

2014

## **A Comparison Of Teacher Perceptions Of Principal Leadership Actions In Highly Effective Schools As Measured By The Audit Of Principal Effectiveness**

Michael Stephens  
*Indiana State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds>

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Stephens, Michael, "A Comparison Of Teacher Perceptions Of Principal Leadership Actions In Highly Effective Schools As Measured By The Audit Of Principal Effectiveness" (2014). *All-Inclusive List of Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1321.  
<https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds/1321>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Sycamore Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in All-Inclusive List of Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Sycamore Scholars. For more information, please contact [dana.swinford@indstate.edu](mailto:dana.swinford@indstate.edu).

## VITA

Michael Stephens

### EDUCATION

- |      |                                                                                       |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2014 | Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana<br>Ph.D. in Educational Leadership     |
| 2005 | Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana<br>Ed.S. in Educational Administration |
| 2001 | Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana<br>M.A. in Educational Leadership      |
| 1988 | Manchester College, Manchester, Indiana<br>B.S. in Psychology                         |

### PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- |                 |                                                                 |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2006 to present | Union Township Corporation<br>Assistant Superintendent          |
| 2004 – 2006     | East Porter County School Corporation<br>Curriculum Coordinator |
| 2001 – 2004     | Kankakee Valley Middle School<br>Assistant Principal            |
| 1991 – 2001     | Kankakee Valley Middle School<br>Social Studies Teacher         |



A COMPARISON OF TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP ACTIONS  
IN HIGHLY EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS AS MEASURED BY THE  
AUDIT OF PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS

---

A Dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

Michael Stephens

September 2014

Keywords: Principal, Evaluation, Leadership

UMI Number: 3680969

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3680969

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Terry McDaniel, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Todd Whitaker, Ph.D.

Professor of Educational Leadership

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Steven Disney, Ph.D.

Superintendent of Schools

River Forest Community School Corporation

## ABSTRACT

The role of the principal has never been as multi-faceted or as scrutinized as it is in today's schools. Principals are looked to for leadership and guidance in the processes, communications, relationships, instructions, and curriculum of today's schools. Marzano (2013) listed 21 responsibilities of the principal of today. Principals of today wear many hats and are looked to have knowledge and skills beyond the scope of leaders in many other professions. The purpose of the quantitative study was to examine the perceptions of the teachers in Indiana high schools pertaining to their principal's level of effectiveness as measured by the Audit of Principal Effectiveness. The results of this study can be beneficial to principals of all schools. Regardless of the grade assigned to the school, the study suggests the value of building relationships with administrative colleagues, the interaction with students, and the setting of high professional goals for all involved.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I respectfully acknowledge my colleagues and friends at the Kokomo cohort. You are a great group with whom to work. I look forward to celebrating all the progress. Additionally, I acknowledge my advisory team, Dr. Whitaker, you have been an inspiration to many, myself included. Dr. Disney, without your suggestion many years ago, I would not be on this journey. Dr. McDaniel, your matter-of-fact approach and down-to-earth advice are greatly appreciated. A special thanks to Mr. Hunter and the Union Township School team, the opportunities I have been granted are greatly appreciated. I enjoy working with all of you.

Jackson and Carter, my sons, thank you for your support and encouragement, this is all for you guys. Thank you Bon, I could not be more proud to be Dr. Stephens II. I would not and could not have done this without you.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of Study .....	4
Research Questions.....	4
Null Hypotheses.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	7
Limitations of the Study.....	9
Delimitations.....	10
Significance of the Study .....	10
Summary.....	11
REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	13
School Leadership.....	13
Indiana School Accountability.....	18
Leadership Standards and Assessments.....	20
Audit of Principal Effectiveness .....	39
Development of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness .....	40

Organizational Development .....	42
Organizational Environment.....	49
Educational Program.....	56
Summary.....	62
METHODOLOGY .....	63
Research Questions.....	64
Null Hypotheses.....	65
Design .....	67
Participants.....	67
Recruitment.....	67
Location of Study.....	68
Instrumentation and Records .....	68
Data Collection .....	68
Instrumentation .....	69
Statistical Analysis.....	69
Survey Reliability .....	70
Summary.....	70
ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS .....	71
Descriptive Data and Correlation Results.....	73
Summary of Findings.....	84
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	86
Descriptive Data and Correlation Results.....	86

Summary of Hypotheses Testing.....	86
Discussion of Findings.....	91
Summary of Study .....	96
Recommendations.....	99
REFERENCES .....	106
APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GRADING METHOD .....	122
APPENDIX B: PERMISSION TO USE HIGH SCHOOL GRADING METHOD.....	1223
APPENDIX C: APE SURVEY .....	1244
APPENDIX D: PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY .....	1277
APPENDIX E: PERMISSION TO USE VALENTINE & BOWMAN REPORT OF NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED SCHOOLS.....	1288
APPENDIX F: LETTER TO PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS .....	1299
APPENDIX G: EMAIL TO PRINCIPALS.....	13030
APPENDIX H: OVERALL SURVEY AVERAGE SCORES PER ITEM.....	1311

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Organizational Direction.....	76
Table 2. Organizational Linkage.....	77
Table 3. Organizational Procedures.....	78
Table 4. Student Relations .....	79
Table 5. Student Relations .....	80
Table 6. Interactive Process .....	81
Table 7. Affective Process .....	82
Table 8. Instructional Improvement.....	83
Table 9. Curriculum Improvement .....	84
Table 10. Comparison of Average Scores.....	97

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

It has come to be that school principals are often evaluated on a narrowing set of criteria, namely standardized test scores. The schools and principals who achieve high scores on these tests are often eligible for funding increases, grant opportunities, and public praise. On the other end of the spectrum, the schools that do not score well on standardized tests are labeled as failing or F schools, vulnerable to state takeover, and other turnaround or transformation measures. The methodology used in figuring the A-F grades for high schools in 2012-2013 in Indiana is presented in Appendix A. Permission to use the high school grading method is presented in Appendix B. In many instances, both the turnaround and the transformational measures entail the principal being replaced. Obviously, the principal has a stake in the success of his or her school. Today's school principal has changed roles over the years of public education in the United States. The evolution of school leadership and the position of principal have been summed as follows:

Yesterday's principal was often a desk-bound, disciplinarian building manager who was more concerned with the buses running on time than academic outcomes. Today's principal must concern herself with not only discipline, school safety, and building management, but also must act as an instructional leader who knows how to use research and testing data to improve teaching methods, student achievement, and classroom

management. Today's principal is a visionary leader who spends significant time working with faculty and interacting with students and rarely sees her desk. Today's principal coordinates staff development and community engagement. (Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2004, p. 1)

A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), which put it to the forefront in the 1980s, precipitated a great deal of the reform in principal accountability.

Principals and superintendents must play a crucial leadership role in developing school and community support for the reforms we propose, and school boards must provide them with the professional development and other support required to carry out their leadership role effectively. The Commission stresses the distinction between leadership skills involving persuasion, setting goals and developing community consensus behind them, and managerial and supervisory skills. Although the latter are necessary, we believe that school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved. (National Committee on Excellence in Education, 1983, para. 1)

In 1986, Valentine and Bowman developed the Audit of Principal Effectiveness (APE; Appendix C. The APE provides information about the effectiveness of principals in dealing with people both inside and outside the school setting, their ability to build a nurturing school climate, and how they serve as the educational leader of the school.

### Statement of the Problem

The Indiana Education Agenda of 2011 and Public Law 90 shared a common goal, to put students first, by concentrating on teacher improvement (Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 001, 2011). The authors of those documents obviously felt the principal was central to the

improvement of the teacher when they said, that putting students first “requires that every school in the state is led by effective principals, as these school leaders have a tremendous impact on both teacher effectiveness and student learning” (Indiana Department of Education [IDOE], 2011, p. 3). The question is, what is it that makes a principal effective? Are principals in more effective schools doing something that sets them apart from schools that are performing at a lesser rate? In order to help principals ascertain for themselves what would be seen as effective practices, Valentine (1989) conducted a study of leadership actions. The aforementioned actions are evaluated by the teachers with whom the principal works and based on this assumption, Valentine and Bowman (1989) developed the APE (Appendix C). The APE recognized the three domains of organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program as areas to measure the principal’s leadership behavior as perceived by teachers. (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). Permission to use the APE was granted by Dr. Valentine for this study (Appendix C). Studies that are more recent have continued to demonstrate a statistically significant relationship between principal leadership behavior and effective schools (Cotton, 2003, Hallinger & Heck, 2005, Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

The APE provides information about how well principals are performing in dealing with personnel inside and outside the school community, how are they building a nurturing school climate, and how they serve as the educational leader of the school. The highest scoring statements in the 1989 administration were “having high professional expectations and standards not just for themselves but also faculty and the school community.” Recognized principals know and follow the policies of the district; they are committed to instructional improvement, and effectively manage the day-to-day operation of the school. It was noted that leaders promote

feelings of confidence in the school and communicate their goals and direction for the school (Valentine, 1989).

### Purpose of Study

The purpose of this quantitative study was to compare teacher's perceptions of principal effectiveness in high schools that earned an A rating in the Indiana's A-F grading system in the school year 2012-13 compared to the teachers perceptions of principal effectiveness in high schools that earned a B through F rating in the IDOE grading rubric, which is explained in Appendix A. The evaluation of principal effectiveness was based upon teacher's reactions to the APE survey. In the original study, teachers were asked questions in three domains and nine factors. Eighty items were included in the survey. This study sought to identify behaviors perceived to be the most influential by teachers in highly effective high schools as well as those actions seen as significant in randomly selected schools. The scores generated by the two groups were compared and contrasted. This could lead to more clarity in actions that should be undertaken by the principal in today's school.

### Research Questions

This quantitative study addressed nine research questions.

1. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Direction questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
2. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Procedures questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?



3. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Linkage questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
4. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Teacher Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
5. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Student Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
6. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Interactive Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
7. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Affective Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
8. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Instructional Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
9. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Curriculum Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?

### **Null Hypotheses**

H<sub>0</sub>1: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Organizational Direction questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Organizational Linkage questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>3: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Organizational Procedures questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>4: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Teacher Relations questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>5: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Student Relations questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>6: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Interactive Processes questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>7: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Affective Processes questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>8: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Instructional Improvement questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>9: There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Curriculum Improvement questions non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

### Definition of Terms

Many of the terms used in this investigation are defined below to ensure consistent use throughout the report.

A-F school grade is the process of assigning a letter grade to a school in Indiana circa 2012-2013 utilizing scores from Indiana's standardized test results.

Affective process is the factor in which the principal expresses sensitivity and humor himself and encourages others to express their pride and loyalty (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

APE is an assessment instrument that provides the principal with teacher insight on 80 items of principal effectiveness (Valentine, 1989).

Curriculum improvement is the factor in which the promotion of and appropriately reviewed and vetted curriculum (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Educational program is the domain that provides insight into the principal as the educational leader of the school (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

High schools are, for this report, Indiana schools that house Grades 9-12 only.

Highly effective high school is, for this report, Indiana notation of an A school reflects student performance and improvement on the Algebra I and English 10 graduation exams, along with graduation rate and college and career readiness (IDOE, 2012).

Interactive process is the factor in which the effective day-by-day management of the school, including rules, procedures and tone of discipline is addressed (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Instructional improvement is the factor in which the principal effectively supervises instruction with a commitment to quality instruction (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Organizational development is the domain in which the principal works with personnel to promote growth and change (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Organizational direction is the domain that pertains to the leader collaboratively developing goals and direction (Valentine & Bowman, 1989)

Organizational environment is the domain where the principal promotes school climate through relationships and procedures (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Organizational linkage is the factor in which the school leader ties the school to the community it serves (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Organizational procedures is the factor in which the principal uses effective procedures for problem solving, decision-making, and change (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Principal evaluation system program that provides for continual improvement of instructional leadership, the meaningful differentiation of the principal's performance, uses many valid measures when determining performance levels, including student growth data. The program provides for the evaluation of principals on a regular basis and provides useful feedback that guides professional development and inform personnel decisions (U.S. Department of Education, 2013).

School principal is the leader of an educational setting that includes children in Grades K-12. The school administrator is the person in charge and has the ability to make key decisions

for the entire school. The leader also is responsible for leading the school in curricular changes, financial changes, and professional development (Marzano et al., 2005).

Student relations is the factor in which the principal develops positive relationships with students through appropriate communication skills, encouragement, support, and high visibility (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

Teacher relations is the factor described by the development of positive relationships with staff as recognized by effective communication, support and reinforcement (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

### Limitations of the Study

The following limitations are presented to acknowledge potential variables not controlled for that may have influenced the findings of this study.

1. Limited control on demographics and personal experiences may have affected survey results.
2. School size may also have influenced the results due to the number of assistant/associate principals involved in each school. If teachers have conflicted views of the actions of various members of the leadership team it may have influenced their perceptions of the school principal.
3. The schools invited to participate were graded using the current IDOE rating system for high schools. This rating only consists of measures of student performance on standardized tests, graduation rate, and the level of college and career ready measures. There are undoubtedly a myriad of other factors that could be included in a school's success.

4. The schools selected to be surveyed were chosen from the IDOE data on schools designated as high schools. Due to not having complete control of the IDOE records, the accuracy of the identification of schools and principals cannot be completely assured.

#### Delimitations

1. The survey was provided only to teachers in the state of Indiana.
2. The schools selected to be surveyed were selected based on the IDOE rating.
3. The schools invited to participate all consisted of the Grade 9-12 configuration.
4. Only data from the 2012-13 school year were used to identify the schools invited to participate, while the teachers surveyed were employed in 2013-2014.

#### Significance of the Study

Leadership is vital in the improvement process for schools. In today's educational setting of increasing accountability, principals, teachers, and all stakeholders want to take advantage of information that may benefit their institution as soon as possible. The opportunity to identify actions that have been successful in schools that have shown positive results would be of benefit to other schools. Marzano et al. (2005) stated, "An effective leader builds a culture that positively influences teachers, who, in turn, positively influence students" (p. 47). Fredericks and Brown (2003) stated, "The instructional leadership role is one that provides a crucial link between the principal's activity and the effectiveness of his or her school" (p. 11). Many studies have been conducted on principal evaluation and several have used the APE as a means of measuring performance (Davis, 1992; Giffing, 2010; Sharp, 2009; Williams, 2000).

The APE was developed in 1986 and is divided into three areas of expertise, (a) organizational development, (b) organizational environment, and (c) educational program. The

APE provides information about how well principals are doing in dealing with personnel inside and outside the school community, whether they are building a nurturing school climate, and how they serve as the educational leader of the school. The most frequently mentioned statements were, having high professional expectations and standards for themselves as well as faculty and the school community. The recognized principal knows and follows the policies of the district, is committed to instructional improvement, and effectively manages the day-to-day operation of the school. It was noted that the leader promotes a feeling of confidence in the school and communicates goals and direction for the school. (Valentine & Bowman, 1989)

The results of this study could inform examination of effective leadership actions. Further, it will help leaders distinguish between common actions of leadership and more effective behaviors that may move their school beyond the norm in terms of improvement, growth and learning. Each leader may choose to react differently in situations with varying characteristics which Hersey and Blanchard (1982) indicated is an appropriate approach to take as a leader. They stated, “It is appropriate for leaders on different occasions to use differing styles depending on the specific problem or circumstance” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 50). Information regarding what teachers perceive as the most effective practices in various situations should prove to be of value to principals as they survey a situation and decide how they will react.

### Summary

This study is organized into five chapters. In Chapter 1, the topic is examined through an introduction, purpose of study, statement of problem, research questions, definitions, and limitations. Chapter 2 entails a thorough literature review based on the evaluation of the actions of school leaders and includes a brief history of principal evaluation, current examples of

leadership standards and assessments, a view of the current state of principal assessment in the state of Indiana, and an explanation of the APE. Chapter 3 describes the research design and methodology to be used in the study, including data collection methods and its analysis. Chapters 4 and 5 present the analysis of data as well as conclusions as they pertain to the perceptions of principals as held by teachers. The resulting conclusions will point out actions that might lead to high teacher approval for the principal. The conclusions will lead to a common understanding of actions a principal may consider undertaking in order to improve teacher motivation.



## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The intent of this chapter is to provide a summary of the relevant literature pertaining to the history and evolution of school leadership, the state of Indiana's dealings with school leadership, current leadership standards and assessments, and a thorough explanation of the APE. It has been demonstrated that principals who seek to perform well on the job as well as on evaluation protocol would do well to consider an internal assessment of their performance as witnessed by the teachers with whom they work.

#### **School Leadership**

The public education system in the United States has evolved over time in response to societal changes, economic fluctuations, and governmental legislation. In spite of the changes over time, decades of school reform have not changed the general structure and function of American schools (Cuban, 1988, Kafka, 2009; Rousmaniere, 2007; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Classes continue to be organized through age-level cohorts, in many cases A-F grades are utilized as evidence of learning, and principals are still given the charge to supervise teachers and inspect educational pedagogy (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Tyack and Cuban (1995) chronicled both the organization and the reform of American schools from the mid-1800s and found that as the population of America grew, the number of students attending American schools grew as well. As the number of students in schools grew,

one room schoolhouses were replaced by grade-level classrooms determined in large part based on the age of the student. Throughout this evolution, administrative tasks in the schools increased, to include staff supervision, student discipline, curriculum development, community relations, and general management of the school resources (Rousmaniere, 2007). As school evolution continued, master teachers were sometimes asked to oversee the administration of the schools, from which the principal position was created. (Kafka, 2009; Rousmaniere, 2007).

Many of the early principals both taught and performed administrative duties, but as their administrative duties increased, their teaching time decreased.

By the 1920s, the modern school principal had been established and looked markedly similar to the position today: Principals had bureaucratic, managerial, instructional, and community responsibilities. They were expected to lead and instruct teachers, to monitor students, to communicate with the district, and to work with parents and members of the wider community. Moreover, they were seen as pivotal figures in any school reform effort. (Kafka, 2009, p. 323)

The principal role has continued to evolve as a result of many educational reforms. The Coleman Report, a notable study on student performance (Coleman et al., 1966), introduced the question of reform in American schools to the public's consciousness. This study purported a correlation existed between educational input and the student outcomes of American schools. This assumption implied that if similar resources were made available to all schools, then student performance results could be expected to be similar as well (Coleman et al., 1966).

Based on surveys conducted throughout the country, the Coleman Report concluded that the majority of students across various demographics actually had similar access to necessary resources across the United States (Coleman et al., 1966). However, a performance gap existed

in students across those same demographics. The results of the Coleman Report seemed to suggest that performance of students must be tied to factors outside of the school's purveyance (Coleman et al., 1966). This report spurred the creation of compensatory programs in education such as Title I and the Elementary Secondary Education Act that are designed to address the needs of disadvantaged students (Lezotte, 2001).

The assertion that schools had little effect on student achievement raised a reaction from many scholars who then undertook many new studies, which became the catalyst of the effective schools movement. Researchers involved in this movement set out to not only refute the assertions of the Coleman Report but also to explore examples of effective schools and examine their shared characteristics. Researchers explored the impact of school programs on student performance and concluded that school programs needed to address student performance inequities and that many effective schools shared similar programmatic characteristics (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Mace-Matluck, 1987).

The term effective school is found throughout educational literature, yet there is not agreement on a single definition for what makes a school effective. Is a school effective if they produce an inordinate number of prize-winning authors, explosive point guards, or Broadway dancers? Many researchers have identified common characteristics of effective schools that include such characteristics of strong instructional leadership of the principal, high expectations for student learning, clear goals and focused school mission, a safe and orderly environment, staff training opportunities, and an established system for monitoring student progress (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Mace-Matluck, 1987).

The leadership role of the principal emerged as a significant factor of school success as recognized in research. It was concluded that strong instructional leadership of the principal was

a main characteristic of effective schools (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Edmonds, 1979; Mace-Matluck, 1987).

