

Factors Influencing Rural Superintendent Tenure in a Midwestern State

Shawn Yates, EdD
Superintendent
Ada-Borup School District
Ada, MN

David De Jong, EdD
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, SD

Abstract

The position of superintendent has long been characterized by high rates of turnover. The purpose of this study was to examine the factors that influence the anticipated length of service of the current superintendents in a Midwestern state. It examined superintendent responses to determine trends affecting length of tenure. The findings of this study showed a disconnect in superintendent recognition of the most challenging aspect of the position. While current superintendents overwhelmingly recognize the importance of relationships, they tend to put less effort into strengthening their relationship with the local school board. As such, deterioration of that relationship leads to the most frequently reported rationale for superintendent departure from a district. Additionally, the study determined that the most significant factor that would convince young superintendents to remain with a school district is offering an increase in compensation. Some turnover is expected given the age of many superintendents as they ascend to the position, but with an influx of young district leaders it is crucial that school boards offer assistance monetarily and through training and recognition of the importance of relationship to successful district tenure.

Key Words

superintendent tenure; rural leadership; relationships with school board members

One hundred years ago the *Journal of Education* noted, “There is nothing more professional in American education than the administration of school systems” (p. 695). To this day the office of superintendent in the public school system is viewed as both crucial and pivotal to the success of both students and communities. “Superintendents know they can change the trajectory of children's lives, alter the behavior of organizations, and expand the possibilities of whole communities” (Houston, 2001, p. 428). “The public school superintendency is a critically important leadership position” (Boyland, 2013, p. 87). Given the importance of the position, it is not surprising that with it comes intense pressure and difficulty. As such, the office of superintendent in the public school system is characterized by high stress and frequent turnover (Hawk, 2011, p. 364).

According to the *2016 American Association of School Administrators Superintendent Salary & Benefits Study*, half of the superintendents served in their present position from one to five years and a quarter of superintendents served from six to ten years (Domenech, 2017). In the state of South Dakota that figure has topped the national average each of the past two years.

According to figures compiled by Rob Monson, School Administrators of South Dakota Executive Director, 23% of public school districts in South Dakota hired a new superintendent in 2013, while in 2014 that figure topped 25%. These figures reflect school district change in superintendents through retirement as well as those individuals either leaving the state, leaving the profession, or leaving a district and taking a superintendent position with another school district within the state of South Dakota.

The tenure of a superintendent has an important direct connection to students, teachers, policies, and achievement. Alsbury (2008) contended that frequent turnover in the superintendent position, “can impede the attainment of positive school reform” (p. 205). The effects are especially pronounced in rural districts. Alsbury (2008) stated,

In districts of 500 or fewer, often the superintendent acts as the principal of a single K–12 school, and thus would have a more direct connection to the classroom level, and more potential for a direct influence on student achievement changes. (p. 210)

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) has studied superintendent turnover since the 1920s. These studies paint a bleak picture regarding consistency of leadership in educational systems across demographics and regional differences. The AASA recognizes that the average length of service is lowest in the largest and smallest districts nationwide (Dlugosh, 1995). According to the South Dakota 2013 Fall Enrollment Census data, only 23 districts had 1,000 students or more. In contrast, more than 100 districts had fewer than 500 students, with 25 districts serving between 500 and 999 students (*Student Membership Reports*, 2014).

Given these demographics, it is clearly important that the factors that lead to higher rates of turnover, especially in rural areas, be studied. In order to have a more clear understanding of direction, to correct any deficiencies, and to prepare the next generation of school leaders, it must first be understood which factors may affect superintendent length of service. The purpose of the study was to examine the factors that influence the length of

service of the current superintendents in the state of South Dakota.

Statement of the Problem

While the pinnacle of the educational administrative track, the superintendency has long been a position of shortened tenure (Yee & Cubin, 1996). While it is an area that reporters have documented and discussed for over a century, little research has been undertaken to determine the cause (Waters & Marzano, 2007). Some recent studies have been conducted that examine superintendent turnover on the east coast, west coast, and south central United States (Boyland, 2013; Johnson, Huffman, Madden, & Shope, 2011; Keedy, 2007; Trevino, 2008; Wolverton, 2002). No recent studies have been directly focused in South Dakota.

Being at the top of the organization, many superintendents have arrived at their position following years of teaching and filling lower level administrative positions (Haar & Robicheau, 2007). Often, by the time individuals arrive at this pinnacle of the administrative pyramid they are advancing in age. According to data collected by the School Administrators of South Dakota, the average age of superintendents in the state hovers just over 52.

