt the information provided during the preparation program had “low” influence on their development.

Years of experience. The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals indicated that prioritizing instruction and student achievement, implement rigorous curriculum, analyze of the curriculum, model instructional strategies and set expectations for learning, develop systems of routine monitoring to improve instruction, and overall ranking of *Instructional Leadership* had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, which disagrees with Taylor, et al. (2014) finding that instructional leadership and student achievement were the top two domains principals felt the most unprepared for related to school leadership.

Research Question 3

Research question three, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to human capital?*, was answered

using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness). The participant responses were then broken down by overall participants, by grade level, and by years of experience.

Overall participants. Overall, principals tend to feel that the activities related to *Human Capital* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Kimball (2011) reports that principals not only have to hire the best talent, but they need to plan for staff turnover, have a message to recruit new talent, use their professional contacts and be sure to have a system for their selection process. However, the highest item that principals believe had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders includes be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates (13.6%, $n = 8$). Despite the importance of hiring the best candidate and having a system for their selection process, principals indicated that this program component had “low” influence on their development as school leaders.

Grade level. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource, ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations, had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that treat faculty/staff members as their most valuable resource, ensure all staff have clear goals and expectations had “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This belief agrees with the conclusion of Kimball (2011) that goal setting from both principals and teachers

motivates performance and they should be communicated. If teachers are effective, then the school has a better chance of being effective. This process can be streamlined by setting goals.

Years of experience. The 2nd and 3rd year principals indicated that be strategic in selecting and hiring candidates had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *Human Capital*, compared to 4th year principals who indicated that selecting and hiring candidates had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Habermann (2004) described similar importance in hiring practices and suggests that 80% of getting a good teacher for students is not the training of the teacher, rather the selection process. The 2nd and 3rd year principals indicated that facilitate professional learning communities had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *Human Capital*, compared to 4th year principals who indicated that facilitate professional learning communities had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This finding agrees with the conclusion by Kimball (2011) that principals must develop their staff, as well as provide the atmosphere that will allow the staff to fully commit to the vision of the principal.

Research Question 4

Research question four, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to executive leadership?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness).

The participant responses were then broken down by overall participants, by grade level, and by years of experience.

Overall participants. Overall, the highest item that principals believe had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders related to *Executive Leadership* include view unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities (39.0%, $n = 23$). This is consistent with Turner (2007), who reports that effective leaders enable organizations to respond to change, address challenges and creates culture that engages employees. It is that leadership that helps executives when they need to wrestle new challenges. Principals indicated that treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This finding mirrors the conclusions by Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005) that principals are also expected to cater to the needs of students, teachers, parents, community members, teacher unions and state and federal agencies.

Grade level. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders. Similarly, Chirichello (2004) states that collective leadership related to principals being collaborators and building a trusting relationship with teachers and stakeholders are all important relating to principal effectiveness.

Years of experience. The 2nd and 3rd year principals indicated that be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback had “high”

influence on their development as school leaders compared to 9-12th grade principals who indicated that be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback had “medium” influence on their development as school leaders. This was confirmed by research from Turner (2007) that concluded that the research surrounding executive leadership places emphasis on an executive having self-knowledge, personal accountability, strategy setting, engaging others and harnessing insights.

Research Question 5

Research question five, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to school culture?*, was answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness). The participant responses were then broken down by overall participants, by grade level, and by years of experience.

Overall participants. Principals tend to feel that activities related to *School Culture* had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Specifically, principals indicated that establish and implement a shared vision had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Barr & Higgins-D’Alessandro (2009) also found that in a school setting, a positive school culture can be described as one where the staff and students support each other, they share common goals and values and the atmosphere of the building allows for all parties to feel a sense of belonging.

Grade level. Pre-K-5th grade, 6-8th grade, and 9-12th grade principals indicated that leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This is consistent with Herrington (2013), suggests that school culture is important because it can determine if the school environment is supportive in nature or hostile and divided. Additionally, McKinney, Labat, and Labat (2015) determined that teacher morale is a component of school culture and that the morale of the teacher impacts the instruction given to students. Furthermore, Mendels and Mitgang (2013) suggests that the pathway that leads to principal improvement includes teacher and staff excellence with a focus on continual improvement, professional learning systems that guarantee learning for children, a focus on college and career readiness, community engagement, self-discipline, and leading schools with a vision.

Years of experience. The 2nd year principals indicated that treat families as key partners in supporting student learning had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to the 3rd and 4th year principals who indicated that treat families as key partners in support student learning was split equally between having “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This is consistent with the conclusion of Turan and Bektas (2013), who argue that the responsible of school culture is not only of the principal, but of multiple stakeholders. School culture encompasses many people, an individual goals are more likely to be accomplished with the support of many people (Turan & Bektas, 2013).