In 1983, The National Commission on Excellence in Education released a letter to the American people entitled *A Nation at Risk*. This letter began

All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also progress of society itself. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 1)

Although *A Nation at Risk* did not address principals specifically, it stated, “The essential raw materials needed to reform our educational system are waiting to be mobilized through effective leadership” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 7). Teachers, students and the community view the principal as an expert instructional leader. Austin (1979) concluded, “When the teachers and other school personnel feel successful about education in their school, children also believe they can achieve and they do” (p. 41). Scholars, policy makers and the public in general all seem to agree that principals are a central figure in schools and thus face expectations to ensure improvement and performance of our schools (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992; Glasman & Heck, 1992; Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1985; Rallis & Goldring, 1993).

Through the increased scrutiny of the American public, the principal’s role has evolved, requiring principals to expand their role into the area of effective instructional leadership. Reeves (2004) clearly stated, “Leadership matters. Even when other variables, including

resources and personnel, are held constant, a single leader has an enormous impact on the entire organization” (p. xi).

Manasse (1985) gathered research on effective schools and effective principals; she presented her findings to the National Institute of Education. She identified focus areas and professional development suggestions that would support effective principal behaviors, which included the need for training principals for the complexities associated with their actual work, developing pedagogical skills to accentuate effective leadership skills, and providing formative feedback through performance appraisal systems. Asserting that that principals make a difference as instructional leaders, W. F. Smith and Andrews (1989) concluded that four trends emerged from research during the 1980s, including that the principal acts as a resource provider, an instructional resource, a communicator, and a visible presence.

Almost 20 years later, demands for school improvement remain a force. In 2001, the U.S. Department of Education once again moved accountability to the forefront by developing and implementing the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001). NCLB raised the expectations for schools and the states that oversee those schools to a higher level. The NCLB identified student demographics in various areas and instituted plans to address the learning gaps purported to be present. Across the country, state departments of education began monitoring school performance through the development of educational standards and standardized assessments.

Principals continue to be at the forefront under NCLB and their role has become more complex and demanding than ever before. Crow (2006) stated the scrutiny of the public and the increased accountability for student learning “has added to the complexity of the principal’s job, requiring principals to be entrepreneurial, to be more focused on student outcomes and instructional processes, and to be more connected with their communities” (p. 316).

Thompson and Barnes (2007) restated the assertion that “research has consistently shown that high-performing schools have principals who are effective leaders” (p. 32). According to Ginsberg and Thompson (1992), principals

oversee the learning process effectively, manage the flood of paperwork, guide staff development, meet student needs, oversee the financial and physical resources of the school, plan and innovate, manage the crises and disruptions of each day, and be everybody’s friend. (p. 60)

### **Indiana School Accountability**

The state of Indiana first responded to the call of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) in 1987 with the A+ Program put forth by then Governor Robert D. Orr and State Superintendent H. Dean Evans (Indiana Department of Education, 1987). The A+ Program first created a performance-based system of accreditation, added five days to the school year, and implied its agreement with the suggestion of the power school leadership brings when it created the Indiana Principal Leadership Academy. The A+ Program also introduced the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP) program (Gold, 1988). Indiana continued the reform effort in 1999 with Public Law 221 (House Enrolled Act No. 1750, 1999) which reworked the school accountability system that was implemented under the A+ Program, and re-aligned the state assessment system to correspond to newly-developed academic standards. Public Law 221 also created a three year School Improvement Plan for all schools, which at the time were to include financial awards and incentives. Under Public Law 221, schools were to be graded on their students’ performance and students’ improvement. Prior to the 2009-2010 school year, schools were labeled as having reached Exemplary Progress, Commendable Progress, Academic Progress, Academic Watch, or Academic Probation, based

on the results of their students' performance and improvement, . . . During the 2010 elections, Governor Mitch Daniels discussed his 2011 legislative agenda which featured the three-pronged approach to changes of educational policy which included (a) evaluation and educators' pay based on student learning, (b) to hold schools accountable for student learning while promoting local control of flexibility within the format of the schools, and (c) to provide more options for parents in selecting schools their children might attend (Office of the Governor, 2010).

In the ensuing year, the IDOE revised the accountability framework that had three goals the first of which aimed to separate the federal mandate of annual yearly progress (AYP) and state accountability (NCLB, 2001). The second change was a revision of the criteria that was used to place schools into categories of accountability based on performance and growth. Third, the plan utilized letter grades to express accountability categories. In answer to the first part of separating AYP and state accountability, a component of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 was the establishment of *Race to the Top* by the U.S. Department of Education (2013). One of the priorities of *Race to the Top* was reform of educator evaluation.

[States shall] design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teacher and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth . . . as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. (U.S. Department of Education, 2013, p. 9)

Officials at the U.S. Department of Education continue to discuss how evaluations should be used in school personnel decisions, including continued employment, professional development and compensation (Whiteman, Shi, & Plucker, 2011). The uses mentioned become particularly

applicable to the principal of a historically struggling school as three of the four turnaround models require the principal to be replaced or the school eliminated (Terry, 2010).

This all became a reality in Indiana under Senate Enrolled Act 001 (SEA 1), which is described by Cole, Ansaldo, Robinson, Whiteman, & Spradlin (2012) as requiring

- annual evaluations of all certificated employees,
- objective measures of student growth,
- rigorous measures of effectiveness,
- annual designations of each certificated employee in four rating categories,
- explanation of the evaluator's recommendation for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected, and
- A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of "effective" or "highly effective." (p.1)

In the ensuing years of implementation, it has become clear that the role of the principal will continue to change and the training of the evaluator, most often the principal, is critical. All this continues to point to the need for more appropriate teacher and principal preparation programs in higher education (Cole et al., 2012). For principals already in the field, the opportunity to learn on the job and improve their skill levels in school leadership is of the utmost concern. The use of administrative standards and comprehensive assessments are on the rise. Principals undoubtedly would benefit from identifying areas of strength and challenge before these rubrics and standards are applied to their situation.

### **Leadership Standards and Assessments**

Brown and Irby (1996) stated, "New challenges have driven educators to search for innovative and appropriate methods of evaluating professional performance" (p. 3). The Wallace



Foundation has provided considerable resources to explore effective leadership tasks that have shown effectiveness. A research group from the University of Minnesota and the University of Toronto worked with the Wallace Foundation to investigate links from leadership practice that resulted in student learning (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). Section 1.4 of that report identified the following six key findings:

1. Previous research has identified a set of core practices underlying the work of successful school and district level leaders. About 15 in total, these practices can be classified as setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the instructional program.
2. Almost all leadership practices considered instructionally helpful by principals and teachers were specific enactments of those core practices.
3. Teachers and principals were in substantial agreement about the leadership practices they considered instructionally helpful.
4. Teachers generally agreed with one another in identifying helpful leadership practices. Teachers varying widely in the sophistication of their classroom instruction nevertheless identified as helpful most of the same leadership practices.
5. School level had a small effect on the importance teachers attached to a small number of leadership practices.
6. Teachers and principals agreed that the most instructionally helpful leadership practice were: Focusing the school on goals and expectations for student achievement; keeping track of teachers' professional development needs; and creating structures and opportunities for teachers to collaborate. (as cited in Louis et al., 2010, p. 66)

The emphasis on teacher input is of particular interest to this research. The APE is a principal assessment tool that is geared toward gaining input from teachers. "Principal evaluation

works best when it is not simply imposed from above” (Peterson, 1991, p. 3). Amsterdam, Johnson, Monrad, and Tonnsen (2003) observed, “Greater involvement of stakeholders in the program evaluation process has been advocated in the evaluation literature” (p. 223). This is an important consideration because it helps the individuals who are involved feel as though they have a contributing role in the school improvement process. Anderson (1991) also supported the value of stakeholder participation, stating that in order “to develop an evaluation process that will be embraced by principals, districts must involve them in the development of the program” (p. 108). Separately, some researchers advocate the concept of involving external stakeholders as contributors to the evaluation itself. Murphy and Pimental (1996) stated, “Once they take on the role of evaluator, parents and students move from the sidelines into the heart of the learning enterprise to share responsibility for improving education” (p. 77). Further, they argued that soliciting input from teachers about principal performance “provides principals with crucial feedback, and they are paying attention as never before” (Murphy & Pimental, 1996, p. 77). Anderson (1991) stated, “Districts should also consider soliciting confidential feedback from peers and teachers” (p. 109). Anderson asserted that teachers are in particularly good position to know “whether a principal is performing satisfactorily” (p. 110), although it is important that teachers be guaranteed some degree of anonymity. Amsterdam et al. (2003) asserted that “technical accuracy of evaluative decisions is improved through the involvement of these (stakeholder) groups in determining and refining its purpose, evaluation criteria, instrumentation, and procedures for collecting information” (p. 223).

In the subsequent sections, the APE was compared and contrasted with some of the current principal standards and assessments used today. This should validate the relevance of this study as well as the need for the further research necessary to inform the leadership in our schools as viewed by those being led.

This section of Chapter 2 provides insight into ties that can be found between current leadership standards, several scales of the assessment of leadership, namely, the VAL-ED assessment (Vanderbilt Peabody College, 2001), the Marzano assessment tool (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2001), the McREL tool, and in particular to Indiana, the RISE evaluation rubric. Ties to the work put forth by Valentine and Bowman called the APE are made.

Determining the practices of effective leadership is not an easy task. Barkley, Bottoms, Feagin, & Clark (2001) stated, “Leadership promotes learning” (p. 4). Their research explored three practices that were being used effectively and discovered that effective leaders modeled learning and exhibited the behavior they want teachers to display. Effective leaders also provide compelling reasons for others to learn, which encourages high expectations of students and staff. The school leaders also created a coaching environment for continuous growth (Barkley et al, 2001).

In an attempt to identify leadership task practices and priorities, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO; 2008) revised its educational leadership policy standards. The new set of standards, called the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, listed the expectations for leadership as well as functions that define standard practice (CCSSO, 2008). ISLLC built a framework of six standards which include vision of learning, maintaining a nurturing educational environment, managing and promoting a safe atmosphere, collaboration among faculty and community for a diverse education, maintaining integrity and fairness, and being engaged in the political, social, and legal agendas. ISSLC called for the establishment of six standards, each divided into given functions of leadership.

Standard 1 called for the setting of a widely shared vision for learning. This corresponds with the domain of Organizational Development associated with the APE and more specifically the factor of Organizational Development. The APE factor Organizational Development states, “The principal envisions future goals and directions for the school, communicates to teachers the

directions the school needs to take toward growth and encourages changes that lead to a better school.” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 12) The ISSLC standard identified five functions of the leadership:

Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission; collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning; create and implement plans to achieve goals; promote continuous and sustainable improvement; and monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans. (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14)

Standard 2 of the ISSLC was to develop a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. The APE complements this through the domain of Organizational Environment that states, “The principal nurtures the on-going climate of the school through development of positive interpersonal relationship.” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 16). The ISSLC standard identified nine functions of the leadership, which were to

nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations; create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program; create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students; supervise instruction; develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress; develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff; maximize time spent on quality instruction; promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning; and monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program. (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14)

Standard 3 of the ISSLC ensured effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment in the same vein as the factor of the APE known as Interactive Processes which states, “The principal organizes tasks and personnel for the effective day-by-day management of the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 17). The ISSLC standard included five functions of leadership, which were to

monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems; obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources; promote and protect the welfare and safety of all students and staff; develop the capacity for distributed leadership; and ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning. (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14)

ISSLC standard 4 was collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. The APE factor of Teacher Relations states that, “The principal develops effective working relationships with staff through appropriate communication skills, sensitivity to needs, appropriate support and reinforcement” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 16). The APE continues with the factor of Student Relations, which says, “The principal develops effective working relationships with students through appropriate communication skills, encouragement, support and high visibility” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 17). The ISSLC standard included four functions, which were to

collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment; promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources; build and sustain positive relationships with families and

caregivers; and build and sustain productive relationships with community partners.

(CCSSO, 2008, p. 15)

Standard 5 put forth by the ISSLC was acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. The APE factor of Interactive Process most closely mirrors this area in stating, the principal is skilled in “providing appropriate information to staff and students, developing appropriate rules and procedures and setting the overall tone for discipline in the school”

(Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 17). The APE goes on to address this area in the factor of Affective Processes in stating, “The principal encourages the expression of feelings, opinions, pride and loyalty through team management, sensitivity, humor, and personal example.”

(Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 17). The ISSLC standard included five functions. Those were to

ensure a system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success; model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior; and safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity; consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making; and promote social justice and ensure that student needs inform all aspects of schooling. (CCSSO, 2008, p. 15)

ISSLC standard 6 was the understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal, and cultural contexts, which is complemented by the statements of the APE factor of Organizational Linkage, “The principal promotes positive working relationships between the school, the community the school serves and other educators and agencies which work with the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 16). The ISSLC standard included three functions.

Those were to

advocate for children, families, and caregivers; act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies. (CCSSO, 2008, p. 15)

Highly effective leaders of the 21st century must be strong in all aspects of leadership. Educational reform, no matter the focus, typically makes an impact in schools with strong leadership (Demski, 2012). A study supported by the Wallace Foundation analyzed the effectiveness of assessing school leader practices. The clearer standards should have encouraged the assessment of leaders' behaviors. Unfortunately, as noted by researchers from Vanderbilt University, the field lacks consensus regarding what should be assessed (CCSSO, 2008).

Research by the Wallace Foundation and Vanderbilt University identified two critical questions, including (a) what should school leaders be assessed for, and (b), how should they be assessed so that the process enhances their effectiveness in improving learning? (Porter et al., 2008). The Wallace Foundation study continued with the examination of the new tools that are available for principal assessment. The study described the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED), which was also funded by the Wallace Foundation. According to the VAL-ED framework there is no one evaluation model that can capture all the subtleties of the principal's role because influences like experience, composition of the student body and staff, geographic setting and the level of schooling all have a bearing on leadership quality.

The VAL-ED program identified six core components of school performance that it purports to occur in effective learning-centered schools. The six components are (a) high standards for student learning, (b) rigorous curriculum, (c) quality instruction, (d) the culture of learning and professional behavior, (e) connections to external communities, and (f) performance accountability. In further examination of the components, numerous similarities between the components of VAL-ED and the factors of the APE in that High Standards for Student Learning in VAL-ED states, "buy-

in among faculty for actions required to promote high standards of learning” (Vanderbilt Peabody College, 2011, p. 3.). However, the APE notes a very similar notion in the factor of Organization Direction when it states, “The principal encourages changes in the school program that lead to a better school for the students” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 12). The second of VAL-ED’s components, titled Rigorous Curriculum, states the principal should develop a rigorous curriculum for all students and plan challenging curricula for students at risk of failing. (Vanderbilt Peabody College, 2011, p. 3). The APE counters with the statement, “The principal promotes the diagnosis of individual and group learning needs of students and application of appropriate instruction to meet those needs.” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 15). The third component of VAL-ED is called Quality Instruction, which ties directly to the APE factor of Instructional Improvement. The fourth of VAL-ED’s components is titled Culture of Learning and Professional Behavior, which entails many parts of leadership. The VAL-ED rubric used in this component includes (a) plans, (b) creates, (c) implements, (d) encourages, (e) recognizes, (f) listens and (g) communicates. In the APE, these components are broken into the four different factors of teacher relations, student relations, the interactive process, and the affective process. The four aforementioned factors all make up the APE domain of Organizational Environment. The APE description of Organizational Environment provides insight into the ability of the principal to nurture the on-going climate of the school through development of positive interpersonal relationships among members of the organization and effective day-to-day operational procedures for the school. (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 16)

The fifth of VAL-ED’s components titled Connections to External Communities examines the principal’s ability to make robust connections in developing a plan for the school and community to collaborate around the school’s academic mission in which the school secures additional resources to enhance teaching and learning. The APE factor of Organizational Linkage states it as, “The



principal effectively promotes the school in the community. . . . The principal utilizes resources from outside the school to assist in the study, development, implementation and/or evaluation of the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 13). The sixth and final component of the VAL-ED rubric is Performance Accountability. This component refers to the principal’s ability to ensure individual and collective responsibility for the school’s learning goals. The APE concurs with the factor of Organizational Procedures, which states the principal evaluates staff, employs appropriate change strategies and utilizes a systemic process for change (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 13).

While the VAL-ED rubric takes a similar approach to principal evaluation as the APE, a difference should be noted in that the VAL-ED program is designed to be implemented by an observer from outside the school. Conversely, the APE is designed to be implemented through internal input sought from the teachers who are administered by the principal on a daily basis.

The Marzano School Leader Evaluation System was based in part on the literature put forth by the same study funded by the Wallace Foundation as the VAL-ED program. This study, entitled *Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning* involved data from nearly 9,000 teachers and more than 800 administrators (Louis et al., 2010). This study is seen as the seminal assessment of the relationship between leadership actions in schools and student achievement. Based on this research in addition to the studies of *What Works in Oklahoma Schools* (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2011), *School Leadership that Works* (Marzano et al., 2005) and *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003), 24 categories of actions to be undertaken by principals were enumerated. These 24 categories were then divided into five domains of (a) data-driven focus on student achievement, (b) continuous improvement of instruction, (c) a guaranteed and viable curriculum, (d) cooperation and collaboration, and (e) school climate. Although the five domains do not match the domains of the APE survey, the specific categories do have similarities to items of the APE survey. The following

paragraphs illustrate the ties between the Marzano School Leadership Evaluation System and Valentines' APE.

Marzano et al.'s (2005) first domain is titled "A Data-Driven Focus on Student Achievement" (p. 4). It states the actions found within this domain help to ensure the school has a clear focus on student achievement based on data. One of the specific categories follows by noting, "The school leader ensures that appropriate school-level and classroom-level programs and practices are in place to help all students meet individual achievement goals when data indicate interventions are needed" (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 4). The APE attends to the same information within the domain of Curriculum Improvement as it states, "The principal uses objective data such as test scores to make changes in curriculum and staffing" (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 16).

The second of Marzano et al.'s (2005) domains is Continuous Improvement of Instruction, which is described as teachers and the school population understanding and valuing teacher pedagogical skills as tools to enhance student learning. One of the categories sums this as, "The school leader is aware of predominant instructional practices throughout the school" (pp. 5-6). Valentine (1988) stated, "The principal is knowledgeable of the varied teaching strategies teachers might appropriately utilize during instruction" (p. 15).

Marzano et al.'s (2005) third domain is called A Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum, which focuses on assuring the curriculum is built to optimize learning for all and that all teachers follow the curriculum. Marzano et al. described this, "The school leader ensures that all students have the opportunity to learn the critical content of the curriculum" (p. 5). Valentine stated the same idea: "The principal promotes the diagnosis of individual and group learning needs of students and application of appropriate instruction to meet those needs" (Valentine 1988, p. 15).

The fourth of Marzano et al.'s (2005) domains is titled Cooperation and Collaboration, which incorporates several ideas of engaging teachers and staff in decision making and helping to ensure

they are operating as a cohesive unit. This is put forth in the statements of “the school leader ensures that teachers have opportunities to observe and discuss effective teaching” (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 5), and Marzano et al. continued, “The school leader ensures that teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives” (p. 5). The APE addresses this in the domain of Organizational Environment, which entails the areas of teacher relations, affective processes and interactive processes. One statement from the factor of Affective Process states, “The principal works with other leaders of the school in the implementation of a team approach to managing the school” (Valentine, 1988, p. 15).

The final domain in the Marzano system is School Climate, which addresses ensuring all stakeholders perceive the school as a positive, well-functioning place. The APE addresses this perception when it states, “Faculty is encouraged to be sensitive to the needs of others. Humor is used to improve school climate. The principal helps teachers develop a sense of pride and loyalty in the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 14). The commonalities between the Marzano School Leadership Evaluation System and the APE give credence to the notion of using the data from a teacher driven review of principal actions in order to aid the principal in reaching the innovating realm of the Marzano Evaluation system.