Half of the superintendents said they did not plan to be on the job by the end of five years. This corresponds with the modal age of the superintendent at between 56 and 60 and the tenuous nature of the job. So, should things not work out, retirement becomes a viable option. (Domenech, 2010, p. 47)

Increasingly however, individuals filling the mid-level administrative roles are not attempting to seek to fill this top administrative

role when it becomes available (Boyland, 2013).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors that influence the length of service of the current superintendents in the state of South Dakota. It examined rural South Dakota school superintendent responses to questions to determine trends affecting length of tenure. Factors affecting superintendent tenure in the state of South Dakota included the importance of personal characteristics, rewarding and challenging aspects of the superintendency, the rationale for superintendent departure, and the feasibility of incentives directed at increasing superintendent tenure. The study also examined the differences in superintendent responses based upon demographic factors.

In addition to analyzing the overall perceptions of superintendents, the study sought to determine potential areas to aide in the preparation of new school leaders and serves as a guide for the local school board to recognize characteristics of potential leaders and what they as a body can do to increase the longevity of the superintendent position.

Research Questions

Six research questions guided this study:

1. How important do superintendents consider the selected qualities of successful superintendents?
2. How important do superintendents consider the selected rewarding aspects of the superintendency?
3. How important do superintendents consider the selected challenging aspects of the superintendency?

4. How important do superintendents consider the selected perceived rationale for superintendent departure?
5. To what extent do superintendents agree regarding the feasibility of convincing superintendents to stay in their current position?
6. What differences are there in superintendents' perceptions regarding expected tenure based on the following demographic variables?
 - a. Gender
 - b. Age
 - c. Salary
 - d. Education
 - e. Size of District
 - f. Job Satisfaction
 - g. Superintendent Experience

Review of the Related Literature

The position of superintendent has been essential and challenging for generations. Reports from the *Journal of Education* in June 1914 recognized the importance of the district leader, as well as outlined the difficulties and public vilification each individual received without regard to the decisions that were made.

Yaffe (2015) recounted ways in which modern technology has improved the ability to communicate valuable information yet has also increased the ease and frequency with which the abilities of the superintendent can be publicly questioned. The pressure has increased as the duties have multiplied, especially for those holding the position of superintendent in rural districts.

In rural districts the superintendent often maintains responsibility for multiple roles. The added functions increase the tension

and difficulties that lead to additional stress and pressure. “The challenge and reality of juggling two positions at once left most of the administrators in the study with eroded enthusiasm as they were divided among a myriad of tasks, activities, and competing interests” (McGuire, 1994, p. 31).

The added stress and responsibilities directly lead to increased turnover and the movement of superintendents to larger districts with increased professional opportunity and additional compensation.

The challenges faced by superintendents have made it difficult to recruit highly qualified individuals to fill the role of district leader. Lamkin (2006) noted,

Fewer candidates find attractive the role of school superintendent, and many school administrators now wait until the end of their careers before they venture into the superintendency. Further, many “middle managers” among public school administrators – for example, principals, curriculum directors, and associate superintendents – see vividly the daily stresses and difficulties in the role of superintendent and choose consciously to avoid those problems by not advancing their careers into the superintendency. (p. 17)

The implications of the choice to avoid the ascension to superintendent requires intensive training on the part of those individuals willing to fill the void. Ellis (2016) states, “The challenge remains how to best

make sure those filling positions as superintendents are prepared to maximize such potential impact once in the position” (p. 35). The local school board must also recognize the challenges faced by the superintendent and be willing to work closely with the individual to ensure success for the entire district.

Changing demands

The office of the superintendent in a public school district is a position requiring intensive education and training. Boyland (2013) noted in her research that, “Superintendents are charged with setting the district’s vision, developing capacity for quality teaching and learning, initiating and implementing policies, building relationships between constituency groups, and appropriately allocating resources” (p. 87). Boyland continued to note that, “As the district’s school improvement leader, the superintendent is also expected to be a constructive and productive agent of change” (Boyland, 2013, p. 87).

Impact on districts

At the time when a superintendent vacates a position, whether it be voluntary or involuntary, it has an impact on the entire district. The difficulty carries beyond the superintendent and permeates the community: “Superintendent transitions, even under the best circumstances, bring uncertainty to organizations that require stability to thrive” (Cook, 2006, p. 14).