Research Question 6

Research question six, *To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to strategic operations?*, was

answered using frequencies and percentages of responses to the *Principals Effectiveness Survey*, which required participants to rate the influence particular activities had on their effectiveness as a school leader using a rating scale (one representing the least influence to their effectiveness and ten representing the greatest influence to their effectiveness). The participant responses were then broken down by overall participants, by grade level, and by years of experience.

Overall participants. Overall, principals indicated that treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This finding disagrees with Mendels and Mitgang’s (2013) conclusions that the relationships between school districts and the principal are evolving. Principals indicated that they felt prepared to work with central office staff and treat them as partners.

Grade level. Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that deliberately allocate resources (eg. Staff time, dollars, and tools) had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. 9-12th grade principals indicated that deliberately allocate resources (eg. Staff time, dollars, and tools) had “medium” and “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. This mirrors the conclusion by Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005) that principals are expected to be instructional and curriculum leaders, disciplinarians, budget analysts and public relations experts.

Years of experience. The Pre-K-5th grade and 6-8th grade principals indicated that assess the current needs of the school had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders compared to the 9-12th grade principals who indicated that assess the current needs of the school had “medium” influence on their effectiveness as school

leaders. This finding coincides with Yang et al. (2015), whom indicate that a needs assessment is conducted so that the target audience can find gaps and discrepancies between what already exists to make decisions regarding what is needed. A needs assessment provides information for the decision-makers to identify appropriate decision alternatives (Yang et al., 2015).

Research Question 7

Research question seven, *What factors, including the leadership development program, influenced principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as school leaders?*, was answered using an inductive thematic coding process using data from one focus group of six elementary school principals and four individual phone interviews of middle and high School principals. Participants had the opportunity to speak openly about how the trainings and support through the leadership development program influenced their effectiveness as school leaders. From the focus group and interview data, responses were analyzed and assigned to four themes: (a) *principal supervisor and peer support*, (b) *no recollection of trainings*, (c) *shortcomings of the program*, and (d) *ways the program prepared the principals for leadership*.

Principal supervisor and peer support. Elementary, middle, and high school principals reported that their principal supervisor influenced their development as a school leader. Principal participants expressed satisfaction with having a positive and working relationship with their principal supervisor. This finding was consistent with Huang et al. (2012) who found that positive relationships between mentors and their mentees could affect the outcome of the mentee's work. Even principals that were not particularly fond of the training and information given during the leadership development

program still noted that their principal supervisor was essential to them as a first year principal. Having a principal supervisor or mentor gave principals a person to talk to in a non-threatening way, someone to talk to that has done the job before them, someone to help the principal assess the needs of their school, and someone to give them advice regarding school culture. The responses from study participants was reaffirmed by research that principals value the opportunity to be reflective with their mentors, as well as for their mentors to affirm that they are doing their jobs. Mentors provide feedback to principals regarding their jobs and provide an outlet for principals to share and reflect on their practice. Mentors serve the purpose of problem solving with a learner and being there to close the gap between what a learner knows and the potential developmental level of the learner (Davis et al., 2005; Saban, 2009).

No recollection of trainings. Elementary, middle and high school principals expressed not remembering trainings or receiving support in five of the six constructs they were asked questions about. Of the five constructs, at least three participants per construct were able to comment on the lack of recall related to receiving support or training in each of those constructs. Principal participants stated that they did not recall some of the trainings because some of the information included in the trainings was not critical to them. Additionally, one principal participant stated that the information was not modeled for her and that she got more information from a website rather than showing up for the training. Furthermore, some of the principal participants just did not remember some of the trainings with no explanation given. This could be because the training was presented so long ago or that the training was not relevant to them as a school leader. The training must be valid to the principal and the learning activities must

be problem-based and practical to the skills they are learning (Davis & Leon, 2011). This study supports the point that program designers must maintain a highly planned training sequence that is creative and spontaneous enough to capture unique opportunities and one that can adapt to real life situations that arise (McIntyre, 2001).

Shortcomings of the program. Elementary, middle, and high school principals reported that multiple components of the leadership development program were recalled, but did not adequately prepare them for school leadership. Additionally, principal participants were able to elaborate on additional experiences not addressed during the leadership development program that did prepare them for school leadership. Furthermore, the relevance of the training sessions, the way the information within the training sessions was delivered, and the lack of addressing essential things the principals needed were all things participants noted as to why the leadership development program did not adequately prepare them for school leadership. Stein and Gewirtzman (2003) affirmed that principal preparation programs should be related to the skills principals will need to be successful in their role and should allow for them to practice by solving problems related to what they may experience in their role.