The next evaluation system that will be tied to the APE is the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Principal Evaluation System (Williams, Cameron, & Davis, 2009). The McREL system included the work of Portin et al. (2009) who utilized interviews with educators in 21 schools. Portin et al. (2009) identified seven leadership needs that make up the descriptors of the McREL Principal Evaluation System, including (a) instruction, (b) culture, (c) management, (d) human resources, (e) strategy, (f) external development and (g) micro politics. McRE researchers, Williams et al. (2009), included 69 previous studies in a meta-analytic research study. Three findings came from this meta-analysis. The first is that leadership matters. The

researchers found that principal leadership had a correlation of 0.25 on student achievement. The second finding was the identification of 21 leadership responsibilities they purport as being statistically significant relationships with student achievement. The 21 responsibilities also strongly align with the seven areas identified by Portin et al (2009). The final finding was principal leadership has a differential impact of student achievement. This means that even if a principal is viewed as a strong leader, it may not lead to higher student achievement if the areas of the principal's strength do not correspond to the needs of his or her staff and/or students. Another possible complication appears when a strong principal misjudges the implications of change, which may cause inconsistent implementation and unintended results. Through this research, the McREL Principal Evaluation System came into being (Williams et al., 2009). The first of the seven standards of the McREL system is strategic leadership, which has substandards for (a) school vision, (b) mission and strategic goals, (c) leading change, (d) school improvement plan, and (e) distributed leadership. The second standard is instructional leadership, which contains substandards of (a) focus on learning and teaching, (b) curriculum, (d) instruction, (e) assessment, and (f) focus on instructional time. The third standard is cultural leadership, which entails (a) focus on collaborative work environment, (b) school culture and identity, and (c) the attitude of acknowledging failures (d) celebrates accomplishments and rewards. The fourth of McREL's standards is human resource leadership. This is made up of substandards (a) professional development, (b) recruiting, (c) hiring, (d) placing and (e) mentoring of staff and teacher evaluation. The next standard is titled managerial leadership. This is built from the substandards (a) school resources and budget, (b) conflict management and resolution, (c) systematic communication, and (d) expectations for students and staff. The sixth standard is the external development of leadership. This is explained by the substandards of addressing parent and community involvement and outreach, as well as being aware of and following federal, state and district mandates. The seventh and final standard of the McREL

system is titled micro-political leadership. This standard contains but one substandard, which is titled school executive micro-political leadership.

The seven standards and their respective substandards will be examined in the context of how each is tied to the APE. By comparing the two school leader protocol models, I sought to solidify the use of the APE as a relevant tool for this study. Principals may use the APE with their staffs to help the principal be recognized as a distinguished leader under the McREL Principal Evaluation System

Facing the deadlines involved in the *Race to the Top* (U.S. Department of Education, 2013), Indiana was one of the states that drew from the ISLLC standards to build a system of evaluation for principals (CCSSO, 2008). The Indiana developed system was titled RISE (IDOE, 2011). RISE evaluation for principals includes a rubric as well as goals developed by the principal with input from the evaluator. The goals are called Student Learning Objectives. The Student Learning Objectives are to be based on measurable student driven data in conjunction with the final performance of the principal's school as measured with the results of standardized tests and published as the Indiana A-F grading system circa 2012. The RISE program rubric examines the principal's actions and activities in two large domains entitled teacher effectiveness and leadership actions. Under each of these domains are subheadings titled competencies. Each competency is further divided into areas identified worthy of review. The domain of teacher effectiveness encompasses the competencies of human capital management, instructional leadership, and leading indicators of student learning. The second major heading is leadership actions comprised of the competencies of personal behavior, building relationships, and culture of achievement.

The IDOE (2011) rubric descriptors of highly effective principals line up with the statements of the APE in each competency. The competency of Human Capital Manager has its

first subheading of Hiring and Retention, which states a highly effective principal “demonstrates the ability to increase the entirety or significant majority of teachers’ effectiveness as evidenced by gains in student achievement and teacher evaluation results” (IDOE, 2011, p. 5).

The APE that states a similar sentiment is “The principal employs new staff who enhances the overall effectiveness of the school and complement the existing staff” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1). The APE goes on to complement the RISE statement, “The principal has effective techniques for helping ineffective teachers” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3). The second area of competency in the RISE evaluation tool is titled Evaluation of Teachers, which is described as “monitoring the use of time and/or evaluation procedures to consistently improve the evaluation process” (IDOE, 2011, p. 5), and the APE states, “The principal actively and regularly participates in the observations and assessments of classroom instruction, including teaching strategies and student learning” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3). The third competency under Human Capital Manager is professional development, which is described as “frequently creating learning opportunities in which highly effective teachers support their peers” (IDOE, 2011, p. 5). The APE (1988) states, “The principal works with other leaders of the school in the implementation of a team approach to managing the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3). The RISE evaluation tool addresses the area of Leadership and Talent Development by “recognizing and celebrating emerging leaders” (IDOE, 2011, p. 5). The APE states the same idea as, “When deserving, teachers are complimented by the principal in a sincere and honest manner” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 2). The fifth portion of Human Capital Manager under the RISE evaluation is titled Delegation. Delegation is described by the exemplar, “encouraging and supporting staff members to seek out responsibilities” (IDOE, 2011, p. 6). The APE asserts, “The principal gives teachers the support they need to be effective”

(Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 2). The sixth realm of evaluation with RISE is Strategic Assignment, which states the principal, “leveraging teacher effectiveness to further generate student success by assigning teachers and staff to professional learning communities or other teams that complement individual strengths and minimize weaknesses” (IDOE, 2011, p. 7). This is compared to the APE statement, “The principal utilizes a systematic process for change that is known and understood by the faculty” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 2). The final area of assessment for Human Capital Manager under RISE is Addressing Teachers who are in Need of Improvement or are Ineffective. This area is described as “staying in frequent communication with teachers on remediation plans to ensure necessary support” (IDOE, 2011, p. 7). The APE counters with “Through discussion with teachers about concerns and problems that affect the school, the principal involves teachers in the decision-making process” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1).

Indiana RISE’s second competency is Instructional Leadership. This competency is made up of the subcategories of Mission and Vision, Classroom Observations, and Teacher Collaboration. Mission and Vision describes the highly effective principal as “frequently revisiting and discussing the vision and/or mission to ensure appropriateness and rigor” (IDOE, 2011, p. 8). The APE restates this as “The principal assists the faculty in developing an understanding of, and support for, the beliefs and attitudes that form the basis of the educational value system of the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1). The APE continues with “The principal provides for the identification of, and the reaching of consensus on, the educational goals of the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1). The second sub-competency under Instructional Leadership is classroom observations. The RISE document describes this as, “monitoring the impact of feedback provided to teachers” (IDOE, 2011, p. 8). The APE concurs

by stating, “The principal possesses instructional observation skills that provide the basis for accurate assessment of the teaching process in the classroom” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3). The final sub-competency in this area of assessment is Teacher Collaboration. According to RISE the highly effective principal spends time, “tracking best collaborative practices to solve specific challenges” (IDOE, 2011, p. 8). The APE uses two statements to address this sub-competency. The first states, “The principal is able to organize activities, tasks, and people” and continues, “during meetings, the principal involves persons in the discussion who might otherwise not participate” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, pp. 2-3).

The third competency of the Teacher Effectiveness domain is Leading Indicators of Student Learning. This is made up of three sub-competencies. Planning and Developing Student Learning Objectives, Rigorous Student Learning Objectives, and Instructional Time. The Planning and Developing Student Learning Objectives is described with the statement, “communicating with community members, parents, and other stakeholders the purpose and progress toward student learning goals” (IDOE, 2011, p. 9). The APE backs that statement by saying, “The principal develops plans for the cooperation and involvement of the community, individuals, and agencies of the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1). The second sub-competency goes hand-in-hand with the first as it states that the principal is proficient at, “establishing an on-going culture of looking at data and progress towards student learning goals involving all staff members in the school regularly meeting to talk about data and instructional practices” (IDOE, 2011, p. 9). The APE states, “The principal uses objective data such as test scores to make changes in curriculum and staffing” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3).

The second domain of the RISE assessment is titled Leadership Actions. The RISE rubric (IDOE, 2011) includes three areas of inspection under this domain, which are modeling of



personal behavior that sets the tone for the school, the “building of relationships to keep all stakeholders working together effectively,” and “developing a school wide culture of achievement that matches the school’s vision.”

The first sub-competency under personal behavior is professionalism. RISE describes the highly effective principal as one who “articulates and communicates appropriate behavior to all stakeholders, including parents and community” (IDOE, 2011, p.10). The APE states, “Through effective management of the day-to-day operation of the school, the principal promotes among staff, parents, and community a feeling of confidence in the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3). The second sub-competency is time management, which is described as, “identifying and consistently prioritizing activities with the highest leverage on student achievement” (IDOE, 2011, p. 10). The APE concurs, “The principal promotes the diagnosis of individual and group learning needs of student and application of appropriate instruction to meet those needs” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3). The third sub-competency of Personal Behavior is using feedback to improve student performance. Under this sub-competency a highly effective principal would excel at “establishing ‘feedback loops’ in which those who provide feedback are kept informed of actions taken based on that feedback” (IDOE, 2011, p.10). The final sub-competency is Initiative and Persistence. Under this sub-competency a principal is evaluated on how well he or she, “engages with key stakeholders at the district and state level, and within the local community to create solutions to the school’s most significant obstacles to student achievement” (IDOE, 2011, p. 11). The APE states, “The principal utilizes resources from outside the school to assist in the study, development, implementation, and/or evaluation of the school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1).

The second competency under the domain of Leadership Actions is building relationships. This competency is made up of the three sub-competencies of culture of urgency, communication, and forging consensus for change and improvement. The culture of urgency is shown by, “ensuring the culture of urgency is sustainable by celebrating progress while maintaining a focus on continued improvement” (IDOE, 2011, p. 11). The APE concurs in stating, “The principal communicates to teachers the directions the school’s programs need to take for growth” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1). The second competency is communication. The competency of communication is summarized by stating the principal should, “interact with a variety of stakeholders, including students, families, community groups, central office, teachers associations, etc.” (IDOE, 2011, p. 12). The APE mirrors this, saying, “The principal understands and analyzes the political aspects of education and effectively interacts with various communities, e.g. local, state, national, and/or various subcultures with the local community” (Valentine, 1988, p. 1). The final competency of building relationships is forging consensus for change and improvement. The RISE assessment summarizes this saying, the principal, “guides other through change and addresses resistance to that change” (IDOE, 2011, p. 12). The APE mimics this, “The principal encourages changes in school programs that lead to a better school for students” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 1).

The final of the competencies under Leadership Actions is the competency of setting the culture of achievement. This contains the sub-competencies of high expectations, academic rigor and data usage in teams. High expectations is defined as, the principal “encourages a culture in which students are able to clearly articulate their diverse personal academic goals” (IDOE, 2011, p. 13). The APE states it as “the principal envisions future goals and directions for the school” and continues to include the student perspective by saying, “the principal encourages student

leadership” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, pp. 1-2). The second of the sub-competencies of the RISE document under the culture of achievement is academic rigor. Academic rigor is exemplified by stating the principal, “creates ambitious academic goals and priorities that are accepted as fixed and immovable” (IDOE, 2011, p. 13). The APE concurs with the statement, “The principal promotes the development of educational goals and objectives that reflect societal needs and trends” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3). The final sub-competency is data usage in teams. This sub-competency is described as, “monitoring the use of data in formulating action plans to identify areas where additional data is needed” (IDOE, 2011, p. 13). The APE continues to state, “The principal has a systematic process for program review and change” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 3).

As was demonstrated for the ISLLC standards, VAL-ED’s Assessment of Leadership, the Marzano School Leader Evaluation System, and the McREL Principal Evaluation System, exemplary performance on the APE would likely equate to a positive showing on the Indiana RISE assessment rubric. The APE is designed to be a tool to aid the principal to self-assess and build capacity, which would undoubtedly help that principal be a more successful leader who is then positioned to receive positive feedback on any of the evaluation systems mentioned in this paper.

#### Audit of Principal Effectiveness

A skill assessment instrument completed by teachers is a valuable tool for the principal. The principal needs tools to gather data about personal skills, accomplishment of school goals, parent attitudes, student needs, etc. With the advent of accountability through outcome-based measures, the assessment of personal administrative skills becomes more essential. (Valentine, 1989, p. 7)

The difference to be noted is the APE is based on teacher insights and the others are based on the observations of outside evaluators. Valentine (1989) stated that a skill assessment of the principal that is compelled by teachers is a valuable tool. Valentine (1989) reported results for all levels of schools. In the original study by Valentine and Bowman (1988), the three questions that received the most positive responses were from three different factors of that study. One was selected from the Organizational Linkage factor, “The principal is supportive of, and operates within, the policies of the district” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 21) and one from the Organizational Direction factor, “The principal has high professional expectations and standards for self, faculty, and school” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 21). The third was selected from the Instructional Improvement factor, “The principal is committed to instructional improvement” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 24). The principal whose evaluation comes via an outside observer may benefit from receiving the insight of those with whom they work on a daily basis, namely teachers.

Having shown numerous ties to the ISLLC standards, the VAL-ED, Marzano, McREL, and RISE evaluation systems, it becomes obvious that positive outcomes on the APE would greatly enhance the scoring of a school leader on the illustrated assessments as well as addressing accepted standards of leadership. In working within today’s complex school, strategic insight from people within the building about a principal’s skill offers great insight. The 80-item APE is a proven, valid, and reliable instrument that is easily available to principals for their use.

### **Development of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness**

The APE was developed during the years 1982 through 1986 (Valentine, 1989). Over this time, the federal Department of Education recognized 1,500 schools for their exemplary

work in the areas of leadership, order and discipline, community support, and high standards and expectations for all students (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). The APE was developed using the literature and research on principal effectiveness as a background. Originally, the surveys included 162 items divided between two forms and were descriptive of 12 factors. The two documents containing 81 items each were mailed to 3,660 teachers across the country. The feedback on this initial use of the APE led to the two forms being shortened to 55 items each, which were used for the years of 1985 and 1986. The reported feedback said this was still too time-consuming so the APE was reevaluated by another random sample of 3,300 teachers. This second iteration became the currently used format of 80 questions on one document divided into the three domains of skill and nine associated factors. This instrument includes the domains of organizational development containing the factors of organizational direction, linkage, and procedures; organizational environment containing the factors of teacher and student relations, and interactive and affective processes; and the educational program containing the factors of instructional and curricular improvement (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

In its current state, The APE has been used in multiple studies and assessments. The instrument has been tested and withstood critical review. Gall, Gall, & Borg (2005) stated that the creation of an absolutely reliable instrument is not possible. Sources of error will be present and cannot be eliminated. Correlation coefficients range from -1.00 to 1.00 with numerical values approaching 1.00 being more reliable. For research levels, Gall et al. (2005) stated, “A measure is considered reliable for most research and practical purposes if its reliability coefficient is .80 or higher, and in Cronbach’s alpha, a value of .70 or higher is usually sufficient” (p. 140). Valentine and Bowman (1986) stated that the APE has total instrument

reliability of .9698, very close to 1.00; thus, based on Gall et al.'s (2005) information, the APE is a reliable instrument to be used for research.

Within the next sections, the APE's domains and factors are explained and tied to research. These in addition to the ties shown to several other major assessment tools and standards further solidify the value of a school leader considering the results of the APE survey when setting individual goals and undertaking school initiatives.

### Organizational Development

The domain of organizational development considers the level to which the principal works with personnel to promote growth and change (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). The domain includes the factors of organizational direction, linkage, and procedures. The principal's Organizational Direction entails providing direction through working with the staff and faculty to develop common goals, establishing high levels of expectation and to promote appropriate change where it is needed. Barth (1981) stated, "The professional growth of teachers appears to be closely related to relationships within schools, between teacher and principal, and teacher and teacher" (p. 147). Within the factor of Organizational Linkage, the principal builds positive relationships between the school, the community it serves, and other educational agencies that affect the school. The factor of Organizational Procedure refers to the principal's ability to utilize effective problem-solving procedures, the process of decision-making, and promoting change. When considering change, the principal is aided by the ability to anticipate the reaction to change and be prepared to address the next situation. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) suggested the school principals are the most influential individuals in any school as they are responsible for overall supervision, tone, climate, professionalism, and morale.

Factor: Organizational direction. The principal works with the faculty to provide direction for the school through developing goals, establishing expectations, and promoting appropriate change (Valentine & Bowman, 1989, pp. 4-5). The factor of organizational direction hinges on goals, expectations and change. Principals who score well in organizational change will have a keen sense of direction for their school, be able to articulate that in a manner that the teachers and staff can see value in the changes necessary in order to move in that direction, and be the appropriate change agent that can help them along the path. According to the CCSSO (2008), “an educational leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth” (p. 14). The leader “organizes the environment to hold staff accountable” (Cheney, Davis, Garrett, & Holleran, 2010, p. 155). Dwyer (1984) examined the principal’s day-to-day routine and determined that the most common reasoning for a principal’s actions was the supposition the action would work in the particular situation. In a school setting, an effective leader will deal with many different challenges and consider a variety of factors in a school setting. Dwyer’s study pointed out the most important ability of the leader is “the recognition of the diversity of approaches to successful instructional management” (p. 37). Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (2001) emphasized this ability by stating, “the multiplicity of role demands requires today’s educational administrator to be an adaptive leader . . . [with] the ability to vary his leader behavior appropriately in differing situations” (p. 79).

The explanation of Organizational Direction includes the importance of working with faculty in order to develop school goals. Bennis (2003) along with Hallinger and Heck (2005) agreed that leaders cannot lead by themselves. A successful instructional leader needs substantial participation of other educators in a collaborative effort to lead the school toward a

shared vision. This conclusion also supported much of DuFour's (1991) and DuFour and Eaker's (1998) work on learning communities and more recent work on principal evaluation by Catano and Stronge (2007). In order for schools to reach desired levels of performance, the effective principal must begin with high expectations. Whitaker (2012) suggested that effective leaders focus on the behaviors that lead to success, not the beliefs that challenge it. The high achieving principal incorporates community members and other partner groups into the establishment to support high academic and behavior expectations. A high achieving principal also creates systems and approaches to monitor the level of academic and behavior expectations. Principals build a culture in which students can clearly articulate their diverse personal academic goals.

The principal has high expectations for self, faculty, and school and helps the faculty develop the same level of expectations. The principal envisions future goals and directions for the school, communicates to teachers the directions the school needs to take toward growth and encourages changes that lead to a better school. The principal helps the faculty develop and reach consensus on the goals of the school. (Valentine & Bowman, 1986, p. 2)

Leaders monitor and measure progress toward the school's vision and/or mission, frequently revisiting and discussing the vision and/or mission to ensure appropriateness of the goals. They continue to cultivate ownership of vision and/or mission within the school and help to spread this to other stakeholder groups. Leaders know that change is difficult, yet highly successful school leaders embrace change and show initiative and persistence in pursuing it. According to Steiner, Hassel, & Hassel (2008), "leaders concentrate on a few changes to achieve early, visible wins. They do this to achieve success in an important area, motivate others for further change, and



reduce resistance by those who oppose change.” (p. 6). The foresighted principal can guide others through change and help them address resistance to that change. They also monitor the success of various strategies and revise the course of action based on strengths and weaknesses. The most effective school leaders build a culture of urgency within the building. The pervasive belief expressed by the authors of the Common Core State Standards stated,

All, not just some students should be on a pathway to college and career readiness. Such a pathway has never been more critical to students for their personal success, their economic success, and their success as citizens in a representative democracy. (Achieve, College Summit, National Association of Secondary School Principals, and National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2013, p. 3)

The most effective school leader ensures this culture of urgency is sustainable by celebrating progress while maintaining a focus on continued improvement.