The problems exacerbate when moving into the larger context of the community. Short tenures create a public perception of increased instability, lowered morale, a loss of organizational direction and ‘vision,’ and a general sense by the staff of ‘here we go again,’ that the district will undergo yet another round of short-lived programs and policies. (Yee & Cuban, 1996, p. 616)

Change takes time to implement as well. “Stability is important,” said Paul D. Houston, past executive director for the American Association of School Administrators. “If you are a district that is impatient, nobody is going to be there to see things change. By the time you are ready to bear fruit, there’s no tree left” (Brodie, 2008, p. 4). The impact is felt strongly by the staff of the district.

The impact is felt all the way through to the students in the classrooms of our schools. Forner, Bierlein-Palmer, and Reeves (2012) noted that successful superintendents are hands-on regarding the instruction and monitoring of student academic performance.

The engaged superintendent will also be able to implement programs that encourage student success (p. 11). “More recent research examining the effects of superintendent leadership on student achievement found a positive correlation between longer superintendent tenures and higher student-test scores” (Kamrath & Brunner, 2014, p. 435). Sparks (2012) explained, “Stability at the central office has been linked to a greater likelihood of success for new education initiatives, which typically take five to seven years to mature” (p. 19).

Methodology and Procedures

This study utilized a superintendent online survey developed by the researcher as shown in Appendix A. The survey contained questions similar to surveys discovered during the literature review.

The population of the study included the superintendents of the 127 school districts in the state of South Dakota that service populations of fewer than 1,000 students.

These superintendents were identified as the population because the primary researcher was a superintendent of a district in South Dakota with fewer than 1,000 students. Survey responses were received from 103 (81.1%) of current superintendents from qualifying districts. The researcher examined the responses for demographic groupings as well as for overall perceptions regarding the research questions. The data were examined utilizing means and standard deviations to determine the importance that superintendent respondents ascribe to the selected qualities of successful superintendents.

The researcher utilized means and standard deviations to determine the importance of both rewarding and challenging aspects of the superintendency from the perspective of superintendents.

The researcher examined the respondent data and conducted a series of one-way analyses of variance to determine differences in superintendent perceptions regarding numerous demographic variables.

Limitations and Delimitations

Several factors may affect the interpretation and generalizability of the results of this study.

1. The study was limited to the superintendents of K-12 public school districts within the state of South

Dakota. Results should not be generalized to states with a vastly different makeup of rural, suburban, and urban districts.

2. The primary researcher was a member of the group of 151 public school superintendents being studied. This relationship could impact data in ways that cannot be determined.
3. The respondents were answering a survey generated by the researcher. This is a delimitation of the study, as a different survey tool may find different results.

Findings

The findings of each analysis are detailed within this next section. Each survey question was established on a Likert scale with a score of 1 identified as *Not at all important* and a score of 5 identified as *Very important*. Statistically significance was identified at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Qualities of successful superintendents

Research question one determined the extent to which current superintendents rated the importance of personal qualities held by successful superintendents. The data depicted in Table 1 indicate that superintendents find most of the character qualities to be either important or essential to the success of a district superintendent.

Table 1

Important Qualities of Successful Superintendents

Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation
Leadership	4.670	0.493
Approachable	4.631	0.560
Personable	4.621	0.544
Relational	4.602	0.583
Verbal Communicator	4.583	0.586
Student-Centered	4.505	0.684
Thick Skin	4.427	0.680
Flexible	4.427	0.636
Educator	4.301	0.725
Community Focused	4.272	0.703
Visionary	4.243	0.693
Written Communicator	4.078	0.725
Unyielding	2.903	1.133

Rewarding aspects of the superintendency

Research question two determined the extent to which current superintendents rated the importance of rewarding aspects of the position of district superintendent. Table 2 depicts that the one essential rewarding aspect of the

superintendency as reported by existing superintendents of districts that service 1000 students or less in the state of South Dakota was that of helping students succeed ($M = 4.81$, $SD = .40$).

Table 2

Rewarding Aspects of the Superintendency

Aspects	Mean	Standard Deviation
Helping students succeed	4.806	0.3975
Helping staff achieve their goals	4.330	0.7056
Making decisions	3.971	0.8455
Diversity of daily tasks	3.874	0.7881
Community visibility	3.796	0.8785
Compensation (salary & benefits)	3.563	0.9668
Meeting state standards	3.272	1.0590
Prestige	2.757	1.0798

Challenging aspects of the superintendency

Research question three determined the extent to which current superintendents rated the most challenging aspects of the position of district superintendent. Each survey question was established on a Likert scale with a score of one

identified as *Not at all challenging* and a score of five identified as *Very challenging*. Superintendent respondents closely ranked four definitive challenges, while a fifth qualified in the category as well as shown on Table 3.