Ways the program prepared the principals for leadership. Elementary, middle, and high school principals elaborated on program components such as having a cohort of principals to share ideas with, being able to call the central office employees, giving feedback to principals while on their campuses, and the idea of having a network of principals that could help them when needed, as being effective components related to preparing them as school leaders. Notably, of the six constructs, nobody across participants stated a lack of recall of trainings and support related to construct one, cohort

support. This agrees with Browne-Ferrigno (2007), whom reports that principals' perceptions about school leadership were influenced by the interactions they had during cohort meetings. Principals are able to speak opening to their colleagues and get feedback on issues and concerns they may be having on their campuses. Individuals who participate in a cohort do not have to feel as if they are achieving a goal alone and are provided with a network of people to share ideas with and to get support and information from. This finding coincides with research conducted by Huang et al. (2012), concluding that the cohort structure was the most appreciated program feature amongst participants. All participants were able to recall trainings and support related to this construct.

Similarly, Huang et al. (2012) reported that principals going through a principal preparation program in the school district of Philadelphia expressed satisfaction in being able to work with a host principal and working full-time in a host school. Principals indicated that being able to contact and network with cohort members, being able to dialogue with the facilitators, and asking department representatives specific questions (as opposed to sitting through a training) were examples of things that influenced their development as a school leader. This finding is consistent with Huang et al. (2012), that the cohort structure has been viewed as one of the most supportive program features within a principal preparation program.

Building positive relationships was a common theme that prepared principals as school leaders. Principal participants elaborated on having positive relationships with other principals within the cohort by stating that having another person to go through the trainings and share ideas with was helpful, as well as having someone to talk to who is going through similar experiences related to being a new principal. This finding aligns

with Fisher and Carlyon (2015), whom suggest that relational leadership is a trait of an insightful leader and that this type of leadership can create opportunities for people to encourage understanding amongst each other and to work together in harmonious ways.

Implications

There has been much research completed regarding the importance of principals being effectively prepared for their roles as school leaders (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013; Miller, 2013; Verrett, 2012; Versland, 2013). There is research stating that university-based preparation programs may not be preparing principals for their roles and a district leadership development program may be needed to prepare principals effectively for their roles as school leaders (Black, 2011; Davis, et al., 2005; Grissom & Harrington, 2010; MyIntyre, 2001; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). The results of this research study have implications for not only the district administrators and principals in the participating school district, but for other district administrators in the state of Texas who develop leadership development programs to prepare principals for school leadership. School districts may consider having a “grow your own” principal preparation model for their principals before allowing them to be school leaders, based on the research stating that principals are not being prepared for their roles coming out of university based programs (Black, 2011; Davis, et al., 2005; Grissom & Harrington, 2010; MyIntyre, 2001; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003).

This research study also has implications for aspiring principals in the participating school district who are looking to participate in professional development activities that may lead them to become effective school leaders. The majority of

principals indicated that human capital, executive leadership, school culture, and strategic operations all had “high” influence on their development as school leaders. Aspiring principals can find professional development activities that align with these constructs in order to gain more knowledge in those areas, preparing them for school leadership before they become school leaders. Furthermore, aspiring principals can seek opportunities from their current principals that are aligned with these constructs. This will allow aspiring principals the practice needed to grow in those areas, which will support them when they hear the theory regarding each construct.

Findings of this study have important implications for the developers of the leadership development program in the participating school district regarding which constructs principals indicate influence their effectiveness as school leaders. A problem faced by program designers is that of maintaining a highly planned training sequence that is creative and spontaneous enough to capture unique opportunities and one that can adapt to real life situations that arise (McIntyre, 2001). The quantitative results indicate which constructs principals felt had low, medium or high influence on their development as school leaders. The participating school district can use the results to revamp the current leadership development program. Particular activities or constructs could be taken out completely or be elaborated on deeply depending on how principals felt that particular activity or construct influenced their development as school leaders. Additionally, this study presented data based on grade level (Pre-K-5th, 6-8th, and 9-12th). Program designers may choose to differentiate the training and support given to principals based on the level of the school the principal will lead. For example, Pre-K-5th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams had

“medium” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, 6-8th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams had “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders, and 9-12th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams had “low” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders. Program designers may choose to look into this disparity and decide to revamp their professional development approach related to cohort support based on the level of the school the principal will lead.