Factor: Organizational linkage. The school leader ties the school to the community it serves (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). “Effective principals are good at scanning the school environment and identifying what their constituencies really expect them to do” (Duke & Iwanicki, 1992, p. 31). The term linkage pertains to all aspects of this factor as the principal is the link between their school and several other entities. The principal ties the school to the community they serve and is looked to as a spokesperson and someone who will be the contact person in all instances. The principal is also the link between the school and its educational colleagues, other schools, the central office, and the state department of education. The principal is often looked to as the source of insight into the mandates and demands placed on a school as a result of educational legislation. Finally, principals are looked to as the filter for all of this linkage as they are to take in information, decipher it, and then put it out to their staff in a clear

manner so that their staff is able to concentrate on its role in education. Strength of a principal who scores well in this area is the ability to identify partners and reaching out to them. Evidence continues to build that when schools, families, and community groups work together to support learning, children tend to perform, remain enrolled, and like school more (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2002). An effective leader is able to gauge his followers and then adjust the manner of leadership in order to best address each situation. Lambert (2003) asserted, “We must enlarge the circle of community to be more inclusive than in the past if we are to develop reciprocal partnerships with parents and members of the broader community” (p. 68). This can lead to empowering situations where “Parents who participate in conversations about schooling develop a broad perspective that enables them to honor their own values, remain vigilant regarding their own children, and advocate for and help create successful schools for all” (Lambert, 2003, p. 69).

Dwyer (1984) observed and interviewed 42 principals from small, large, urban, and rural schools about instructional leadership. These schools all had similar elements that helped them be successful. Principals relied on their beliefs and experiences, community input, and their desired goals and vision in order to manage the school climate in the structure of the organization to provide successful student outcomes. Dwyer (1984) stated,

These principals assessed their environments, knew their limitations and strengths, and understood the kinds of programs and outcomes they desired for students. They not only saw themselves as pivotal points around which these elements turned, but they believed in their abilities to influence each of those parts. They directed their energies toward improving the social climate of their schools and the quality of the instructional organization. (p. 16)

Because schools are social meeting places, it becomes incumbent on the principal to be a master relationship builder.

Just as the culture of the classroom is the sum of the teacher's attitudes and expectations, so too, the school culture is a result of the staff's collective thoughts, beliefs, expectations and conversations that lead directly to both individual and group behaviors. (Achieve, 2013, p. 10)

Factor: Organizational procedures. The principal utilizes effective procedures for problem solving, decision-making, and change (Valentine & Bowman, 1986). Although one would not wish to put all of the school improvement eggs in one leadership basket, any discussion of strategies to promote school level reform that establishes accountability and improves educational outcomes must include the role of the principal as a key element. (Heck & Marcoulides, 1992, p. 133)

The principal who scores well in organizational procedures employs effective procedures for problem solving. These principals anticipate the potential outcomes of the decisions they make and they look to support their teachers as decisions are made in the best interest of their school. These principals are looked to for fair and effective evaluation of the staff. Reeves (2006) suggested,

Leaders recruit, hire, and retain proficient and exemplary teachers. In their efforts to retain proficient and exemplary teachers, leaders focus on evidence, research, and classroom realities faced by teachers. They link professional practice with student achievement to demonstrate the cause and effect relationship. (p. 16)

Liu and Johnson (2006) surmised the manner in which a teacher may affect their job satisfaction and retention and Darling-Hammond, LaPoint, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007)

reported on the impact school leaders have on teaching quality. They reported the number one reason for teachers' decisions about whether to stay in a school is the quality of administrative support. The principal fosters this feeling of support in the school. Principals monitor the effectiveness of their system and the approach that they use to recruit and hire teachers. Effective principals leverage personal characteristics of the teachers they hire to accentuate the school's vision. "An educational leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth" (School Leadership Briefing, 2013, para. 2). "The leader has developed a system of job embedded professional development that differentiates training based on teaching needs, which help retain proficient and highly exemplary staff" (Leadership and Learning Center, 2011a, p. 16). The evaluation of teachers becomes one of the skills a highly effective principal masters. Effective principals do not shy away from difficult conversations and provide targeted feedback to staff on problem areas. They deliver fair and accurate feedback in a way that maximizes the chance of improvement, fosters a "we're on the same team" feeling, and counsels or removes low performers. (Achievement First, n.d., p. 3). The efficient principal monitors the use of time and evaluation procedures by consistently improving the evaluation process.

Leadership and talent development sets many good leaders apart from great leaders. Cheney et al. (2010) stated that the "leader provides formal and informal leadership opportunities for others and encourages them to exercise appropriate authority in the areas for which they are held accountable" (p. 155). The most effective principals encourage and support teacher leaders as well as their career progression, moreover, they recognize and celebrate emerging leaders. Strong leaders demonstrate the ability to increase their teachers' effectiveness as evidenced by

improvement in teacher evaluation results. While stressful, one of the most important portions of a principal's assignment is addressing teachers who are in need of improvement or ineffective. The effective principal "courageously engages in difficult conversations with below-proficient teachers, helping them improve" (Marshall, 2011, p. 5). The highly effective principal further communicates with teachers on remediation plans to ensure necessary support is in place and tracks those plans in order to inform future decisions about the effectiveness of certain supports.

### Organizational Environment

The domain of organizational environment assesses the ability of the principal to nurture the climate of the school through development of positive interpersonal relationships. The most effective school leaders are strong communicators. The Leadership and Learning Center (2011a) summed it with

leaders in education understand communication as a two way street. They seek to listen and learn from students, staff, and community. They recognize individuals for good work and maintain high visibility at school and in the community. Regular communications to staff and community keep all stakeholders engaged in the work of the school. (p. 14)

This principal employs effective day-to-day procedures while running the school (Valentine & Bowman, 1986). The factors under organizational environment are (a) teacher relations, (b) student relations, (c) interactive processes, and (d) affective processes. The organizational environment is constantly changing and is determined more by the direction and strength of prevailing forces that affect learning than by brick and mortar considerations. The U.S. Department of Education (2013) defined a highly effective principal as a leader whose students in each subgroup achieve high rates of growth. The U.S. Department of Education

defined high rates as the equivalent of one and one half years of growth. According to a report from Marzano et al. (2005), principal and teacher effectiveness accounts for nearly 60% of a school's impact on student achievement. "These are the most important in-school factors driving school success, with principals accounting for 25% and teachers 33% of a school's total impact on achievement" (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 2). Effective leadership is undoubtedly a contributing factor to this success. Zepeda (2007) said,

The standard for accountability has put tremendous stress on school system personnel, especially the principal, who now is held ultimately accountable for student achievement. Increased accountability has resulted in the principal assuming a greater degree of responsibility for student achievement than in the past. (p. 6)

Truly effective leadership not only refers to the leaders, but is also reflected in the environment they create as well as the followers that are drawn to them. Gruenert (2005) stated that a positive, collaborative school culture increased student achievement. Because of the number of variables present, Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (1996) argued that successful leaders adapt to actions in response to each situation and the needs of the people involved. Hersey et al. (1996) further stated, "The effectiveness of any leader is tied to the followers' characterization of the leader's motive for action" (p. 112). It seems obvious that effective schools do not just occur. Effective schools, where learning occurs, are borne out of a culture built by the leaders of the school. Hord (2004) explained the schools should have an "unwavering commitment to student learning that is consistently articulated and referenced in the staff's work" (p. 7). Gruenert's (2005) reported that collaborative cultures improve student achievement by observing, "according to the results from this study, collaborative cultures seem to be the best setting for student achievement" (p. 50).

Culture influences all aspects of the school, including what teachers talk about in the lounge (Kottler, 1997), how the staff dresses (Peterson & Deal, 1998), how the teachers decorate the halls, and their willingness to change (Hargreaves, 1997). Principals are not the only source of leadership and because of this, they must undertake actions that build a positive culture and engender all stakeholders as leaders. Many, including the teachers, observe all the actions and reactions, as well as the procedures and practices of the principal. In today's schools, delegation has become a powerful idea. The sharing of ideas and placing teachers in strategic assignments support the work of an effective principal. Effective school leaders go beyond simply encouraging and supporting staff members in seeking out opportunities; they provide training that aids staff in its ability to manage tasks and responsibilities. An effective principal "promotes others as a reward for development or as a developmental opportunity" (Steiner et al., 2008, p. 24). As Whitaker (2012) asserted, "it is never about programs, it is always about people" (p. 7). The best of school leaders will leverage teacher effectiveness to further generate student success by assigning teachers and staff to teams that complement individual strengths and minimize weaknesses.

Organizational environment refers to the internal environment of an organization that influences work behavior. The behavior of an organization is determined by its own norms, traditions, morals, and values. . If improved performance is desired, it is imperative the organizational environment be optimized. In a study of successful schools, researchers reported that the most effective principals were skilled in providing a structured environment in which teachers could function effectively and where they felt, appreciated and regarded for their effort (Levine & Stark, 1982).

Factor: Teacher relations. Success in teacher relations is signaled by the development of positive relationships with staff as evidenced by effective communication, support, and reinforcement of appropriate relations (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). Principals who are proficient in the area of teacher relations are perceptive to the needs of their teachers, they support the teacher's efforts and compliment them when things go well in their classroom. The teachers who work with this principal feel comfortable suggesting ideas for improvement. This principal is sincerely interested in what the teacher has to say, thus giving the teacher a voice in the direction of the school. Elmore (2000) believed that schools need to move toward this more distributive leadership model. "Distributed leadership, then, means multiple sources of guidance and direction, following the contours of expertise in an organization, made coherent through a common culture" (Elmore, 2000, p. 15).

This view of leadership stresses the creation of a common culture and working toward a common goal or vision in order to improve the instruction. Elmore (2005) stressed how important collaboration is in the pursuit of academic excellence. DuFour (1991) and DuFour and Eaker (1998) found that in some very productive schools, collaborative teams of teachers work and learn together to improve student learning outcomes. DuFour focused on high performing collaborative teams and presented six characteristics of a professional learning community, including (a) a shared mission, vision and goals, (b) collective inquiry, (c) collaborative teams, (d) experimentation, (e) improvement, and (f) maintaining a results oriented attitude. The principal helps to establish the value of this interactive process in the school. Principals must be willing to share the praise for the success just as they are willing to share in the responsibility of leadership with their staff. Newman and Wehlage, (1995) asserted that when teachers work together to pursue a shared purpose, they undoubtedly take on a collective responsibility for



student learning. When things are not going as well as all would like in the classroom, the principal is competent in diagnosing the problem and understands the complexity of the educator's job. The principal is willing to listen to suggestions and when making a mistake, are not too proud to admit it. Austin (1979) stated, "When the teachers and other school personnel feel successful about education in their school, children also believe they can achieve and they do" (p. 14). Thus, it is the charge of the principal to leave teachers, students and their community filled a feeling of confidence.

**Factor: Student relations.** Principals who attend to student relations develop positive relationships with students through appropriate communication skills, encouragement, support, and being highly visible (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). This principal takes time to interact with students in a meaningful way, she or he encourages the students to share in the leadership of their school and the responsibility that role entails. Corbett (1990) opined that students may influence school policies by participating in the decision-making process and providing their input. An effective principal obviously enjoys working with students and demonstrates it through positive reinforcement. Kojimoto (1987) surveyed students and found that when students described the perfect principal, they showed a preference for the principal who tried to learn about them and build relationships with them. The students preferred face-to-face informal discussions with their principal and gave high marks to the principal who took time to project a concerned demeanor. Students emphasized the value of the principal as a counselor and enjoyed principals being approachable. Ruder (2006) observed that the "lack of approachability leads to distrust, fear, and the ultimate deterioration of a trusting relationship" (p. 40) and that "a principal's visibility assures students that there is someone in charge, someone to whom they can go if they are experiencing difficulty, someone they can trust" (p. 41). School leaders monitor the success

of the various communication approaches they institute in order to identify their most appropriate channel of communicating with their students in specific situations.

Factor: Interactive process. The principal facilitates the effective day-by-day management of the school, including rules, procedures and tone of discipline (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). Barth (1981) stated, “The professional growth of teachers appears to be closely related to relationships within schools, between teacher and principal, and teacher and teacher” (p. 128). The school leader keeps teachers informed about the aspects of the school that affects them. This school leader develops and implements systems and mechanisms that generate feedback and advice from students, teachers, parents, community members, and other stakeholders to improve student performance. The leader also establishes situations in which those who provide feedback are kept in the loop of actions taken by the principal in response to that feedback. Bennis (2003) argued that leaders create and communicate a vision. As a result, people are often drawn to visionary leaders. Principals well versed in the skills needed to communicate information to the staff in a clear manner are strong organizers of both people and tasks. As a result, people around them know what is expected of them. The strong interactive process leader sets the tone for the building, discipline, and behavior all while making sure students and staff know why rules and procedures are in place.

Factor: Affective processes. The principal encourages the expression of feelings, opinions, pride, and loyalty through team management, sensitivity, humor, and personal example (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). This principal is seen as a team player who is sensitive to the needs of the staff, helps that staff stay involved, and allows all to have a role in the success of the school. This success is shared and the principal is willing to then share personal ties to the school that further the pride and loyalty of the entire team. This principal is simply fun to work

with and the use of humor is appropriate and sets a congenial tone. The principal may employ humor as a way to help teachers and staff members feel that the school is a more congenial place. Hurren (2006) found that the more a principal laughs with their teachers, the better the school becomes as a place to teach and learn. As a socially public person, the personal behavior of the principal has become a highly observed area for the leaders of our schools. The most effective school leader uses their position in the community as a positive. Principals know they are in the public eye and use this as a teachable moment. Principals behave in the manner they would want their staff and students to behave. In the realm of today's educational environment, ethical leadership cannot be separated from technical leadership. "Technical expertise without a moral compass is inadequate for the task, as is a moral compass without technical expertise" (Starratt, 2005, p. 4). Nor can ethical behaviors be easily isolated from one's general conduct. Rebore (2001) asserted, "In humans, conduct does not merely occur, but emanates from the totality of the person" (p. 5).

A major factor in the success of school leaders is their ability to build relationships. "Any model for leading and managing people is only as effective as its foundation, and the foundation of any leadership effort requires the mastery of and the ability to demonstrate a specific set of basic interpersonal skills" (R. M. Smith, Montello, & White, 1992, p. 242). "Accomplished educational leaders model professional, ethical behavior and expect it from others" (National Board for Professional Teacher Standards [NBPTS], 2010, p. 5). The strongest school leaders articulate and communicate appropriate behavior to all stakeholders including parents and the community. They create mechanisms, systems, and/or incentives to motivate students and colleagues to display professional, ethical and respectful behavior at all times. Leaders willingly use feedback to improve student performance. "The leader actively engages in

‘active listening’ with the faculty and staff. The leader’s calendar reflects numerous individual and group meetings with staff at every level” (Leadership and Learning Center, 2011a, p. 14).

### Educational Program

The domain of Educational Program provides insight into the ability of principals to serve as educational leaders of school through active participation in instructional leadership and curricular improvement. Principals have a definite effect on a school’s productivity. They appear to exhibit this influence in great deal through instructional leadership (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982). Other than school safety, the most important item a school is charged with is student learning.

Leaders in education make student learning their top priority. They direct energy and resources toward data analysis for instructional improvement, development and implementation of quality standards based curricula and evaluate, mentor, and provide feedback to staff on instructional delivery. (Leadership and Learning Center, 2011b, p. 7)

Sullivan and Glanz (2006) argued that an effective instructional leader needs to do three things: including support their teachers through providing proper resources, emphasize the importance of academics through high expectations and standards, and work with their teachers through instructional conferences, and professional reflection.

Hallinger and Heck (2005) examined research conducted during the past two decades when suggesting the principal’s role in instructional leadership. They concluded that instructional leaders (a) create a shared vision, (b) express high expectations, (c) guide the staff through continuous improvement, (d) monitor the taught curriculum, (e) provide resources for continued staff development, and (f) are visible examples of the schools goals. This aligns with much of the general leadership research. (Bennis, 2003; Bennis & Goldsmith, 2003; Bolman &

Deal, 2003; Northouse, 2007). The most effective school leaders monitor the impact of implemented learning opportunities on student achievement, and efficiently and creatively orchestrate professional learning opportunities in order to maximize time and resources dedicated to learning opportunities.

Factor: Instructional improvement. “The principal influences positively the instructional skills present in the school through clinical supervision, knowledge of effective schooling, and commitment to quality instruction.” (Valentine & Bowman, 1986, p. 3). The principal effectively supervises instruction with a commitment to quality instruction and through the pursuit of academic achievement, must ensure a high level of academic rigor. Cheney et al. (2010) suggested, “Leader [sic] uses time and provides focus, coherence, and synthesis to maximize learning opportunities” (p. 154). The highly effective school leader creates systems to monitor the progress towards rigorous academic goals, ensuring wins are celebrated when goals are met and new goals reflect achievements. In order to track goals, and set the new ones, leaders must track and utilize student data. Jerald (2006) asserted the effective principal utilizes data

when teachers and administrators examine data as part of the school improvement process, school improvement teams become more efficient and effective, decision making becomes more collaborative, teachers develop more positive attitudes about their own and their students’ abilities, and educators begin to feel more in charge of their own destinies. (p. 2)

Principals at highly productive schools ensure that data used as a basis for decision making is transparent and communicated to all stakeholders, and formulates action plans to identify areas where additional data is needed. Tomlinson (1999) explained that teachers need to

differentiate instruction and learning in the classroom and how leaders can effectively introduce these strategies. Leaders for responsive, personalized, or differentiated classrooms focus much of their professional energy on two fronts, including what it means to teach individual learners effectively and how to extend the number of classrooms in which that sort of teaching becomes the norm.

“Accomplished principals ensure that teaching and learning are the primary focus of the organization. As stewards of learning, these principals lead the implementation of a rigorous, relevant, and balanced curriculum” (NBPTS, 2010, p. 13). Elmore (2000) asserted,

Successful leaders have an explicit theory of what good instructional practice looks like. They model their own learning and theories of learning in their work, work publicly on the improvement of their own practice, and engage others in powerful discourse about good instruction. (p. 3)

Marzano et al. (2005) performed a meta-analysis of 69 school leadership studies conducted between 1970 and 2005. The study computed the correlation between the leadership behavior of the principal and the academic achievement of students to be .25. Highly effective principals had a moderate influence upon student achievement. The strongest principals had the greatest impact, increasing student achievement. The study identified 21 factors of the school leader. Marzano et al. called these factors general responsibilities. Ten of these factors were related to instructional leadership based on previous definitions (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Bossert et al., 1982; Bridges, 1982; Dimmock & Walker, 2005; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). The instructional leadership factors that correlate with student academic achievement include (a) develop communication, (b) school culture, (c) focus, (d) ideals/beliefs, (e) involvement in curriculum, (f) instruction and assessment, (g) knowledge of

curriculum, (h) monitor, (i) evaluate, and (j) develop relationships, resources, and visibility. The study suggests the importance instructional leadership (Marzano et al., 2005; Sullivan & Glanz, 2006).

School leaders are asked to spend more time in classrooms today than ever before and classroom observations have become a daily routine for effective principals. The instructional leader “spends at least two to three hours a day in classrooms conducting walk-throughs, informal and formal class observations, focuses instruction and school culture” (Achievement First, 2012, p. 6). Jenkins (2009) stated that instructional leaders need to know what is going on in the classroom, for without this knowledge they would be unable to appreciate the situations teachers and students face. The school leader creates systems and schedules to ensure all teachers understand the principal’s observation of the classroom is an absolute priority.

DuFour and Eaker’s (1998) research findings significantly affected instructional leadership. Before their study, principal instructional leadership focused on the principal becoming an expert resource for teachers (Andrews & Soder, 1987; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). Elmore (2000) built upon DuFour’s (1991) theory of professional learning communities in his research. Elmore focused on Hallinger’s and Murphy’s (1987) dimension of curriculum and instruction to improve instruction and the role of the leader. Sullivan and Glanz (2006) examined how the actions and activities of an effective instructional leader improve student learning. Many of these actions are based upon the Marzano et al.’s (2005) research as well as the work done by Cotton (2003). Cotton identified 26 best practice leadership principal behaviors that lead to improved student achievement. Most of these 26 behaviors are ways in which the principal supports teachers instructionally as they make an effort to improve student learning (Cotton, 2003). Because of the movement toward a system-wide review of the principal

as leader, professional development has become one of the more obvious means of measuring principal effectiveness. In addition to spending more time in classrooms and providing direct feedback to teachers, the highly effective school leader has built time into the school calendar for teacher collaboration. A goal for principals is that they get “teams to take ownership for using data and student work to drive constant refinement of teaching” (Marshall, 2011, p. 3). The most positive school leader monitors collaborative efforts to ensure a focus on student learning as they track best collaborative practices to solve specific challenges, all of which can be generalized while holding the collaborating teams accountable for their results.