Table 3

Challenging Aspects of the Superintendency

Challenge faced	Mean	Standard Deviation
Lack of family time	3.874	0.9669
Meeting budgetary constraints	3.864	1.0669
Navigating politics	3.816	0.9367
Lack of personal time	3.806	1.0484
Making difficult decisions	3.631	1.1114
Making personnel decisions	3.544	1.0551
Being on display	3.437	0.9869
Board relations	3.117	1.0874

Rationale for departure

Research question four determined the extent to which current superintendents perceive are important factors and rationale for the departure of the position of district superintendent. The responses are delineated in

Table 4, with only board relations ($M = 4.29$, $SD=1.03$) and better professional opportunity ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.42$) ranking in the range of important definitive factors leading to superintendent departure from a district.

Table 4

Importance of Perceived Rationale for Departure from a District

Reason for departure	Means	Standard Deviation
Board Relations	4.291	1.0255
Better professional opportunity	3.689	1.4213
Compensation	3.330	1.3090
Pressure / Workload	3.320	1.3152
Geography	2.786	1.5571

Convincing reasons to stay

Research question five determined the extent to which current superintendents perceive are important factors and rationale for convincing the district superintendent to remain in the

current position. The data collected regarding the three factors that could convince superintendents to remain are represented in Table 5.

Table 5

Factors That Could Convince Superintendents to Remain

Factor	Means	Standard Deviations
Compensation	3.806	1.2131
Improved board relations	3.408	1.3243
Workload relief	3.010	1.2947

Based on the statistical analysis the following 12 research findings emerged:

1. The researcher noted that respondents were primarily in agreement regarding the important qualities of successful superintendents.
2. All of the qualities presented, with one exception, were noted as important with a mean score of greater than 4.00 on a five-point scale and a standard deviation of less than 0.73.
3. When examining the rewarding aspects of the superintendency, the researcher noted that respondents most strongly identified with qualities pertaining to assisting others. The data collected regarding assisting students and staff both had means greater than 4.00 on a five-point scale and a standard deviation of less than 0.71.
4. Given a list of potential challenging aspects of the superintendency, respondents ranked board relations as the least challenging aspect of the position.
5. The researcher noted that board relations was the most significant reason given regarding rationale for superintendent departure, receiving a mean score of 4.29 on a five-point scale and a standard deviation of 1.03.
6. Respondents noted an increase in compensation as being the most convincing rationale for a district to be able to retain the current superintendent.
7. Statistically significant differences were noted in years of superintendent experience regarding rationale for departure. Respondents with the most experience were significantly less likely than those with less experience to leave based upon compensation and better professional opportunity. No significant differences were found for convincing rationale to stay regarding the level of experience.
8. Statistically significant differences were noted in level of superintendent education regarding both rationale for departure as well as convincing rationale to stay. Those with doctoral degrees were significantly less likely to leave based on the pressure and work load, and likewise less likely to stay if offered a lessened work load.
9. Statistically significant differences were noted in level of superintendent job satisfaction regarding both rationale for departure as well as convincing rationale to stay.
10. Respondents reporting the highest satisfaction levels were significantly less likely than those with average satisfaction to leave based on compensation and geographic location. Respondents with the lowest levels of job satisfaction were significantly more likely than those with the highest satisfaction to report improved board relations as a rationale to stay.
11. The most variability and statistically significant differences occurred when comparing groups by age regarding both rationale for departure as well as convincing rationale to stay.

12. No statistically significant difference was noted among the demographic variables of gender, salary level, or district size for either rationale for departure or convincing rationale to stay.

Discussion

The superintendent position, especially in rural districts, affords the individual a myriad of both challenges and opportunities. As stated by Garn (2003), superintendents in rural districts are more likely to serve in a dual capacity (filling additional administrative roles or teaching), and they are also more likely to relocate to a rural district with similar student populations.

However, relationships with students and constituents are also more likely to occur on deeper levels in rural settings. When discussing successful rural superintendents, Chance (1992) stated, "Respondents mentioned 'open communication' as the key to their longevity. In their relationships with the board, the superintendents said they had congenial, understanding board members who let the administrators run the school" (p. 477).