The results of the qualitative research have implications for how principals prefer to receive professional development. Despite research stating what professional development activities are effective for principal preparation, school districts do not know which approach to take to prepare their principals for school leadership (Davis & Leon, 2011; Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Gentilucci, et al., 2013; Mendels & Mitgang, 2013). Overall, principals indicated that being able to contact and network with cohort members, being able to dialogue with the facilitators, and asking department representatives specific questions (as opposed to sitting through a training) were examples of things that influenced their development as a school leader. Additionally, across grade levels and years of experience, principals indicated that their principal supervisor influenced their development as a school leader. Even principals that were not particularly fond of the training and information given during the leadership development program still noted that their principal supervisor was essential to them as a first year principal. This could be important when developing future professional development sessions for aspiring principals.

Principal participants did not remember many of the sessions that were presented to them, but remember the relationships developed within their cohort and with their principal supervisor and indicated that those things were effective and influenced their effectiveness as school leaders. Program designers may consider partnering those things that principals indicated had “low” influence on their development as school leaders with a principal supervisor. Instead of providing training on those constructs that had “low” influence on the principals’ development as school leaders, those constructs could be given to the principal supervisor to present and mentor the principal on, ultimately having more influence on principals’ development as school leaders. For example, 9-12th grade principals indicated that professional development for leadership teams and teachers, as well as district curriculum had “low” influence on their development as school leaders. If program developers find these items to be important for high school principals, program developers may consider the principal supervisor sitting down with the principal and mentoring them on these items, as opposed to providing a training to this grade level of principals.

Recommendations for Future Research

There are several recommendations suggested for future research. First, the researcher recommends replicating this study in a school district that is more diverse. This study reported results from principals who lead schools on the elementary, middle and high school levels, however, the number of principal participants for each grade level, as well as principal participants with varying years of experience was disproportional. The researcher recommends that the study be conducted with proportional numbers of elementary, middle, and high school principals to better

generalize the data for each of those grade levels. Additionally, the study may not be able to be replicated in other areas due to the lack of principal turnover, meaning few to no new principals are hired each year. For this reason, caution should be considered when thinking about the implementation of this study in other school districts as the results may not be generalizable to other school districts.

Second, the research was primarily collected 2-4 years after the principal participants participated in the leadership development program. The researcher discovered that principal participants did not remember the leadership development program and its components and the influence those components had on their effectiveness as school leaders. The researcher suggests collecting the data immediately after the leadership development program in the participating school district, as opposed to collecting the data years after a principal completes the leadership development program may vary the results. Third, this study does not take into account prior experience a principal participant has prior to becoming a principal. It is recommended that future research make a determination between support and trainings given during a leadership development program and past experiences of the participant.

Fourth, the elementary school principals participated in the qualitative portion of the study via focus group, while the middle and high school principals participated in the qualitative portion of the study via a phone interview. The researcher discovered that the elementary focus group responses were more aligned to the questions asked, while the phone interview responses tended to be random and off topic. A future study could include all focus group responses or all phone interview responses to collect qualitative responses to ensure consistency across all principal participants.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence a district leadership development program has on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in the participating school district. This sequential mixed methods study includes a quantitative portion, followed up with a qualitative phase that included interviews and a focus group. Survey responses from principal participants revealed a mostly positive attitude toward the leadership development program in the participating school district by principal participants reporting that most of the components had “medium” or “high” influence on their effectiveness as school leaders.

With the doubt that university based principal preparation programs are preparing principals for leadership roles, “grow your own” leadership development programs have become popular in some large school districts (Versland, 2013). This study strengthened the previous results found in other studies by finding which components of a district leadership development program actually influence 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals’ effectiveness as school leaders. Additionally, it provides the participating school district with qualitative responses related to their approach to preparing beginning principals for their roles as school leaders, as well as gives other school districts in the state of Texas an idea of what elementary, middle and high school principals need to feel developed and ready for their role as school leaders.

There is research that has been completed stating that university-based preparation programs may not be preparing principals for their roles and a district leadership development program may be needed to prepare principals effectively for their roles as school leaders (Black, 2011; Davis, et al., 2005; Grissom & Harrington, 2010;

MyIntyre, 2001; Stein & Gewirtzman, 2003). If school districts want to get a realistic view of what professional development activities beginning principals feel influence their effectiveness as school leaders, the researcher suggest that school districts survey principals multiple years after their 1st year of principalship, after the principals have multiple years of experience to reflect on. As part of this study, the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principal participants were able to reflect on the professional development they received prior to becoming principals, with two, three, and four years of principalship under their belts. Reflecting on the components of the leadership development program with these vast levels of experience gives the participant school district a realistic view of if the professional development beginning principals received plays a factor two, three, and four years after principals are initially trained. The components that the principal participants report influenced their effectiveness as school leaders multiple years after receiving training for those components should be expounded upon on and made the focus of principal preparation.