DuFour and Eaker (1998) believe that principals play a key role in creating the conditions that enable schools to become professional learning communities. Schools should become a place in which faculty members share the decision-making process. A shared vision includes faculty members rather than excluding them through a top down process. Professional development trains the staff and teachers to work collaboratively on teams in order to improve student learning. The principal models behavior that is consistent with the vision and values shared by the school.

DuFour and Eaker (1998) asserted that principals must guide schools as they move toward becoming professional learning communities while communicating the importance of the mission and values on a daily basis. Principals create structures in which teachers can be collaborative. Teachers are encouraged to be leaders as principal’s trust and believe in the teacher’s ability to guide collaborative teams. Finally, principals must believe that continuous improvement requires continuous learning (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). For professional learning communities to be successful, DuFour and Eaker (1998) argued that professional staff development programs need to be in place. Professional development needs to be sustained over



a considerable period as it provides coaching to master new skills that result in reflection and dialogue. Last, professional development fosters individual and organizational renewal.

Factor: Curriculum improvement. “The principal promotes an articulated, outcome-based curriculum through diagnosis of student needs and systematic program review and change” (Valentine & Bowman, 1988, p. 16). Sorenson, Goldsmith, Mendez, and Maxwell (2011) discussed the curricular expectations of the principal as follows:

Principals must establish curricular expectations based on personal content knowledge, an understanding of instruction, instructional strategies and activities, and an awareness of how to properly evaluate curriculum design. Content knowledge includes research methods, data analysis, and skill mastery . . . the evaluative piece of curriculum leadership relates to the principal being cognizant of differing assessment tools such as diagnostic, placement, formative, summative, and accreditation (p. 51)

Elmore (2000) asserted that the principal “should manage the conditions of learning so as to produce a given result” (p. 9). In order for this model to be successful, a principal needs to have a vast knowledge and understanding of curriculum and assessment. Elmore stated how important this role is for the principal by asserting that

somewhere on the list, one usually finds a reference to instruction, couched in strategically vague language, to include both those who are genuinely knowledgeable about and interested in instruction and those who regard it as a distraction from the main work of administration. However, why not focus leadership on instructional improvement and define everything else as instrumental to it? The skills and knowledge that matter in leadership, under this definition, are those that can be connected to, or lead

directly to, the improvement of instruction and student performance. Standards-based reform forces this question. (p. 14)

Elmore was one of the most recent educational researchers to argue this point. In an ideal world, all principals would be experts in their field, but in reality, school principals need to advocate for collaboration so the expert teachers can share their wisdom with others (DuFour, 1991; DuFour & Eaker, 1998).

The principal seen as a strong curricular leader develops educational goals. Sorenson et al. (2011) stated, “Curricular leadership demands high principal expectations” (p. 51). The attainment of goals are treated as if principals medical doctors. The principal diagnoses learning needs of the students, administers programming based on those diagnoses, and then reviews the results of that programming using objective statistics and data. The principal continues in this manner in order to help others see the process and implement it across the entire curricular program. Glathorn (2000) suggested there are many types of curricula, and the principal should work with teachers in order to align the written, supported, and assessed curricula.

### **Summary**

The information in this chapter presents the history of the principal’s position, the evolution of the job over time, and the current parameters within which principals work in the state of Indiana. The chapter also explores contemporary standards and as well as assessment tools currently in use. Examination of the ties between those standards/assessments and the APE were also presented. Finally, this chapter delved into the APE tool itself in an effort to relate its domains and factors to other research and to the daily work of the principal.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses research methodology including the null hypotheses, data sources, population of the study, the data collection process, and the instrument used. The purpose of this quantitative study sought to compare teacher's perceptions of principal effectiveness in high schools that earned an A rating in the Indiana's A-F grading system in the school year 2012-13 compared to the teachers perceptions of principal effectiveness in randomly selected schools that earned a B through F rating.

The evaluation of principal effectiveness was based upon teacher's reactions to the APE survey. In Valentine and Bowman's (1989) study, 80 items were included in the survey. The APE provides information about the effectiveness of principals in dealing with people both inside and outside the school setting, the ability to build a nurturing school climate, and how the principal serves as the educational leader of the school. This tool divided and subdivided the assessment of the school principal into three domains and nine factors.

The first of the three domains is organizational development, which has the factors of organizational direction, linkage, and procedures. The second domain is organizational environment, which holds factors of teacher and student relations, as well as interactive and affective processes. Finally, the third domain is educational program which encompasses the factors of instructional and curriculum improvement.

My study sought to define behaviors viewed to be the most influential as judged by teachers in highly effective high schools that can be undertaken by the principal in today's school setting. The design involved the following:

- The population surveyed encompassed high school (Grades 9-12) teachers from all appropriate schools in Indiana.
- Two hundred forty six high schools (Grades 9-12) were included in the population.
- The APE results were used to generate data; each complete response to the survey was included in the data set.

### **Research Questions**

This quantitative study addressed nine research questions.

1. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Direction questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
2. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Procedures questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
3. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Linkage questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
4. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Teacher Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?

5. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Student Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
6. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Interactive Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
7. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Affective Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
8. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Instructional Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?
9. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Curriculum Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?

### **Null Hypotheses**

H<sub>0</sub>1. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Organizational Direction” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>0</sub>2. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Organizational Linkage” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>03</sub>. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Organizational Procedures” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>04</sub>. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Teacher Relations” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>05</sub>. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Student Relations” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>06</sub>. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Interactive Processes” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>07</sub>. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Affective Processes” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>08</sub>. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the “Instructional Improvement” questions in non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

H<sub>09</sub>. There are no statistically significant differences between the scores obtained on the Curriculum Improvement questions non-A high schools in Indiana and the scores obtained on the same survey in recognized A or highly effective high schools in Indiana.

## Design

Creswell (2003) stated, “A survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (p. 153). Although it is recognized that all research has possible flaws, “those shortcomings are made clearer in survey research than in other social research methods, thereby permitting more considered evaluations of their implications” (Babbie, 1990, p.40). The use of a quantitative information means the information is independent of other data and the subjects remain anonymous. In this study, the data collected to determine teachers’ perceptions of principals was collected through a survey; and there was no face-to-face interaction with the individual teachers participating in the study.

## Participants

For the purposes of this study, a high school was defined as a Grade 9-12 school. There were a total of 119 high schools in the state of Indiana with this grade configuration that were identified as an A school by the Department of Education in the 2012-2013 school year. Sixty-nine schools were named B schools, 43 were named C schools, 12 were named D schools, and three were labeled as F schools. The schools included represented traditional public, charter, and private high schools. An email was sent to the superintendent and the principal responsible for each of the high schools identified requesting their endorsement of their teacher’s participation in this survey (Appendix E). Principals then forwarded the survey information to their teachers.

## Recruitment

A list of all high schools (Grades 9-12) in Indiana that received a school grade in 2012-2013 was obtained from the IDOE database. An email containing the Qualtrics survey link was then sent to principals enabling them to participate in the survey. All teachers were asked to

participate in this study to help assess the teacher perspectives of the principal's actions with whom they work.

### **Location of Study**

All research was conducted using the Qualtrics on-line survey program. The link to the survey was attached to the email. The potential participants accessed the on-line survey via the link in the email.

### **Instrumentation and Records**

The APE (Appendix C) was the tool from which data were collected in this study. The principals' email addresses were obtained through the IDOE. Principals received an email requesting their participation in this study (Appendix F). The email contained a cover letter explaining the study and a link to the Qualtrics survey. Teachers who participated were forwarded the survey link by their principal, thus signaling the principal's approval of participation. Each respondent was asked to respond to the survey one time only. The survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete.

### **Data Collection**

1. All 246 schools identified as high schools were included in the population.
2. A list of principals of high schools was obtained from the Indiana Department of Education's website.
3. Principals and their superintendents were contacted (Appendix F) and asked to provide a list of their teacher's email addresses in their school or directly forward the survey information to the teachers in their school. Teachers were asked to participate in the study by completing the survey. An email was sent to each principal, the body of this email consisted of a letter explaining the study and a link to an on-line survey.



By advancing to the second page of the survey, the participant acknowledged their consent to participate in the study. If the participant chose not to participate at any time, they simply closed out of the survey.

4. Approximately three weeks after the initial email of the survey to the teachers, a follow-up email was sent to the same email addresses encouraging them to participate by completing the survey on-line. (Appendix F)

### Instrumentation

The APE was used for teachers to give input on the actions undertaken by their principal. The APE was developed in 1984 by Valentine and Bowman (1986). After much testing and analysis, the revised instrument, finalized in 1986, consists of 80 items, which provides the principal with teacher insights on the principal's level of effectiveness. Teacher perceptions were sought within three domains and nine factors. The three domains are Organizational Development (27 items), Organizational Environment (37 items), and Educational Program (15 items). The factors under Organizational Development consist of Organizational Direction (7 items), Organizational Linkage (11 items), and Organizational Procedures (9 items). Under the heading Organizational Environment are the factors Teacher Relations (13 items), Student Relations (8 items), Interactive Processes (9 items), and Affective Processes (7 items). Tied to the domain of Educational Program are the factors Instructional Improvement (8 items) and Curriculum Improvement (7 items). Permission was granted by Dr. Valentine to use the APE survey when seeking data from the teachers of Indiana high schools (Appendix D).

### Statistical Analysis

The study on teacher's perception of principal actions relied on statistical analysis of results of the APE. The APE contains 80 items and each item is rated from 1 for not effective to

9 for highly effective; thus, a high score indicates a more positive view of the effectiveness of the principal on that area. All completed APE instruments were used to derive the means and standard deviations of all scores. For  $H_01-H_09$ , the significance of group differences was tested using the  $t$  test for independent means for each hypothesis at the .01 level of confidence. The use of the  $t$  test corresponded with the statistical analysis used to examine the original data derived in the 1987 (Valentine & Bowman, 1987).

### Survey Reliability

The APE was developed from 1982 through 1986, after which the instrument was refined, statistically analyzed, used in research and school systems, and eventually shortened in order to provide a practical instrument for principals' use (Valentine & Bowman, 1986). Since 1986, the survey has been used in numerous research studies and in hundreds of schools across the country. The currently version of the APE was tested on a random sampling of 3,300 teachers in all geographic areas of the country. Valentine and Bowman (1986) reported a total instrument reliability of .9698 score on Cronbach's alpha.

### Summary

The methods employed in this survey were intended to provide quantitative feedback about the research questions. As such, it was possible to identify principals' practices noted by teachers that were perceived to be most productive, and then the practices of the principals of the identified A schools were compared and contrasted to results that were obtained from the survey of the B through F schools.

## CHAPTER 4

### ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this quantitative study was to compare Indiana teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in high schools that earned an A rating in Indiana's A-F grading system during the 2012-13 school year to the teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in high schools that earned a B through F rating. The evaluation of principal effectiveness was based upon teacher's reactions to the APE survey. The APE recognized nine factors (a) organizational direction, (b) organizational linkage, (c) organizational procedures, (d) teacher relations, (e) student relations, (f) interactive processes, (g) affective processes, (h) instructional improvement, and (i) curriculum improvement—as areas to focus on in the measurement of a principal's leadership behavior as perceived by teachers (Valentine & Bowman, 1989). The APE provides information about how effective principals are in dealing with personnel inside and outside the school community, how well they are building a nurturing school climate, and how well they serve as the educational leader of the school.

Descriptive statistical analyses of the data were performed and the resulting means and standard deviations for each of the continuous variables were recorded. Two sample *t* tests were performed to test the nine null hypotheses. A summary of the procedures of this quantitative study included

1. All schools included in the survey were identified as high schools by the Indiana Department of Education.
2. The principals and their respective superintendents were sent an email explaining the survey and the purpose of the research. After the prescribed time, a follow up email was sent to the principals of the high schools. The principals then forwarded the link to the online survey to their teachers. To protect participants' anonymity no attempt was made to ascertain what principals actually forwarded the survey and no attempt was made to determine the number of teachers from any particular school who responded.
3. Two hundred forty-four teachers responded. All identified schools were sorted according to the grade issued by the IDOE for 2012-2013. During the 2012-2013 school year, there were 119 high schools identified as A schools and 126 schools that made up the B through F group. The schools were grouped as A schools and B through F schools (158 respondents from A schools and 86 respondents from B through F schools).
4. The APE was offered to all willing participants. The APE is divided into 9 domains, The APE domain question areas are Organizational Direction, seven items; Organizational Linkage, 11 items; Organizational Procedures, nine items; Teacher Relations, 13 items; Student Relations, eight items; Interactive Process, 10 items; Affective Process, seven items; Instructional Improvement, eight items; and Curricular Improvement, seven items.
5. All nine sets of data were entered into Excel software, which was used to conduct statistical, analyzes.

6. *F* test: two-sample for variance were performed to assure unequal variances.
7. *T* test: two-sample assuming unequal variances were performed on each set of data derived from the results of the APE domain question areas (Organizational Direction, Organizational Linkage, Organizational Procedures, Teacher Relations, Student Relations, Interactive Process, Affective Process, Instructional Improvement, Curricular Improvement). Comparing the responses from teachers who identified themselves as teaching in an A rated school as contrasted with teachers who identified themselves as teaching in a B- through F-rated school. A *p* value of .01 was used in order to further avoid Type I Error.

This chapter presents an analysis of the data and results of this study and is organized into three sections that include descriptive data and correlation results, findings and analysis of the hypotheses, and a summary of findings.

### **Descriptive Data and Correlation Results**

Two hundred forty-four teachers responded to the APE survey. One hundred fifty-eight of the responses originated from A-rated high schools and 86 from B- through F-rated high schools. The number of responses in each domain of the APE varied because of the number of survey questions that were utilized to assess each domain and the response rate varied in each domain. The study examined the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Direction questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Organizational Direction, there were 1,674 responses to the questions in this domain. This number is derived from the number of questions contained in each domain and the number of

- respondents who reacted to the survey. One thousand and eighty-four of the responses came from A-rated schools and 590 from B- through F-rated schools.
2. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Linkage questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Organizational Linkage, there were 2,585 responses. One thousand six hundred sixty-three of the responses came from A-rated schools and 922 from B- through F-rated schools.
  3. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Procedures questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Organizational Procedures, there were 1,960 responses. One thousand two hundred seventy-six of the responses came from A-rated schools and 684 from B- through F-rated schools.
  4. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Teacher Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Teacher Relations, there were 2,796 responses. One thousand eight hundred thirty of the responses came from A-rated schools and 966 from B- through F-rated schools.
  5. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Student Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Student Relations, there were 1,707 responses. One thousand one hundred twenty-one of the responses came from A-rated schools and 586 from B- through F-rated schools.

6. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Interactive Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Interactive Processes, there were 1,923 responses. One thousand two hundred sixty-one of the responses came from A-rated schools and 662 from B- through F-rated schools.
7. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Affective Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Affective Processes, there were 1,447 responses. Nine hundred sixty-six of the responses came from A-rated schools and 481 from B- through F-rated schools.
8. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Instructional Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Instructional Improvement, there were 1,615 responses. One thousand and eighty-six of the responses came from A-rated schools and 529 from B- through F-rated schools.
9. Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Curriculum Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking? In the domain of Curriculum Improvement, there were 1,407 responses. Nine hundred thirty-two of the responses came from A-rated schools and 475 from B- through F-rated schools.

The data obtained from the online administration of the APE survey was entered into Excel spreadsheets to examine the descriptive statistics. Means and standard deviations for the data tied to the nine factors included in the APE were analyzed.

A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teacher's perceptions of their principal's leadership in the domain of Organizational Direction in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. There was no significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.21$ ,  $SD = 2.02$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.37$ ,  $SD = 1.68$ ) conditions,  $t(1,404) = 1.82$ ,  $p = 0.069$ , as presented in Table 1. These results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teacher's perceptions of leadership in the domain of Organizational Direction.

Table 1

*Organizational Direction*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	7.20	7.37
Variance	4.07	2.83
Observations	1,084.0	590.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	0.00
<i>df</i>	1,404.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-1.82	
$P(T \leq t)$ one-tail	0.03	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
$P(T \leq t)$ two-tail	0.07	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	



A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Organizational Linkage in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. There was not a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.03$ ,  $SD = 2.04$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.13$ ,  $SD = 1.66$ ) conditions;  $t(2,237) = 1.45$ ,  $p = 0.146$  as presented in Table 2. These results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Organizational Linkage.

Table 2

*Organizational Linkage*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	7.03	7.13
Variance	4.15	2.75
Observations	1,663.00	922.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	2,237.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-1.45	
$P(T \leq t)$ one-tail	0.07	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
$P(T \leq t)$ two-tail	0.15	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Organizational Procedure in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. There was a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M$

= 6.93,  $SD = 2.25$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.25$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ) conditions;  $t(1745) = 4.167$ ,  $p < 0.01$  as reflected in Table 3. These results suggest the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Organizational Procedure.

Specifically, the results suggest that teachers in B- through F-rated schools felt their principals are more adept in the Organizational Procedure domain actions than the teachers at A-rated schools rate their principals.

Table 3

*Organizational Procedures*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	6.67	7.07
Variance	5.75	3.28
Observations	1,276.00	684.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	1,745.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-4.17	
<i>P</i> ( $T < = t$ ) one-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
<i>P</i> ( $T < = t$ ) two-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

A two-sample *t* test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Teacher Relations in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. There was a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.93$ ,

$SD = 2.25$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.25$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ) conditions;  $t(2,356) = 4.167$ ,  $p < 0.01$  as reflected in Table 4. These results suggest the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Teacher Relations. Specifically, the results suggest that teachers in B- through F-rated schools felt their principals were more adept in the Teacher Relations domain than the teachers at A-rated schools who rated their principals.

Table 4

*Student Relations*

T test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	6.93	7.25
Variance	5.05	3.27
Observations	1,830.00	966.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	2,356.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-4.18	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) two-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

A two-sample *t* test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Student Relations in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. The study suggests there is not a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.25$ ,  $SD = 2.07$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.44$ ,  $SD = 1.58$ ) conditions;

$t(1483) = 2.09, p = 0.036$  as reflected in Table 5. These results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Student Relations.

Table 5

*Student Relations*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	7.25	7.44
Variance	4.29	2.50
Observations	1,121.00	586.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	1,483.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-2.09	
<i>P</i> ( $T < = t$ ) one-tail	0.02	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
<i>P</i> ( $T < = t$ ) two-tail	0.04	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

A two-sample *t* test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Interactive Process in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. There was a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.01, SD = 2.13$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.37, SD = 1.59$ ) conditions;  $t(1,701) = 4.152, p < 0.01$  as reflected in Table 6. These results suggested the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Interactive Process. Specifically, the

results suggested that teachers in B- through F-rated schools felt their principals were more adept in the Interactive Process domain than the teachers at A-rated schools who rated their principals.

Table 6

*Interactive Process*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	7.01	7.37
Variance	4.52	2.52
Observations	1,261.00	662.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	1,701.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-4.15	
<i>P</i> ( $T < = t$ ) one-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
<i>P</i> ( $T < = t$ ) two-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

A two-sample *t* test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Affective Process in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. There was not a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.84$ ,  $SD = 2.19$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.05$ ,  $SD = 1.75$ ) conditions;  $t(1,167) = 1.97$ ,  $p = 0.049$  as reflected in Table 7. These results suggested the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Affective Process.

Table 7

*Affective Process*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	6.84	7.05
Variance	4.79	3.06
Observations	966.00	481.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	1,167.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-1.97	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.02	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) two-tail	0.05	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

A two-sample *t* test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Instructional Improvement in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. There was a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.93$ ,  $SD = 2.18$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.22$ ,  $SD = 1.75$ ) conditions;  $t(1,272) = 2.84$ ,  $p < 0.01$  as reflected in Table 8. These results suggested the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Instructional Improvement. Specifically, the results suggested that teachers in B- through F-rated high schools felt their principals were more adept in the Instructional Improvement domain than the teachers at A-rated schools who rated their principals.

Table 8

*Instructional Improvement*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	6.93	7.22
Variance	4.75	3.07
Observations	1,086.00	529.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	1,272.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-2.84	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) two-tail	0.00	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

A two-sample *t* test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Curriculum Improvement in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools. See Table 9 above. There was not a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.91$ ,  $SD = 2.12$ ) and B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.01$ ,  $SD = 1.75$ ) conditions;  $t(1,127) = 0.99$ ,  $p = 0.324$  as reflected in Table 9. These results suggested the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Curriculum Improvement.

Table 9

*Curriculum Improvement*

<i>T</i> test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	A-rated Schools	B- through F-rated Schools
Mean	6.91	7.01
Variance	4.51	3.08
Observations	932.00	475.00
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0.00	
<i>df</i>	1,127.00	
<i>t</i> Stat	-0.99	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) one-tail	0.16	
<i>t</i> Critical one-tail	2.33	
<i>P</i> ( $T \leq t$ ) two-tail	0.32	
<i>t</i> Critical two-tail	2.58	

**Summary of Findings**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to compare teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in high schools which earned an A rating in the Indiana's A-F grading system in the school year 2012-13 compared to the teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in randomly selected schools that earned a B through F-rating. The evaluation of principal effectiveness was based upon teachers' reactions to the APE survey. In the original study, teachers were asked questions in three domains and nine factors. A total of 80 items were included in the survey. This study has shed light on behaviors viewed to be the most influential



as judged by teachers in A-rated high schools as well as those actions seen as significant in B- through F-rated high schools. The two groups were contrasted. This has led to more clarity in actions that are advisable to the principal in today's school.

Nine *t* tests were performed; one on each set of data derived from the comparison of the reactions of teachers in A-rated high schools in Indiana with those from B- through F-rated high schools in Indiana as they were identified for the 2012-2013 school year. The results of these analyses indicated a significant difference between the perceptions of the two groups of teachers for the domains of Organizational Procedures, Teacher Relations, Interactive Processes, and Instructional Improvement. The results of the analyses suggested the teachers in B- through F-rated high schools perceive the actions of their principals as even more favorable in these areas than those of the perceptions of the principals of A-rated high schools as rated by their teachers. The domains of Organizational Direction, Organizational Linkage, Student Relations, Affective Processes and Curriculum Improvement showed no significant differences when comparing the teachers' perceptions of their principals' actions in the A-rated high schools as compared to B- through F-rated high schools. The average scores in all nine domains were found to be higher in the BF rated high schools than those of the A rated schools.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section presents a summary of the research study. The second section contains a discussion of findings including a summary of the descriptive data and correlation results, as well as a summary of the hypotheses testing. The third section looks at the implications of teachers' perceptions of principals' actions in Indiana's A-rated high schools as well as those in B- through F-rated high schools. The final section of this chapter offers suggestions for the application of the results in today's school setting as well as research recommendations for future studies.

#### **Descriptive Data and Correlation Results**

Two hundred forty-four teachers responded to the APE survey. One hundred fifty-eight of the responses originated from A-rated high schools and 86 from B- through F-rated high schools. The number of responses in each domain of the APE varied because of the number of questions used to assess each domain and the response rate varied in each domain.

#### **Summary of Hypotheses Testing**

1. The first research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Direction questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample *t* test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals'

- leadership in the domain of Organizational Direction in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 1). There was no statistically significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.21, SD = 2.02$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.37, SD = 1.68$ ) conditions  $t(1404) = 1.82, p = 0.069$ . The results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Organizational Direction.
2. The second research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Linkage questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Organizational Linkage in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 2). There was no statistically significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.03, SD = 2.04$ ) and B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.13, SD = 1.66$ ) conditions;  $t(2237) = 1.45, p = 0.146$ . These results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Organizational Linkage.
  3. The third research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Organizational Procedures questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Organizational Procedure in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 3). There was a statistically significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.93, SD = 2.25$ ) and

B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.25$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ) conditions;  $t(1745) = 4.167$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . The results suggest the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Organizational Procedure. Specifically, the results suggest teachers in B- through F-rated high schools feel their principals are more adept in the Organizational Procedure domain actions than the teachers at A-rated schools rate their principals.

4. The fourth research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Teacher Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Teacher Relations in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 4). There was a statistically significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.93$ ,  $SD = 2.25$ ) and B- through F-rated schools ( $M = 7.25$ ,  $SD = 1.81$ ) conditions;  $t(2356) = 4.167$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . The results suggest the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Teacher Relations. Specifically, the results suggest teachers in B- through F-rated high schools feel their principals are more adept in the Teacher Relations domain than the teachers at A-rated schools rate their principals.
5. The fifth research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Student Relations questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Student Relations in A-rated high schools and in B-

- through F-rated high schools (Table 5). The study suggests there was no statistically significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.25$ ,  $SD = 2.07$ ) and B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.44$ ,  $SD = 1.58$ ) conditions;  $t(1483) = 2.09$ ,  $p = 0.036$ . These results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Student Relations.
6. The sixth research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Interactive Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Interactive Process in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 6). There was a statistically significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 7.01$ ,  $SD = 2.13$ ) and B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.37$ ,  $SD = 1.59$ ) conditions;  $t(1701) = 4.152$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . The results suggest the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Interactive Process. Specifically, the results suggest teachers in B- through F-rated high schools feel their principals are more adept in the Interactive Process domain than the teachers at A-rated schools rate their principals.
7. The seventh research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Affective Processes questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Affective Process in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 7). There was no statistically significant

difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.84$ ,  $SD = 2.19$ ) and B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.05$ ,  $SD = 1.75$ ) conditions;  $t(1167) = 1.97$ ,  $p = 0.049$ .

The results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Affective Process.

8. The eighth research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Instructional Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Instructional Improvement in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 8). There was a significant difference in the scores for the A-rated schools ( $M = 6.93$ ,  $SD = 2.18$ ) and B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.22$ ,  $SD = 1.75$ ) conditions;  $t(1272) = 2.84$ ,  $p < 0.01$ . The results suggest the school's rating does have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Instructional Improvement. Specifically, the results suggest teachers in B- through F-rated high schools feel their principals are more adept in the Instructional Improvement domain than the teachers at A-rated schools rate their principals.
9. The ninth research question asked, "Is there a significant difference in the scores obtained on the Curriculum Improvement questions on the APE survey in Indiana high schools earning a B through F marking compared to those earning an A marking?" A two-sample  $t$  test was conducted to compare teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership in the domain of Curriculum Improvement in A-rated high schools and in B- through F-rated high schools (Table 9). There was no statistically

significant difference in the scores for the A-rated high schools ( $M = 6.91$ ,  $SD = 2.12$ ) and B- through F-rated high schools ( $M = 7.01$ ,  $SD = 1.75$ ) conditions;  $t(1127) = 0.99$ ,  $p = 0.324$ . These results suggest the school's rating does not have an effect on teachers' perceptions of leadership in the domain of Curriculum Improvement.

### **Discussion of Findings**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the differences, if any, between the teachers' perceptions of principal leadership actions between Indiana's A-rated high schools compared to B- through F-rated high schools during the 2012-2013 school year. Descriptive statistical analyses of the data were performed and the resulting means and standard deviations for each of the continuous variables were recorded. Two sample  $t$  tests were performed to test the nine null hypotheses.

It was initially assumed that principals of the A-rated high schools would be seen as far more effective than those principals in the B- through F-rated high schools as rated by their teachers. This assumption was based on the interpretation of the literature review on the leadership theory in schools. Many authors have noted effective schools, in practice, have effective leaders (Ginsberg & Thompson, 1992; Glasman & Heck, 1992; Murphy et al., 1985; Rallis & Goldring, 1993). The evaluation of principal effectiveness was based upon teachers' reactions to the APE survey. The report by Valentine and Bowman (1989) that looked at nationally recognized schools compared to randomly selected schools suggested that recognized schools were led by more highly rated leaders (Appendix C), brought into question the possible explanation that the current IDOE grading system does not accurately represent the true level of perceived effectiveness of the principal even though it must be included in their evaluation under the current Indiana laws. The grading system utilized in Indiana High Schools for the 2012-2013

school year is presented in Appendix G. The APE recognized nine factors of (a) organizational direction, (b) organizational linkage, (c) organizational procedures, (d) teacher relations, (e) student relations, (f) interactive processes, (g) affective processes, (h) instructional improvement, and (i) curriculum improvement as areas to focus on in the measurement of the principal's leadership behavior as perceived by teachers. (Valentine & Bowman, 1989).

The APE has been nationally normed and has been utilized in numerous studies. The test has a high Cronbach's alpha throughout the items all scoring above the acceptable level. Since the results of average scores from this survey (Appendix H) and the national survey performed in 1989 are reflective of one another, the statement that the current survey may accurately reflect teachers on a wider scale can be considered. (See Table 10 below).



Table 10

*Comparison of the Nine Factors of the APE Using the Survey Averages of Indiana High Schools and Nationally Recognized Survey Averages*

Factor	Indiana High School Survey Average	Nationally Recognized Survey Average
Student Relations	7.31	7.48
Organizational Direction	7.26	7.84
Interactive Processes	7.13	7.75
Organizational Linkage	7.06	7.72
Teacher Relations	7.04	7.50
Instructional Improvement	7.03	7.58
Curriculum Improvement	6.94	7.47
Affective Processes	6.91	7.26
Organization Procedures	6.81	7.32

Although the current APE average scores were all lower than their nationally recognized counterparts reported in 1989, the differences are consistent. The differences may be a result of the general tenor in the state of Indiana over the 2013-2014 academic year as the teaching profession has come under a great deal of scrutiny and many laws have been enacted that have negatively impacted the morale of educators in the state. The one notable difference between the 1989 study and the 2014 study is the rank order placement of Student Relations. In 1989, it was ranked sixth, and in the current study, it was the most noted item. This may be in response to the more student-centered approach of the current educational paradigm.

The APE provides information about how well the principal is doing in dealing with personnel inside and outside the school community, how the principal is building a nurturing school climate, and how the principal serves as the educational leader of the school. The results of this study suggest that teachers of B- through F-rated high schools find their leader to be superior to the leaders of A-rated high schools in several areas. A great deal of research already cited has suggested that highly effective schools are led by highly effective principals, and as such, it appears that teachers' opinions of their principal based on the results of the APE does not correlate to the IDOE data utilized when grading high schools. The grades are derived by the IDOE and reported to be based on performance and improvement. During the 2012-2013 school year the IDOE used the overall performance of the high schools on Indiana end of course assessments (ECA) in Algebra I and English 10, graduation rates, and scores on providing college and career ready classes. High schools could also earn bonuses or incur penalties when comparing the percent of students who passed the Indiana high stakes test in 8th grade as compared to those who passed the ECA as well as the number of students who passed the ECA compared to those who graduated in a four-year period. For a more detailed description of the grading process, see Appendix A.

Confounding factors may exist; the size of the sample pool was relatively small considering the entire population of high school teachers in the state of Indiana. A small percentage of teachers responded, which may be due to the timing of the survey, which took place toward the end of the school year. It is also worth noting that almost twice as many A-rated school teachers responded than B- through F-rated school teachers even though there was actually a few more B- through F-rated high schools than A-rated high schools (A  $n = 119$ ; B through F  $n = 126$ ). This may suggest that teachers from higher-rated schools are more likely to

report their perceptions than those from schools rated less than exemplary. In addition, the data were collected from teachers employed in 2013-2014, although the identification of schools was based on ratings from the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, the principals being rated may have moved on to other positions when the survey was completed.

Other areas could have had an impact on the answers provided; for instance, could there be motivation and team unity found when a school is labeled less than exemplary? Did teachers from the B- through F-rated high schools galvanize around the thought of proving the system is flawed and, thus, the teachers worked more closely with their leader? Further consideration could be given to the relationships of teachers and principal from B through F- rated schools if the principal undertook new and innovative efforts to make a positive impact, when the A-rated schools' principals did not perceive the need for innovation? Other questions arise such as how long the teacher had worked with the principal. Did the principal hire the various teachers thus producing a relationship and loyalty? What is the most frequent form of professional development and is the principal seen as being responsible for this endeavor? More questions may be based on school location, size, demographic variables, and the governance of the school above the principal. Further, utilizing an average grade over a longer period might be a more accurate descriptor of the school as opposed to a single year's grade. Finally, this research may benefit from expanding outside of Indiana. This would shed light on the differences of school-rating procedures as well as provide insight into the universality of teacher perceptions of positive actions of principals. Each of the mentioned confounding factors could give rise to interesting future study.

### Summary of Study

This study was designed to analyze the teachers' perception of the principal's various actions and compare those perceptions between A-rated high schools and B- through F-rated high schools in the state of Indiana during the school year 2012-2013. In this study, all nine factors of the Audit of Principal Effectiveness (Valentine & Bowman, 1988) received a higher average rating for the B- through F-rated high schools than those for the A-rated high schools. Analysis revealed statistically significant differences in four of the factors surveyed between the two groups. The five areas where no statistically significant difference was found included Organizational Direction, Organizational Linkage, Student Relations, Affective Process, and Curriculum Development.

The first factor noted was Organizational Direction, which is described as the direction the principal provides in working with faculty to develop goals, expectations, and to promote appropriate change. The second factor not meeting statistical significance was Organizational Linkage. Organizational Linkage promotes working relationships between the school, community and other educators. The third non-statistically significant factor was Student Relations, defined as the principal's ability to develop working relationships through communication skills, encouragement, support and high visibility. The fourth non-statistically significant factor was Affective Processes, regarded as the ability of the principal to encourage expression of feelings, opinions, pride and loyalty through management, sensitivity, humor and personal example. The fifth and final factor found to be non-statistically significant was Curriculum Improvement. Curriculum Improvement refers to the principals' ability to promote and articulate curriculum through diagnosis of student need and program review. While the

above-mentioned factors were found to be non- statistically significant, they should not be regarded as a reason to discount their input into our understanding.

Several of the factors found to be non-statistically significant included some of the most highly rated questions from both groups of survey participants. The fifth most highly rated question came from Student Relations, “The principal is highly visible to the student body.” The fourth most rated trait was found in Organizational Direction. The question asked the degree of the principal’s high professional expectations for self, faculty, and school. The third most highly rated question also came from Student Relations, “the principal enjoys working with students.” The second and most highly rated questions were from the Organizational Linkage factor, which regarded the principals’ ability to work within the policies of and with the other administrators in the school corporation. Although these questions all came from factors found to be non-statistically significant might suggest there are actions to which principals should attend regardless of the recognized performance of the school.

Although there are actions perceived as positive regardless of the grade of the school, the goal of this study was to discover if there were differences between the actions of principals of A-rated high schools and those of B- through F-rated high schools. The original assumption of the study was that principals of A-rated high schools would be regarded by teachers as more positive than those of B- through F-rated high schools. That original assumption was not supported by the study’s results.

Possible explanations for this could be the culture of many B- through F-rated high schools and their teachers is one of indignation at being labeled as less than exemplary. Given the opportunity to respond to questions about their own schools, teachers may report outlooks that are more positive. Alternatively, some teachers at A-rated high schools may regard the

schools' success is less because of the efforts of their principal and more a reflection of the student body or the teaching staff.

The results of this study pointed to four factors within the APE as being statistically significant when comparing the principals of A-rated high schools and B- through F-rated high schools, with the B- through F-rated school teachers recognizing their principal more highly in each instance:

1. Organizational Procedures, or the level to which the principal utilizes effective procedures to problem solving, decision-making, and change.
2. Teacher Relations, which is described as the degree to which the principal develops effective working relationships with the staff using communication skills, sensitivity to needs, and support and reinforcement.
3. Interactive Process, described as how well the principal organizes tasks and personnel for day-to-day management of the school.
4. Instructional Improvement, which focuses on how much the principal positively influences the instructional skills of the teachers through supervision, knowledge of effective schooling, and quality instruction.

The most recognized areas of effectiveness as reported by the teachers surveyed should be of interest to principals when reflecting on their current practice. The most highly scored questions on the survey included

1. "The principal is supportive of and operates within the policies of the district."
2. "The principal maintains a good rapport and a good working relationship with other administrators of the district."
3. "The principal enjoys working with students."

4. “The principal has high professional expectations and standards for self, faculty and schools.”
5. “The principal is highly visible to the student body.”

Although these areas were not a dividing point between A-rated and B- through F-rated high school leaders, the areas most noted may be worthy of inspection by all school leaders and could lead to a stronger teacher response level if addressed by the principal. These areas mirror many of the findings that Valentine and Bowman (1989) reported in their work.

The significance of this study may suggest that while there is distinction in being recognized as an A-rated high school, this recognition does not necessarily indicate a high level of principal effectiveness according to the teachers’ perceptions. Indiana’s school grading criteria requires achievement and growth in student performance, but that does not necessarily translate into a measure of the principal’s perceived level of effectiveness. Therefore, an implication of this study could be an A-rated high school does not always indicate an A-rated leader.

### **Recommendations**

As the results of this study indicate, there are significant factors that influence teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s effectiveness. When generalizing the results, one must proceed with caution within the noted limitations and delimitations of this study. Although the findings were significant with respect to teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s effectiveness, this study was conducted only within Indiana high schools. This study, in conjunction with other similar studies on principal effectiveness, can serve to guide principal self-reflection and improvement. All principals can begin to examine their own leadership styles and compare them to the findings of this study. By reflecting on their own practices, asking questions, and listening to the

responses of their teachers, principals may begin to become more effective in the eyes of their teachers.

The first of the four factors a principal may want to reflect on is Organizational Procedures. Organizational Procedures pertain to problem-solving, decision-making, and change. The most telling characteristic of this factor was the inclusion of the teacher in the decision-making process. For example, the 24th question on the APE survey was, “Through discussion with teachers about concerns and problems that affect the school, the principal involves teachers in the decision-making process.” Wiggins (2013) stated, “Administrators should start their evaluations with conversation concerning what counts as evidence of student learning” (p. 2).

Another example from the APE is, “During the identification of needed change, the principal’s style is more supportive and participative than directive and authoritative.” Hattie and Yates (2013) stated, “Teachers/leaders engage in dialogue not monologue” (p. 1). Based on this research, the principal would do well to include teachers in the process of decision-making. Cotton (1993) encouraged principals to move away from enforcing policies made outside the building and move toward a role where the principal works collegially with the staff, sharing authority with them.

Mojkowski and Fleming (1988) echoed this noting, “A school improvement impetus and authority emanating from outside the school does not produce the responsibility and commitment necessary to sustain consequential improvement” (p. 2). Further, according to the results of this study, even when the principal identifies areas in need of change and improvement, teachers seem to appreciate a supportive and team-minded approach to making those changes.



Marzano, Zaffron, Zraik, Robbins, and Yoon (2013) stated principals and school leaders must understand change as including the need to address “the existing framework of perceptions and beliefs, or paradigm, as part of the change process—an ontological approach” (p. 163). The principal may want to consider providing the staff opportunities to be involved in developing school policies, using leadership teams in the decision-making process, and encouraging people to express diverse and contrary opinions where appropriate.

The second factor found to be statistically significant was Teacher Relations, which stresses communication, sensitivity, support and reinforcement of teachers. The Hawthorne studies pointed to the idea the more engaged a person is while doing their job, the more productive the principal is (as cited in Harvard Business School, n.d.). The Hawthorne effect pointed the principal toward finding the time to work with and support the instruction of their teachers (as cited in Harvard Business School, n.d.).

One of the most responded to statement in this factor was, “The principal takes time to listen to teachers.” This simple act was a highly recognized characteristic. Through this, the principal was seen to have an understanding and appreciation of how teachers feel. Pink (2013) stated, “Move from up selling to up serving . . . up serving means doing more for the other person than he expects or you initially intended, taking the extra steps that transform a mundane interaction into a memorable experience.” (p. 226). This study would suggest principals would do well to build professional capital with their teaching staff. This professional capital account would build with the amount of time a principal designates as time to listen to the concerns of the teachers and staff.