REFERENCES

- Ashton, B. & Duncan, H. (2012). A beginning rural principal's toolkit: A guide for success. *Rural Educator*, 34(1), 19-31.
- Avidov-Ungar, O. (2016). A model of professional development: teachers' perceptions of their professional development. *Teachers & Teaching*, 22(6), 653-669.
- Barr, J. J., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2009). How adolescent empathy and prosocial behavior change in the context of school culture: A two-year longitudinal study. *Adolescence*, 44(176), 751.
- Black, W. (2011). Who Are we? Collaborative inquiry and the description of one state's principal preparation programs. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(2), 1-17.
- Bradshaw, J., & Goldbart, J. (2013). Staff views of the importance of relationships for knowledge development: Is training by specialists a waste of money?. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 26(4), 284-298.
- Briggs, A. (2014). *School leader preparation for teacher evaluation: An examination of authentic experiences and meaningful assessment* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database (UMI 1524021457)
- Brown-Ferrigno, T. & Knoeppel, R. (2005). Training principals to ensure access to equitable learning opportunities in a high-need rural school district. *Educational Considerations*, 33(1), 9-15.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2007). Developing school leaders: Practitioner growth during an

- advanced leadership development program for principals and administrator-trained teachers. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 2(3), 1-30.
- Chirichello, M. (2004). Collective leadership: Reinventing the principalship. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 40(3), 119-123.
- Collins, J. W., & O'Brien, N. P. (Eds.). (2011). Greenwood dictionary of education (2nd ed). Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Costello, D. (2015). Challenges and supports of instructional leadership in schools. *Antistasis*, 5(1), 3-6.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). Developing successful principals. *Stanford Educational Leadership Institute*, 1(1), 1-32.
- Davis, S. H., & Leon, R. J. (2011). How not to prepare school principals. *Planning and Changing*, 42, 274-287.
- Davis, S. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Innovative principal preparation programs: What works and how we know. *Planning and Changing*, 43, 25-45.
- Della Sala, M. R., Klar, H. W., Lindle, J. C., Reese, K. L., Knoepfel, R. C., Campbell, M., & Buskey, F. C. (2013). Implementing a cross-district principal mentoring program: A human resources approach to developing a midcareer principals' leadership capacities. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 34(2).
- Duncan, H., Range, B., & Scherz, S. (2011). From professional preparation to on-the-job development: What do beginning principals need? *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 6(3), n3.
- Federici, R. A., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2012). Principal self-efficacy: Relations with burnout, job satisfaction and motivation to quit. *Social Psychology Of Education: An*

International Journal, 15(3), 295-320.

Fisher, A., & Carlyon, T. (2015). School leaders growing leadership from within: A framework for the development of school leaders. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 20(2), 93-102.

Geer, G. C., Anast-May, L., & Gurley, D. K. (2014). Interns perceptions of administrative internships: Do principals provide internship activities in areas they deem important? *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 9(1), n1.

Gentilucci, J. L., Denti, L., & Guaglianone, C. L. (2013). New principals' perspectives of their multifaceted roles. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 24, 75-85.

Gill, J. & Hendee, R (2010). Leading other into leadership. *Principal*, May/June 2010, p16-20.

Govender, K., & Dhunpath, R. (2011). Student experiences of the PhD cohort model: Working within or outside communities of practice?. *Perspectives in Education: The Changing Face of Doctoral Education in South Africa: Special Issue 3*, 29, 88-99.

Grissom, J.A., & Harrington, J.R. (2010): Investing in administrator efficacy: An examination of professional development as a tool for enhancing principal effectiveness. *American Journal of Education*, 16, 583 – 632.

Haberman, M. (1995). Selecting star teachers for children and youth in urban poverty. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(10), 777.

- Hanushek, E. A. (2009). School policy: Implications of recent research for human capital investments in South Asia and other developing countries. *Education Economics*, 17(3), 291-313.
- Hernandez, R., Roberts, M., & Velma, M. (2012). Redesigning a Principal Preparation Program: A Continuous Improvement Model. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(3), n3.
- Herrington, D. E. (2013). Leader as mentor & coach: Creating a culture of excellence and dignity. *National Forum of Educational Administration & Supervision Journal* 30(3), 50-57.
- Holyoke, L., & Larson, E. (2009). Engaging the adult learner generational mix. *Journal of Adult Education*, 38(1), 12-21.
- Huang, T., Beachum, F. D., White, G. P., Kaimal, G., FitzGerald, A. M., & Reed, P. (2012). Preparing urban school leaders: What works?. *Planning and Changing*, 43(1/2), 72.
- Jeong, Y., Young, L., Sung, P., Wong- Ratcliff, M., Ahangar, R., & Mundy, M. (2015). Discovering the needs assessment of qualified STEM teachers for the high-need schools in south Texas. *Journal of STEM Education: Innovations & Research*, 16(4), 55-60.
- Khan, P., & Iqbal, M. (2013). An analysis of principals' interventions for school effectiveness: Principals' perspectives. *Dialogue*, 8(4), 421.
- Kimball, S. M. (2011). Principals human capital managers at every school: Principals must tie school improvement strategies to their work at recruiting, selecting, developing, and retaining effective teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(7), 13.

- Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education* (Vol. 41). New York: New York Association Press.
- McAdamis, S. (2010). Central office and school leaders create a conversation. *Journal of Staff Development, 31*(3), 24-27.
- McCarthy, J., Trenga, M. E., & Weiner, B. (2005). The cohort model with graduate student learners: Faculty-student perspectives. *Adult Learning, 16*(3-4), 22.
- McIntyre, K. (2001): Training programs for principals. *Theory Into Practice, 18*(1), 28 – 32.
- McKinney, C. L., Labat Jr, M. B., & Labat, C. A. (2015). Traits possessed by principals who transform school culture in national blue ribbon schools. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 19*(1), 152.
- Mendels, P., & Mitgang, L. (2013). *Creating strong principals*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- Mestry, R., Moonsammy-Koopasammy, I., & Schmidt, M. (2013). The instructional leadership role of primary school principals. *Education as Change, 17*(sup1), S49-S64.
- Miller, W. (2013). Better principal training is key to school reform. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.
- Oxford Dictionaries (2011). Dictionary: www.oxforddictionaries.com
- Peurach, D. J., & Gumus, E. (2011). Executive leadership in school improvement networks: A conceptual framework and agenda for research. *Current Issues in Education, 14*(3).
- Reynolds, C. H., & O'Dwyer, L. M. (2009). Examining the relationships among

- emotional intelligence, coping mechanisms for stress, and leadership effectiveness for middle school principals. *Journal of School Leadership*, 18(5), 472.
- Saban, R. J. (2009). Key findings. *Catalyst for change*, 36(1), 2-6.
- Saban, J., & Wolfe, S. (2009). Mentoring principals around leadership practices. *Catalyst For Change*, 36(1), 2-6.
- Salazar, P. S. (2007). The professional development needs of rural high school principals: A seven-state study. *Rural Educator*, 28(3), 20-27.
- Smith, I. & Addison, C. (2013). The “new” school leader: Training instructional leaders for a new generation of teachers and learners. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 17(2), 135-140.
- Sparks, S. (2013). Principals lack training in shaping school climate. *Education Week*, 32(23), 8.
- Stein, S. J., & Gewirtzman, L. (2003). *Principal training on the ground*. New York, NY: Argosy Publishing.
- Szal, D., & Williams, H. (2011). Candidates’ assessment of a principal preparation program. *Education*, 131(3), 481-485.
- Taylor, R. T., Pelletier, K., Trimble, T., & Ruiz, E. (2014). Urban school district’s preparing new principals program 2008-2011: Perceptions of program completers, supervising principals, and senior level school district administrators. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 9(1), 1-13.
- Texas Education Agency. (2015). *2013-2014 Academic excellence indicator system district reports*. Retrieved from <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/>
- Tex. Educ. Code ch. 19, § 149.2001. Principal Standards. June 2014.

- Tucker, P. D., Henig, C. B., & Salmonowicz, M. J. (2005). Learning outcomes of an educational leadership cohort program. *Educational Considerations*, 32(2), 27-35.
- Turan, S., & Bektas, F. (2013). The relationship between school culture and leadership practices. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 52, 155-168.
- Turner, J. (2007). Developing executive leadership in the public sector. *Public Manager*, 36(4), 50.
- Verrett, S. L. (2012). Gender perceptions of administrative team members regarding secondary principals' leadership actions and behaviors in managing change (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations. (1542)
- Versland, T. M. (2013). Principal efficacy: Implications for rural 'grow your own' leadership programs. *Rural Educator*, 35(1), 1-10.
- Watkins, R. (2005). Dimensions of a comprehensive needs assessment. *Distance Learning*, 2, 38-40.
- Yang, J., Lee, Y., Park, S., Wong-Ratcliff, M., Ahangar, R., & Mundy, M. A. (2015). Discovering the needs assessment of qualified STEM teachers for the high-need schools in south Texas. *Journal of STEM Education: Innovations and Research*, 16(4), 55.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY COVER LETTER

APPENDIX A
SURVEY COVER LETTER

November 2015

Dear Participating School District Principal,

You are being solicited to complete the Impact and Effectiveness Survey for New School Leaders (*Principal Effectiveness Survey*). The purpose of the survey is to assess to what extent cohort support, instructional leadership, human capital, executive leadership, school culture and strategic operations influenced principal effectiveness related to school leadership.