Marzano (2012) called for the establishment and fostering of procedures that ensure staff have input into key decisions and regarded Input as one of the 21 responsibilities of a school

leader. The act of being listened to gives the teacher a feeling the principal understands and appreciates the view of the teacher so it is important to listen to them. Hollas (2009) called this the “Human Beings approach” (p. 21). The Human Beings approach is described as, “caring for people and creating a place where others can do their best work” (Hollas, 2009, p. 21). Fullan (2008) simplified it to “love your employees” (p. 19). Fullan’s research points toward the inclusion of a systematic method to recognize the successes of the staff, exposing the staff to cutting-edge research on effective schooling, and inspiring teachers to accomplish things teachers may have thought was outside their grasp.

Interactive Process was found to be the third factor of statistical significance.. This pertains to the day-to-day management of the school by keeping the staff appropriately informed and setting the appropriate tone for discipline in the school. The principal keeps teachers informed about aspects of the school that the teacher actually needs to be kept aware. Further, when the principal disseminates information it is clear and easily understood.

Cotton (1993) mentioned safe, orderly, well-managed schools will have “a visible, supportive principal. . . . Principals of well-disciplined schools tend to be very visible in hallways and classrooms, talking informally with teachers and students, speaking to them by name, and expressing interest in their activities” ( p. 3). Marzano (2003) echoed the interactive process as “the extent to which the school leader is an information provider and facilitates group decision making” (p. 30).

The results of this survey indicate a principal should be visible in the schools’ halls to see and be seen by students and staff alike. Marzano et al. (2005) classified visibility as one of the 21 most important responsibilities of a school leader. Further, the principal must plan and

implement a process to keep the staff, parents, and students informed in order to best address the Interactive Process factor.

Whitaker (2013) suggested a regular newsletter, or Friday Focus. Providing and reinforcing clear structures, rules, and procedures will help to prioritize the actions of the school. Finally, having a keen awareness of situations that could hinder the progress of the school and acting appropriately is a skill recommended for a principal.

The final statistically significant factor was Instructional Improvement, or the principal's ability to implement effective supervision that leads to effective schooling and quality instruction. The descriptors of this factor include varied teaching strategies, accurate assessment; research based learning processes and instructional improvement. Marzano, Frontier, and Livingston (2001) pointed out, "The purpose of supervision should be the advancement of teachers' pedagogical skills, with the ultimate goal of advancing student achievement" (p. 3). Whitaker (2013) stated, "Effective principals understand that their primary role is to teach the staff, not teach the students" (p. 10). Principals should stay informed on current research and theory on effective schooling, thus allowing the principal to be competent in providing conceptual guidance regarding effective classroom practices.

1. Although not found to be statistically significant, principals should be aware of noteworthy responses to five questions, including The principal is highly visible to the student body.
2. The principal has high, professional expectations and standards for self, faculty, and school.
3. The principal enjoys working with students.

4. The principal maintains a good rapport and a good working relationship with other administrators of the district.
5. The principal is supportive of, and operates within, the policies of the district.

Based on these survey questions and their common recognition, principals may consider making systematic and frequent visits to the classrooms in their school, establishing concrete goals for student performance and attending to those goals on a regular basis. Principals may want to build a system in order to fairly and regularly recognize student accomplishments, and finally, the principal may want to build and maintain an effective line of communication with not only their staff but also the community and the governing body of the school corporation in general.

Implications beyond the individual principal making improvements to his or her own practice may be suggested by this research. Principal preparation programs may benefit from focusing on the impact of relationships between the principal and the school's teachers. Research suggest that principal-teacher relationships are regarded as a significant part of a principal's level of effectiveness the two most recognized questions on the survey had to do with the relationships between the principal and their administrative colleagues. Based on this information, principal preparation programs would do well to include policy understanding and administrative team building as part of their curriculum. Additionally, based on this research, the leadership preparation programs might include components related to problem solving, communication skills, and supervision as teams build their curricula. Finally, the inclusion of principal-student relations should be included in the certification process. Two of the five most reported questions dealt directly with the principal-student relationship. The specific questions

mentioned were also found to be some of the most recognized questions when Valentine and Bowman (1989) first reported on this.

The findings of this study suggest the need for future research would be appropriate. The expansion of this research into the elementary-school and middle-school levels may be considered. The consideration of other variables, including school location, student body size, principal tenure, and demographic make-up of the school community may reveal different results. Teacher employment background, years of service, and professional development may also be areas f. as well as principal's leadership style, path to leadership, and make-up of the administrative staff are other areas of possible research.

## REFERENCES

- Achieve. (2013). Implementing the common core state standards: The role of the secondary school leader. Retrieved from [http://www.achieve.org/files/RevisedSecondaryActionBrief\\_Final\\_Feb.pdf](http://www.achieve.org/files/RevisedSecondaryActionBrief_Final_Feb.pdf)
- Achieve, College Summit, National Association of Secondary School Principals, and National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2013). *Implementing the common core state standards: The role of the elementary school leader*. Retrieved from [http://www.achieve.org/files/RevisedElementaryActionBrief\\_Final\\_Feb.pdf](http://www.achieve.org/files/RevisedElementaryActionBrief_Final_Feb.pdf)
- Achievement First. (n.d.). Professional growth plan: School principal. Retrieved from <http://www.newschools.org/file/Principal-12.doc>
- Amsterdam, C. E., Johnson, R. L., Monrad, D. M, & Tonnsen, S. L. (2003). A collaborative approach to the development and validation of a principal evaluation system: A case study. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 17, 221-242. doi. 10.1007/x11092-005-2981-y
- Anderson, M. E. (1991). *Principals: How to train, recruit, select, induct, and evaluate leaders for America's schools*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ED337843). Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED337843>
- Andrews, R. L., & Soder, R. (1987). Principal leadership and school achievement. *Educational Leadership*, 44(6), 9-11. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_198703\\_andrews.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198703_andrews.pdf)

- Austin, G. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. *Educational Leadership*, 37(2), 10-14. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_197910\\_austin.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_197910_austin.pdf)
- Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barkley, S., Bottoms, G., Feagin, C., & Clark, S. (2001). *Leadership matters: Building leadership capacity*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/district-policy-and-practice/Documents/Leadership-Matters-Building-Leadership-Capacity.pdf>
- Barth, R. (1981). *The principal as staff developer*. Boston, MA: Boston University School of Education. Retrieved from [http://p12.project.tcnj.edu/660summer09/Coleman/leake-The\\_Principal\\_as\\_Staff\\_Developer-558196109.pdf](http://p12.project.tcnj.edu/660summer09/Coleman/leake-The_Principal_as_Staff_Developer-558196109.pdf)
- Bennis, W. (2003). *On becoming a leader* (Rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (2003). *Learning to lead: A workbook on becoming a leader* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64. doi: 10.1177/0013161X82018003004

Bridges, E. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980.

Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 12-33. doi:

10.1177/0013161X82018003003

Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes*

*in student achievement* (Occasional Paper No. 17). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State

University, Lansing Institute for Research on Teaching. Retrieved from

<http://education.msu.edu/irt/PDFs/OccasionalPapers/op017.pdf>

Brown, G. H., & Irby, B. J. (1996). Administrative portfolios: The development of a portfolio

system. Retrieved from ERIC Document Resource Center. (ED400248; Tier 3

publication). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov>

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2007). What do we expect of school principals? Congruence

between principal evaluation and performance standards. *International Journal of*

*Leadership in Education*, 10, 379-399. Retrieved from <http://alex.state.al.us/>

[leadership/Principals%20%20Files/RC-7,%20Virginia%20study%20of%20Eval%20](http://alex.state.al.us/leadership/Principals%20%20Files/RC-7,%20Virginia%20study%20of%20Eval%20)

[Instruments.pdf](http://alex.state.al.us/leadership/Principals%20%20Files/RC-7,%20Virginia%20study%20of%20Eval%20)

Cheney, G. R., Davis, J., Garrett, K., & Holleran, J. (2010). A new approach to principal

preparation. Ft. Worth, TX: Rainwater Leadership Alliance. Retrieved from

[http://www.anewapproach.org/docs/a\\_new\\_approach.pdf](http://www.anewapproach.org/docs/a_new_approach.pdf)

Cole, C., Ansaldo, J., Robinson, J. & Whiteman, R., & Spradlin, T. (2012). *Overhauling teacher*

*appraisal systems: Examining planning and implementation issues of school districts.*

Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.



- Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F., & York, R. (1966). *Equity of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Corbett, H. (1990). *On the meaning of restructuring*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues14.html>
- Cotton, K. (1993) *School-wide and classroom discipline*. Retrieved from <http://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/schoolwide-and-classroom-discipline.pdf>
- Cotton, K. (2003). Principals and student achievement: What research says. Alexandria, VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crow, B. (2006). Complexity and the beginning principal in the United States: Perspectives on socialization. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44, 310-325. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578230610674930>
- Cuban, L. (1998). How schools change reforms: Redefining reform success and failure. *Teachers College Record*, 99, 453-477. Retrieved from [http://larrycuban.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/38\\_102731.pdf](http://larrycuban.files.wordpress.com/2010/12/38_102731.pdf)
- Darling-Hammond, L., LaPoint, M., Meyerson, D., Orr, M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs*. (School Leadership Study: Final Report). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute. Retrieved from <http://seli.stanford.edu>

- Davis, E. L. (1992). *The leadership behaviors of principals and their effect on school improvement in effective urban high schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/dissertations/AAI9310290/>
- Demski, J. (2012, June 7). Seven habits of highly effective tech-leading principals. *THE Journal*, 1-9. Retrieved from <http://thejournal.com/articles/2012/06/07/7-habits-of-highly-effective-tech-leading-principals.aspx>
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational leadership: Culture and diversity*. London, England: Sage.
- DuFour, R. (1991). *The principal as staff developer*. Amherst MA: National Educational Service.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Duke, D. L., & Iwanicki, E. (1992). Principal assessment and the notion of “fit.” *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 25-36. doi: 10.1080/01619569209538709
- Dwyer, D. C. (1984). The search for instructional leadership: Routines and subtleties in the principal’s role. *Educational Leadership*, 41(5), 32-37. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_198402\\_dwyer.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198402_dwyer.pdf)
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-18, 20-24. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_197910\\_edmonds.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_197910_edmonds.pdf)
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.

- Ferrandino, V. L., & Tirrozi, G. N. (2004). Principals' perspectives. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*. Retrieved from <http://www.principals.org/Portals/0/Content/46536.pdf>
- Fredericks, J., & Brown, S. (2003). School effectiveness and principal productivity. *NASSP*, 77(9), 9-16. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/019263659307755603>
- Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change*. Retrieved from <http://www.michaelfullan.ca/images/handouts/2008SixSecretsofChangeKeynoteA4.pdf>
- Gall, J., Gall, M., & Borg, W. (2005). *Applying educational research: A practical guide*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Giffing, R. (2010). A comparison of teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in national blue ribbon schools and matched sets of selected non-blue ribbon schools in Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3408712)
- Ginsberg, R., & Thompson, T. (1992). Dilemmas and solutions regarding principal evaluation. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 58-74. doi: 10.1080/01619569209538711
- Glasman, N., & Heck, R. (1992). The changing leadership role of the principal: Implications for principal assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 5-24. doi: 10.1080/01619569209538708
- Glathorn, A. (2000). *The principal as curriculum leader: Shaping what is taught & tested* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Gold, D. (1988, April 13). Extensive tests in Indiana make teachers uneasy. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1988/04/13/29istep.h07.html?r=1571667222>

- Gruenert, S. (2005). Correlations of collaborative school cultures with student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(45), 43-45. doi: 10.1177/019263650508964504
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (2005). The study of educational leadership and management: Where does the field stand today? *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 33, 229-244. doi: 10.1177/1741143205051055
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 45(1), 54-61. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_198709\\_hallinger.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198709_hallinger.pdf)
- Hargreaves, A. (1997). Cultures of teaching and educational change. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *The challenge of school change*. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing.
- Harvard Business School. (n.d.). *The Hawthorne effect*. Retrieved from <http://www.library.hbs.edu/hc/hawthorne/09.html#nine>
- Hattie, J., & Yates, G. (2013, June 8). *Plenary 4 - Understanding learning: Lessons for learning, teaching and research*. Presentation at the Australian Council of Educational Research. Retrieved from [http://research.acer.edu.au/research\\_conference/RC2013/6august/10/](http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference/RC2013/6august/10/)
- Heck, R., & Marcoulides, G. (1992). Principals' assessment: Conceptual problem, methodological problem, or both? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 124-144. doi: 10.1080/01619569209538714
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Leadership style: Attitudes and behaviors. *Training and Development Journal*, 36(5), 50-52.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., & Johnson, D. (1996). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., & Johnson, D. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (Rev. 2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hollas, B. (2009). *The 7 secrets of motivating and inspiring your team*. Peterborough, NH: Crystal Springs Books.
- Hord, S. (2004). *Learning together, leading together: Changing schools through professional learning communities*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.
- House Enrolled Act No. 1750. (Public Law 221). IC 20-10.2-3 (1999; Recodification, 2005)
- Hurren, B. L. (2006). The effects of principal's humor on teacher's job satisfaction. *Educational Studies*, 32, 373-385. doi: 10.1080/0305569060080321
- Indiana Department of Education. (1987). *The future is now: Indiana's A+ program for educational excellence as recommended to the 1987 Indiana General Assembly*. Indianapolis, IN: Burford.
- Indiana Department of Education. (2011). *RISE evaluation and development system: Evaluator and teacher handbook*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.
- Indiana Department of Education. (2012). *Legislative guidance: Rigorous measures*. Indianapolis: Author.
- Indiana Department of Education. (2014) *High school grading method*. Indianapolis: Author.
- Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 001 (Public Law 90). IC 20-28-11.5 (2011)
- Jenkins, B. (2009). What it takes to be an instructional leader. *Principal*, 34-37. Retrieved from <http://www.naesp.org/principal-archives>

- Jerald, C. (2006). Using data: The math is not the hard part. Using data issue brief. Washington, DC: Learning Point Associates.
- Kafka, J. (2009). The principalship in historical perspective. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84, 318-330. doi: 10.1080/01619560902973506
- Kojimoto, C. (1987). The kid's-eye view of effective principals. *Educational Leadership*, 69-74. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_198709\\_kojimoto.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198709_kojimoto.pdf)
- Kottler, J. (1997). *What's really said in the teachers' lounge: Provocative ideas about cultures and classrooms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Lambert, L. (2003). Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Leadership and Learning Center. (2011a). *Reeve's leadership performance matrix*. Retrieved from [http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/practicerubrics/Docs/HoughtonMifflin\\_PrincipalRubric.pdf](http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/practicerubrics/Docs/HoughtonMifflin_PrincipalRubric.pdf)
- Leadership and Learning Center. (2011b). *Florida multidimensional leadership assessment matrix*. Retrieved from <http://www.fldoe.org/committees/pdf/fmlamatrix.pdf>
- Levine, D., & Stark, J. (1982). Instructional and organizational arrangements that improve achievement in inner-city schools. *Educational Leadership*, 40, 41-46. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_198212\\_levine.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198212_levine.pdf)
- Lezotte, L. (2001) *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/pdfs/edutopia.org-closing-achievement-gap-lezotte-article.pdf>

- Liu, E., & Johnson, S. (2006). New teacher's experiences of hiring: Late, rushed, and information poor. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 43, 324-360. doi: 10.1177/0013161X05282610
- Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.pdf>
- Mace-Matluck, B. (1987). *The effective schools movement: Its history and context: A SEDL monograph*. Austin TX: Southwest Educational Development Lab. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED304781.pdf>
- Manasse, A. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications of research. *Elementary School Journal*, 85, 439-463. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086.461413>
- Marshall, K. (2011). Principal evaluation rubrics. Retrieved from <http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/practic RUBRICS/Docs/MarshallPrincipalRubric.pdf>
- Marzano Research Laboratory. (2011). *What works in Oklahoma schools: Phase I state report*. Englewood, CO: Morton.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. (2012). *Levels of school effectiveness*. Retrieved from <http://legisweb.state.wy.us/InterimCommittee/2012/Z02MarzanoLevels.pdf>

- Marzano, R., Frontier, A., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Supervising the art and science of teaching*. Retrieved from <http://enyfamathandscience.wikispaces.com/file/view/Effective+Supervision+-+Review+-+1-22-12.pdf>
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R., Zaffon, S., Zraik, L., Robbins, S., & Yoon, L. (2013). A new paradigm for educational change. *Education, 116*(2). Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-18163706/a-new-paradigm-for-education-change>
- Mojkowski, C., & Fleming, D. (1988). *School site management: Concepts and approaches*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED307660.pdf>
- Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Peterson, K. (1985). Supervising and principals: Lessons from effective districts. *Educational Leadership, 43*(2), 78. Retrieved from [http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed\\_lead/el\\_198510\\_murphy.pdf](http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198510_murphy.pdf)
- Murphy, J. A., & Pimentel, S. (1996). Grading principals: Administrative evaluations come of age. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(1), 74-81. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20405709>
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2010). *National board certification for principals: A new way to develop, recognize & retain top school leaders*. Retrieved from <http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/educatoreffectiveness/nationalboardcertification/principals/standards.pdf>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html>



- Newmann, F., & Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Center on Organization and Restructuring Schools.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Northouse, G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Office of the Governor. (2010, November 4). *Governor outlines 2011 legislative priorities* [Press release]. Retrieved from [http://www.in.gov/portal/news\\_events/58797.htm](http://www.in.gov/portal/news_events/58797.htm)
- Peterson, D. (1991). *Evaluating principals*. (ERIC Digest Series No. 60). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (No. ED330064)
- Peterson, K., & Deal, T. (1998). How leaders influence the culture of schools. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 28-30. Retrieved from [http://larrycuban.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/el199809\\_peterson-1.pdf](http://larrycuban.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/el199809_peterson-1.pdf)
- Pink, D. (2013). *To sell is human: The surprising truth about moving others*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books. Retrieved from <http://gicoaches.com/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2013/03/To-Sell-is-Human-1594487154-AFirstFridayBookSynopsis.pdf>
- Porter, A. C., Murphy, J., Goldring, E., Elliott, S. N., Polikoff, M. S., & May, H. (2008). *Vanderbilt assessment of leadership in education: Technical manual 1.0*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Learning Sciences Institute.
- Portin, B., Knapp, M., Dareff, S., Feldman, S., Russell, F., Samuelson, C., & Yeh, T. (2009). *Leadership for learning improvement in urban schools*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

- Rallis, S., & Goldring, E. (1993). Beyond the individual assessments of principals: School-based accountability in dynamic schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(2), 3-23. doi: 10.1080/01619569309538717
- Rebore, R. (2001). *The ethics of educational leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Reeves, D. (2004). *Assessing educational leaders: Evaluating performance for improved individual and organizational results* (1st ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Reeves, D. (2006). *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better results*. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rousmaniere, K. (2007). Go to the principal's office: Toward a social history of the school principal in North America. *History of Education Quarterly*, 47(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-5959.2007.00072.x
- Ruder, R. (2006). Approachability & visibility. *Principal Leadership*, 7(3) 39-41. Retrieved from <http://www.nassp.org>
- School Leadership Briefing. (2013). ISLLC standards. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolbriefing.com/isllc-standards/>
- Sharp, D. C. (2009). *A study of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal effectiveness* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from [https://www.bakeru.edu/images/pdf/SOE/EdD\\_Theses/Sharp\\_David.pdf](https://www.bakeru.edu/images/pdf/SOE/EdD_Theses/Sharp_David.pdf)
- Smith, R. M., Montello, P. A., & White, P. E. (1992). Investigation of interpersonal management training for educational administrators. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86, 242-245. doi: 10.1080/00220671.1992.99441122
- Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Sorenson, R., Goldsmith, L., Mendez, Z., & Maxwell, K. (2011). *The principal's guide to curriculum leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2002). *What do we mean by 'family and community connections with schools?'* [Research Brief]. Austin, TX: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.sedl.org/learning/text\\_versions/Module1.pdf](http://www.sedl.org/learning/text_versions/Module1.pdf)
- Starratt, R. (2005). Cultivating the moral character of learning and teaching: A neglected dimension of educational leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, 25, 399-411. doi: 10.1080/13634230500197272
- Steiner, L. M., Hassel, E. A., & Hassel, B. (2008). School turnaround leaders: Competencies for success. Chapel Hill, NC: Public Impact. Retrieved from [http://www.publicimpact.com/publications/Turnaround\\_Leader\\_Compencies.pdf](http://www.publicimpact.com/publications/Turnaround_Leader_Compencies.pdf)
- Sullivan, S. S., & Glanz, J. G. (2006). *Building effective learning communities: Strategies for leadership, learning, & collaboration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Terry, J. (2010). What's possible: Turning around America's lowest achieving schools. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/blog/2010/03/whats-possible-turning-around-americas-lowest-achieving-schools/>
- Thompson, T., & Barnes, R. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the promise to our nation's children*. Washington DC: Aspen Institute.
- Tomlinson, C. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward Utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- U.S. Department of Education. (2013). FY 2013 Race to the top-district executive summary. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/2013-executive-summary.pdf>
- Valentine, J. W. (1989, April). The APE: A process for self-improvement. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the North Central Association. Retrieved from <http://mospace.umsystem.edu>
- Valentine, J. W., & Bowman, M. (1986). APE: A user's technical manual. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri. Retrieved from <http://mospace.umsystem.edu>
- Valentine, J. W., & Bowman, M. (1988). APE: Instrumentation for principal research. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri. Retrieved from <http://mospace.umsystem.edu>
- Valentine, J. W., & Bowman, M. (1989). Principal effectiveness in "national recognition" schools. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri. Retrieved from <http://mospace.umsystem.edu>
- Vanderbilt Peabody College. (2011). *Development of the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)*. Nashville, TN: Author. Retrieved from [http://valed.discoveryeducation.com/pdfs/DEA\\_VALED\\_Framework.pdf](http://valed.discoveryeducation.com/pdfs/DEA_VALED_Framework.pdf)
- Whitaker, T. (2012). *What great principals do differently* (2nd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Whitaker, T. (2013). *Help teachers be their best*. Retrieved from [http://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/Whitaker\\_JF13.pdf](http://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/Whitaker_JF13.pdf)
- Whiteman, R., Shi, D., & Plucker, J. (2011). *Revamping the teacher appraisal process*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

- Wiggins, G. (2013). *An interview with Grant Wiggins: The power of backwards design*. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/interview-grant-wiggins-power-backwards-design-ben-johnson>
- Williams, H. S. (2000). Teacher's perception of principal effectiveness in selected secondary schools in Tennessee. *Education, 121*, 264-276.
- Williams, J., Cameron, G., & Davis, T. (2009). *Principal evaluation system*. Denver, CO: Mid-continental Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved from <http://ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/TLE-McRELBooklet.pdf>
- Zepeda, S. (2007). *Institutional leadership of school improvement*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

## APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GRADING METHOD

New High School (HS) "A-F" Model**Overview of Performance and Improvement**

- High schools receive **weighted** points in four areas:
  1. English 10 ECA (30%)\*
  2. Algebra I ECA (30%)\*
  3. Graduation Rate (30%)
  4. College & Career Readiness (10%)\*

**1 & 2. Calculating English10 and Algebra I ECA Scores**

- Schools receive a *preliminary* score based on the percentage of their students in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade cohort that passed the ECA or ISTAR.
  - Score shall be raised if there is at least 10.3% (Eng) or 17.1% (math) **improvement** in the passage rate from the 8<sup>th</sup> grade ISTEP+, IMAST or ISTAR to the 10<sup>th</sup> grade ECA or ISTAR.
  - Score shall be lowered if there is -0.1% or less (Eng. or math) **improvement** in the passage rate from the 8<sup>th</sup> grade ISTEP+, IMAST or ISTAR to the 10<sup>th</sup> grade ECA or ISTAR.
  - Score shall be raised if at least 59.3% (Eng.) or 62.8% (math) of students that did not pass the ECA or ISTAR in 10<sup>th</sup> grade do so by graduation.

**3. Calculating a Graduation Rate Score**

- Schools receive a *preliminary* score based on their 4 YR graduation cohort rate.
  - Score shall be raised if 34.4% or more students receive non-waiver **Honors Diplomas**.<sup>^</sup>
  - Score shall be lowered if 32.8% or more students receive **General** or **waiver diplomas**.<sup>^</sup>
  - Score shall be raised if 13.2% of students that did not graduate within four (4) years do so in **five (5) years**.<sup>^</sup>

**4. Calculating a College & Career Readiness Score**

- Schools receive a score based on the percentage of graduates who receive at least one of the following:
  - a passing score (3, 4, or 5) on an **AP** exam; or
  - a passing score (4, 5, 6, or 7) on an **IB** exam; or
  - three (3) verifiable **college credits** from the Priority Liberal Arts or CTE course lists; or
  - an IDOE approved **industry certification**.

**Determining a Final Grade for a High School**

- Add the final weighted scores together from the four areas for a FINAL Grade.

*\*The College & Career Readiness weight shall increase each year at least 5% and its increases will be offset by the equivalent decrease spread evenly over the English 10 and Algebra I ECAs weights.*

*^These three components of the model begin in 2014-15, and the targets are subject to change.*

## APPENDIX B: PERMISSION TO USE HIGH SCHOOL GRADING METHOD

**From:** "Kelly Bauder" <kbauder@doe.in.gov>  
**To:** "Michael Stephens" <mstephens@union.k12.in.us>  
**Date:** 11/17/2014 5:40 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Appendix

Mr. Stephens -

Anyone is free to use the information on our website as it has been released to the public. There is information on A-F calculations and lots of other information on school accountability on our website. You are welcome to use this information from our website as part of your dissertation. The Indiana Department of Education could not comment on the topic of your work or if you employed the right methodology for any conclusions you reached, but you can use our information as a source. Best of luck.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 17, 2014, at 2:49 PM, "Michael Stephens" <mstephens@union.k12.in.us> wrote:  
>  
> This is page 122 from my Dissertation and the following is an example of a similar email that I received from Dr. Valentine in request to use his survey...you can see it is a simple, yes you can use it requirement.  
>  
> Thank you, this is of the utmost time crunch.  
>  
> Mike  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
> The information contained in this email and any attachments is confidential and may be subject to copyright or other intellectual property protection. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to use or disclose this information, and we request that you notify us by reply mail or telephone and delete the original message from your mail system.  
> <A-F HS.pdf>  
> <permission example.pdf>

## APPENDIX C: APE SURVEY

Directions: There are 80 statements in this instrument. The statements describe specific principalship skills. Because teachers work more closely with principals than any other professional group, teachers' perceptions are particularly important. Please take a few minutes to read each statement and select the response that most appropriately describes your assessment of your principal's ability for each item. DO NOT record your name. All responses will be reported as a group, not individual data. Please be honest and candid with your responses.

For each item, select the response that describes HOW EFFECTIVELY YOUR PRINCIPAL PERFORMS EACH SKILL. Please use the following nine-point scale as the measure of effectiveness.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9  
 (Not Effective) (Moderately Effective) (Very Effective)

1. The principal assists the faculty in developing an understanding of, and support for, the beliefs and attitudes that form the basis of the educational value system of the school.
2. The principal provides for the identification of, and the reaching of consensus on, the educational goals of the school.
3. The principal has high, professional expectations and standards for self, faculty, and school.
4. The principal helps the faculty develop high, professional expectations and standards for themselves and the school.
5. The principal envisions future goals and directions for the school.
6. The principal encourages changes in school programs that lead to a better school for the students.
7. The principal communicates to teachers the directions the school's programs need to take for growth.
8. The principal develops plans for the cooperation and involvement of the community, individuals, and agencies of the school.
9. The principal utilizes resources from outside the school to assist in the study, development, implementation, and/or evaluation of the school.
10. The principal provides for the gathering of information and feedback from individuals and agencies in the community.
11. The principal provides for the dissemination of information to individuals and agencies in the community.
12. The principal is supportive of, and operates within, the policies of the district.
13. The principal maintains good rapport and a good working relationship with other administrators of the district.
14. The principal invests time with the district office and other external agencies to obtain support and resources from the agencies.
15. The principal strives to achieve autonomy for the school.
16. The principal develops and implements school practices and policies that synthesize educational mandates, requirements and theories, e.g. legal requirements, social expectations, theoretical premises.
17. The principal understands and analyzes the political aspects of education and effectively interacts with various communities, e.g. local, state, national, and/or various subcultures within the local community.
18. The principal informs the staff of new developments and ideas in education.
19. During the identification of needed change, the principal's style is more supportive and participative than directive and authoritative.
20. During evaluation of change, the principal's style is more supportive and participative than directive and authoritative.
21. The principal anticipates the effects of decisions.
22. The principal fairly and effectively evaluates school personnel.



23. The principal employs new staff who enhance the overall effectiveness of the school and complement the existing staff.
24. Through discussion with teachers about concerns and problems that affect the school, the principal involves teachers in the decision-making process.
25. The principal discusses school-related problems with teachers, seeking their opinions and feelings about the problem.
26. The principal utilizes a systematic process for change that is known and understood by the faculty.
27. The principal has the patience to wait to resolve a problem if the best solution to that problem is not yet readily evident.
28. The principal is willing to admit to making an incorrect decision and corrects the decision if feasible.
29. The principal is perceptive of teacher needs.
30. The principal gives teachers the support they need to be effective.
31. The principal diagnoses the causes of conflict and successfully mediates or arbitrates conflict situations.
32. Teachers feel at ease in the presence of the principal.
33. When deserving, teachers are complimented by the principal in a sincere and honest manner.
34. The principal is receptive to suggestions.
35. The principal is accessible when needed.
36. The principal takes time to listen.
37. Teachers feel free to share ideas and concerns about school with the principal.
38. When teachers discuss a problem with the principal, the principal demonstrates an understanding and appreciation of how teachers feel about the problem.
39. When talking to the principal, teachers have the feeling the principal is sincerely interested in what they are saying.
40. Through effective management of the day-by-day operation of the school, the principal promotes among staff, parents, and community a feeling of confidence in the school.
41. The principal finds the time to interact with students.
42. Students feel free to initiate communication with the principal.
43. Students in the school view the principal as a leader of school spirit.
44. The principal encourages student leadership.
45. The principal helps develop student responsibility.
46. The principal is highly visible to the student body.
47. The principal positively reinforces students.
48. The principal enjoys working with students.
49. The principal keeps teachers informed about those aspects of the school program of which they should be aware.
50. When the principal provides teachers with the information about school operations, the information is clear and easily understood.
51. When teachers are informed of administrative decisions, they are aware of what the principal expects of them as it relates to the decision.
52. The principal is able to organize activities, tasks, and people.
53. The principal develops appropriate rules and procedures.
54. The principal uses systematic procedures for staff appraisal, e.g. retention, dismissal, promotion procedures.
55. The principal establishes the overall tone for discipline in the school.
56. The principal establishes a process by which students are made aware of school rules and policies.
57. The principal communicates to teachers the reasons for administrative practices used in the school.
58. The principal works with other leaders of the school in the implementation of a team approach to managing the school.
59. The principal encourages faculty to be sensitive to the needs and values of other faculty in the school.
60. The principal helps teachers clarify or explain their thoughts by discussing those thoughts with them.
61. During meetings, the principal involves persons in the discussion who might otherwise not participate.
62. The principal shares personal feelings and opinions about school issues with teachers.
63. Humor used by the principal helps to improve the school environment by creating a more congenial working climate.
64. Personal thoughts shared by the principal about school help teachers develop a sense of pride and loyalty as members of the school.

65. The principal is knowledgeable of the general goals and objectives of the curricular areas.
66. The principal is knowledgeable of the varied teaching strategies teachers might appropriately utilize during instruction.
67. The principal possesses instructional observation skills that provide the basis for accurate assessment of the teaching process in the classroom.
68. The principal actively and regularly participates in the observations and assessment of classroom instruction, including teaching strategies and student learning.
69. The principal has effective techniques for helping ineffective teachers.
70. The principal maintains an awareness and knowledge of recent research about the learning process.
71. When criticizing poor practices, the principal provides suggestions for improvement.
72. The principal is committed to instructional improvement.
73. The principal promotes the development of educational goals and objectives that reflect societal needs and trends.
74. The principal promotes the diagnosis of individual and group learning needs of student and application of appropriate instruction to meet those needs.
75. The principal administers a school-wide curricular program based upon identification of content goals and objectives and the monitoring of student achievement toward those goals and objectives.
76. The principal participates in instructional improvement activities such as program and curriculum planning and monitoring of student learning outcomes.
77. The principal uses objective data such as test scores to make changes in curriculum and staffing.
78. The principal has a systematic process for program review and change.
79. The principal encourages articulation of the curricular program.
80. Using the nine-point scale, give your rating of your principal's overall effectiveness.

## APPENDIX D: PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY

**Michael Stephens - RE: Audit of Principal Effectiveness**

---

**From:** "Valentine, Jerry W. (Emeritus)" <ValentineJ@missouri.edu>  
**To:** Michael Stephens <mstephens@union.k12.in.us>  
**Date:** 2/5/2013 3:11 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Audit of Principal Effectiveness  
**Attachments:** A. APE Instrument items without watermark 2-14-03.doc; B. APE Domain and Factor Descriptions 12-17-02.doc; C. APE Factors with items per factor 2-14-03doc.doc; D. APE Scoring Spreadsheet 9-05.xls

---

Michael Stephens

I am writing to provide you with permission to use the Audit of Principal Effectiveness for your doctoral research study at Indiana State University. This permission is granted based upon your compliance with the IRB research guidelines established at ISU. I wish you the best of luck with your study. Please send me a PDF copy of your final study so that I may read the study and findings. I am attaching four files that might be of help as you prepare your proposal and study.

Jerry Valentine

Jerry W. Valentine, Ph.D.  
 Professor Emeritus  
 University of Missouri  
 1266 Sunset Drive  
 Columbia, MO 65203  
 (573) 356-8948

---

**From:** Michael Stephens [mailto:mstephens@union.k12.in.us]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 05, 2013 2:58 PM  
**To:** Valentine, Jerry W. (Emeritus)  
**Subject:** RE: Audit of Principal Effectiveness

Dr. Valentine,  
 Be assured that all respondents shall remain anonymous and that I will follow all ISU IRB guidelines. I will certainly send your regards to Dr. Gruenert, he has been a big help and will be invited to the next scramble I am in.  
 Thank you for your help.

Mike

APPENDIX E: PERMISSION TO USE VALENTINE & BOWMAN REPORT OF  
NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED SCHOOLS

>>> "Valentine, Jerry W. (Emeritus)" <ValentineJ@missouri.edu> 9/28/2014 10:21 PM >>>

Mike

You have permission to include the report in your study as an appendix.

Jerry

Jerry W. Valentine, Ph.D.

Professor Emeritus

University of Missouri

1266 Sunset Drive

Columbia, MO 65203

(573) 356-8948

ValentineJ@missouri.edu

[www.ipistudentengagement.com](http://www.ipistudentengagement.com)

[www.education.missouri.edu/orgs/mlc](http://www.education.missouri.edu/orgs/mlc)

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Stephens [mailto:mstephens@union.k12.in.us]

Sent: Saturday, September 27, 2014 7:02 PM

To: Valentine, Jerry W. (Emeritus)

Subject: Nationally Recognized Report

r. Valentine,

I am putting the finishing touches on my work, and while in my defense, Dr. Todd Whitaker suggested I used your report looking at random versus Nationally recognized schools from 1989. I would ask your permission to use this entire report as an appendix. If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know

Thank you,

Mike

The information contained in this email and any attachments is confidential and may be subject to copyright or other intellectual property protection. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to use or disclose this information, and we request that you notify us by reply mail or telephone and delete the original message from your mail system.

## APPENDIX F: LETTER TO PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS



## Indiana State University

November 18, 2013

Dear Superintendent/Principal,

I am a Ph.D. student in Educational Leadership at Indiana State University and I am conducting a study of teacher perceptions of principal leadership actions in Indiana high schools. The objective of this research project is to attempt to compare teacher perceptions of principal leadership actions in A rated schools as compared to B-F rated schools to see if there is any difference. Through your participation, I eventually hope to understand how best to satisfy the needs of high schools and the principals that lead them.

The survey to be utilized is the Audit of Principal Effectiveness (APE) developed by Valentine and Bowman. This survey is attached for your review. The link to the survey to be used by your teachers is [https://indstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_6PDPWjMY6Je6Znf](https://indstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6PDPWjMY6Je6Znf)

If you or your teachers choose to participate, do not attach any name to the questionnaire in any manner. I do not need to know any respondent identifier other than a method to codify A and B-F schools. No one will know whether you or your personnel participated in this study. Your responses will not be identified with you personally, the information will be tied to the school with which you work so as to identify the A and B-F schools. Nothing you say on the questionnaire will in any way will be shared with your school/corporation so as to avoid any influence on your present or future employment with your school corporation.

I hope you will take a few minutes to complete this survey. Without the help of people like you, research on schools, teaching and school leadership could not be conducted. Your participation is voluntary and there is no penalty if you do not participate.

If you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire or about participating in this study, you may contact me at (219) 759-2531 or at [mstephens1@sycampores.indstate.edu](mailto:mstephens1@sycampores.indstate.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN 47809, by phone at (812) 237-8217, or by e-mail at [irb@indstate.edu](mailto:irb@indstate.edu).

Sincerely,

*Michael Stephens*

Michael Stephens Ed.S.  
Assistant Superintendent  
Union Township Schools  
Ph.D. Student, Indiana State University

## APPENDIX G: EMAIL TO PRINCIPALS

## PhD Work

Michael Stephens

Wed 4/30/2014 3:49 PM

Sent Items

 2 attachments

427863 IRB Revised Informed Consent (Exhibit C) Anonymous Survey Cover Letter.doc; APE Instrument items without watermark 2-14-03.doc;

Principals,

The attached information will address a survey I am conducting in pursuit of my PhD. I will also be contacting your Superintendent regarding this process. With your blessing, please either forward the ISU Qualtrics Survey link contained within the IRB informed consent letter to the teachers at your DOE identified High School. (Only those schools identified as High School in the grading format need reply.)

Or, if you would prefer I contact your teachers directly, please provide me with a manner to reach them via their email.

The survey itself will take approximately 10 minutes. I will be glad to share the results of the survey with any of you.

Please the the attached.

Thank you,

Mike Stephens  
Assistant Superintendent  
Union Township School Corporation.

## APPENDIX H: OVERALL SURVEY AVERAGE SCORES PER ITEM

Question number	Average score	Responses
12	7.78	236
13	7.75	236
48	7.75	208
3	7.67	239
46	7.58	216
5	7.46	239
47	7.45	213
72	7.44	205
40	7.41	216
41	7.41	215
44	7.37	214
33	7.34	215
36	7.33	217
68	7.31	205
14	7.30	234
56	7.30	213
6	7.27	237
50	7.27	215
15	7.25	236
52	7.25	214
16	7.23	232
49	7.23	215
4	7.22	238
35	7.18	216
73	7.18	204
1	7.17	241
39	7.16	217
42	7.15	212
63	7.15	207
37	7.13	214
53	7.13	215
66	7.12	206
58	7.11	214

Question number	Average score	Responses
65	7.10	207
51	7.09	214
23	7.07	211
38	7.07	214
45	7.07	214
64	7.07	204
34	7.06	215
54	7.06	210
59	7.06	211
70	7.06	203
19	7.05	240
2	7.03	240
67	7.03	202
74	7.03	198
75	7.03	201
7	7.02	240
18	7.02	240
62	7.01	204
32	7.00	216
20	6.99	217
55	6.99	215
79	6.92	200
22	6.91	216
28	6.89	213
76	6.89	202
77	6.89	199
57	6.87	212
71	6.85	196
17	6.83	233
25	6.79	216
21	6.78	216
30	6.78	215
60	6.76	203
43	6.73	215
24	6.72	216
11	6.69	233
9	6.68	234
8	6.67	239
78	6.61	199
27	6.59	213