Please try to answer all of the questions. Filling out the survey is completely voluntary, but answering each response will make the survey most useful. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete and all of your responses will be kept completely anonymous. No obvious undue risks will be endured and you can stop your participation at any time. In addition, you will not benefit directly from your participation in this study.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and your willingness to participate is directly implied if you click on the attached link and complete the survey. Your completion of the Impact and Effectiveness Survey for New School Leaders (*Principal Effectiveness Survey*) is greatly appreciated. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at (edtingle@yahoo.com). Thank You!

To complete the survey, please click on the link located in the body of the email.

Sincerely,

Eric Tingle

Doctoral Candidate, UHCL

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The purpose of this survey is to gather information to determine the effectiveness of the Leadership Development State Mandated First-Time School Leaders Induction Program. School leader induction is mandated by the Texas Education Code for School Administrators (TEC §241.15) which requires that all first-time school administrators in the state of Texas participate in a one-year leadership learning experience and be assigned a mentor.

The survey consist of four major components: 1) demographics, 2) cohort support, 3) mentor support, and 4) choice offerings. The survey is designed for quick completion so the majority of the responses solicits the ranking of your experiences. There are two open-ended questions that are based on the most or least impact on your effectiveness as a school leader. The survey should not take more than 10 minutes.

Part I - Cohort Demographics

Select all that apply:

_____ Dean/AP – Year 1 _____ Principal – Year 1 _____ Principal – Year 2

_____ Principal – Year 3 _____ Principal – Year 4

_____ ES _____ K8 (ES/MS) _____ MS _____ 6-12 (MS/HS) _____ HS

Ethnicity: ____African American ____Hispanic ____White ____Asian ____Two or More Races

Gender: ____Male ____Female

Number of years as an AP prior to participating in the leadership development program _____

Number of years as a Principal prior to participating in the leadership development program _____

Part II - Cohort Support

To what extent did the Leadership Development Monthly Cohort meeting increase your effectiveness as a school leader in the following areas: 1) Observation & Feedback, 2) Instructional Planning, 3) Data-Driven Instruction, 4) Scholar and Adult Culture, 5) Instructional Leadership: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, 6)

c) Be reflective in their practice and strive for continuous improvement										
d) View unsuccessful experiences as learning opportunities										
e) Inspire and keep staff focused on the end goals										
f) Possess strong communication skills										
g) Be willing to listen to others and create opportunities for stakeholders to provide feedback										
h) Treat all members of the community with respect through positive relationships										
Overall Ranking										
TEC Principal Standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
School Culture – 4										
a) Leverage school culture to drive improvement outcomes										
b) Establish and implement a shared vision										
c) Establish and communicate consistent expectations										
d) Focus on students' social and emotional development										
e) Treat families as key partners in supporting student learning										
Overall Ranking										
TEC Principal Standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Strategic Operations – 5										

a) Assess the current needs of the school										
b) Meet with leadership teams, regularly monitor multiple data points to evaluate progress toward goals										
c) Develop a year-long calendar and daily schedules for strategic maximizing of instructional time										
d) Deliberately allocate resources (e.g. staff time, dollars, and tools.)										
e) Treat central office staff as partners in achieving goals										
Overall Ranking										

B – Time Spent with Mentor

How many hours per month did you spend with your LD Mentor? Select only one.

_____ Zero hour per month

_____ 1 to 2 hours per month

_____ 3 to 4 hours per month

_____ 5 to 6 hours per month

_____ 7 to 8 hours per month

_____ 9 to 10 hours per month

_____ More than 10 hours per month

C – Primary method of Mentoring

Rank the primary method of interaction with your LD Mentor? One (1) represents primary method of mentoring interaction to five (5) least primary method of mentoring interaction.

_____ Face-to-face

_____ Telephone (Verbal)

c) Staff Documentation											
d) Leading Relevant Review (Knezek)											
e) Intentional Interventions (Knezek)											
f) STAAR Update											
g) A4E - Dashboard											
h) Giving & Receiving Feedback											
i) SDMC											
Overall Ranking											

1) From the Choice Courses listed above, please list the Top 2 that had the MOST Impact on your effectiveness as a school leader:

_____ Preliminary Budget Planning _____ Legal Updates _____
 Staff Documentation
 _____ Leading Relevant Review _____ Intentional Interventions _____ STAAR
 Update
 _____ A4E – Dashboard _____ Giving & Receiving Feedback _____ SDMC

Why were the courses impactful?

2) From the Choice Courses listed above, please list the Top 2 that had LEAST impact on your effectiveness as a school leader:

_____ Preliminary Budget Planning _____ Legal Updates _____
 Staff Documentation
 _____ Leading Relevant Review _____ Intentional Interventions _____ STAAR
 Update
 _____ A4E – Dashboard _____ Giving & Receiving Feedback _____ SDMC

Why were the courses NOT impactful?

Mentor's Name (Optional) _____

Mentee's Name (Optional)

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

You are being asked to participate in the research project described below. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate, or you may decide to stop your participation at any time. Should you refuse to participate in the study or should you withdraw your consent and stop participation in the study, your decision will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you may be otherwise entitled. You are being asked to read the information below carefully, and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to participate.

Title: INFLUENCE OF A DISTRICT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ON 2ND, 3RD, AND 4TH YEAR PRINCIPALS

Student Investigator(s): Eric Tingle, M.S.

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Michelle Peters, Ed.D.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study will be to determine the influence a district leadership development program has on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year principals in the participating school district.

PROCEDURES

The research procedures are as follows: Participants will participate in interviews and focus groups in order to obtain data and feedback regarding the influence of the leadership development program in the participating school district.

EXPECTED DURATION

The total anticipated time commitment will be approximately six months from October 2015 to March 2016.

RISKS OF PARTICIPATION

There are no anticipated risks associated with participation in this project.

BENEFITS TO THE SUBJECT

There is no direct benefit received from your participation in this study, but your participation will help the investigator(s) better understand the influence the leadership development program had on your effectiveness as a school leader.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS

Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of your study records. The data collected from the study will be used for educational and publication purposes, however, you will not be identified by name. For federal audit purposes, the participant's documentation for this research project will be maintained and safeguarded by the researcher (Eric Tingle) for five years after completion of the study. After that time, the participant's documentation may be destroyed.

FINANCIAL COMPENSATION

There is no financial compensation to be offered for participation in the study.

INVESTIGATOR'S RIGHT TO WITHDRAW PARTICIPANT

The investigator has the right to withdraw you from this study at any time.

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

If you have additional questions during the course of this study about the research or any related problem, you may contact the Student Researcher, Eric Tingle, at phone number 832-901-7083 or by email at edtingle@yahoo.com. The Faculty Sponsor Michelle Peters, Ph.D., may be contacted at phone number 281-283-7600 or by email at petersM@uhcl.edu.

SIGNATURES:

Your signature below acknowledges your voluntary participation in this research project. Such participation does not release the investigator(s), institution(s), sponsor(s) or granting agency(ies) from their professional and ethical responsibility to you. By signing the form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

The purpose of this study, procedures to be followed, and explanation of risks or benefits have been explained to you. You have been allowed to ask questions and your questions have been answered to your satisfaction. You have been told who to contact if you have additional questions. You have read this consent form and voluntarily agree to participate as a subject in this study. You are free to withdraw your consent at any time by contacting the Principal Investigator or Student Researcher/Faculty Sponsor. You will be given a copy of the consent form you have signed.

Subject's printed name: _____

Signature of Subject: _____

Date: _____

Using language that is understandable and appropriate, I have discussed this project and the items listed above with the subject.

Printed name and title: _____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent: _____

Date: _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON-CLEAR LAKE (UHCL) COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS HAS REVIEWED AND APPROVED THIS PROJECT. ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE UHCL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (281-283-3015). ALL RESEARCH PROJECTS THAT ARE CARRIED OUT BY INVESTIGATORS AT UHCL ARE GOVERNED BY REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. (FEDERALWIDE ASSURANCE # FWA00004068)

APPENDIX D

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

APPENDIX D

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to cohort support?
2. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to instructional leadership?
3. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to human capital?
4. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to executive leadership?
5. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to school culture?
6. To what extent did the leadership development program influence your effectiveness as a school leader related to strategic operations?
7. What factors, including the leadership development program, influenced principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as school leaders?

RÉSUMÉ

Eric D. Tingle

EDUCATION

Ed.D.	Educational Leadership University of Houston-Clear Lake, Houston, TX	2016
M.S.	Educational Management University of Houston Clear Lake, Houston, TX	2011
B.S.	Elementary Education/Coaching University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK	2005

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2013-Present	Principal Houston ISD, Houston, TX
2011-2013	Assistant Principal Houston ISD, Houston, TX
2008-2011	Math Interventionist Alief ISD, Houston, TX
2006-2008	Teacher Alief ISD, Houston, TX

CERTIFICATIONS

- Principal (EC-12), State of Texas
- Generalist (EC-4), State of Texas
- English as a Second Language Supplemental (EC-4), State of Texas