Superintendent respondents overwhelmingly recognized the importance of relationship and service to others. When ranking the importance of various qualities of successful superintendents, the relational and service aspects were most clearly defined as being essential to success. Superintendents who desire to see others succeed are themselves recognized as having achieved success. The value of the superintendent is therefore defined in the level of service they give to others.

In order to be successful, relationships must be developed amongst students, staff, parents, community members, and the board.

Unfortunately, superintendent respondents significantly ranked the issue of board relationships as the least challenging aspect of the position. Given the myriad tasks required of rural superintendents, anything determined to be not challenging will receive minimal effort, as the multitude of daily tasks and recognized challenges receive the bulk of the superintendent's available time and resources. This can lead to a break down in the most essential relational aspect of the position.

When the relationship between the board and superintendent is compromised or breached in a negative way, it is likely that the superintendent will seek employment elsewhere.

However, superintendents in this study perceived that board relations are the least challenging aspect of the position.

One interpretation of this contradiction is that there may be a disconnect between a superintendent's perception of the quality of his or her relationship with school board member and the perception of the quality of this same relationship from the perspective of the school board member.

This is significant because it may provide a deeper understanding into the complex relationships between superintendents and school board members.

The collapse or disintegration of the board relationship with the superintendent consequently leads respondents of all gender, ages, salary levels, degrees obtained, levels of experience, professional level, or job satisfaction to terminate employment.

The oldest and most experienced superintendents in rural districts in South Dakota are not likely to be swayed by any

rationale regarding seeking employment elsewhere including compensation, preferred geographical location, intense pressure and workload, or better professional opportunities. The one exception that can cause the oldest and most experienced superintendents to seek employment elsewhere or retire early is the breakdown in the board relationship.

Being at the pinnacle of the K-12 education system, individuals that hold the superintendent position are not likely to be able to utilize educational degrees or experience to leverage greater compensation or a lessened work load, especially in rural districts. Therefore, younger superintendents may be more likely to seek employment opportunities that significantly increase their compensation or hold the promise of a professional increase through servicing a larger number of students. While not driven by personal prestige, the compensation difference and ability to focus on the task of being a superintendent may lead both young and those with less than doctoral degrees to pursue employment in other districts.

Given the increased levels of turnover in the superintendent position in South Dakota over the past two years, we can expect to see high levels for several years to come. As younger superintendents with less experience fill positions in rural districts, it will likely lead to continued increased turnover not only through retirement of older and experienced superintendents, but also through the churn of younger, less experienced superintendents transitioning to higher paying districts offering better professional opportunities. The rural districts often benefit from passionate educators with fresh ideas; however, as the superintendents mature and grow, they are more likely to leave the rural districts to receive more compensation and a smaller work load

regarding the various duties performed in the rural districts.

Conclusions

The data analysis and findings of the study present the following conclusions:

1. Relationships are perceived as the driving force behind success in the superintendent position. The qualities closely linked to relationship were ranked among the most crucial qualities of successful superintendents. The only essential rewarding aspect of the superintendent position was relational in helping students to succeed, closely followed by helping staff achieve their goals.
2. Superintendents believe board relations to be the least challenging aspect of the position. As such, it is a low priority since it is deemed less important and not as difficult as the myriad other daily tasks facing rural superintendents.
3. The lapse of board relations is the primary rationale leading to superintendent departure. Even superintendents in the oldest age bracket, and therefore closest to retirement, are likely to consider a lapse in board relations as a valid rationale for departure.
4. The youngest and least experienced superintendents, most likely supporting young families and positioning themselves professionally are most driven by compensation and better professional opportunities, and therefore more likely to leave rural schools for larger districts.

Recommendations for Practice

The following recommendations for practice emerged based upon the results of this study. Nearly one-half of the respondents had fewer than five years of experience. Nearly one-third of respondents were less than 45 years old and

nearly two-thirds of respondents were serving their first district as superintendent. The researchers in this study anticipate witnessing a continued high rate of turnover amongst rural districts in the state of South Dakota unless the following issues are addressed:

1. Superintendent compensation must be addressed in the rural districts. Both groups of the youngest respondents were statistically significantly more likely to stay in their current position if offered additional compensation.
2. Superintendents and school boards must actively pursue ways to strengthen and deepen their relationship.
3. Training of superintendents must include recognition of the importance of relationship as a driving factor of the position. While human relations courses are required for administrative certification, there needs to be a focus on productive strategies to address and mitigate difficult circumstances, while also recognizing conflict management as an integral skill.

Author Biographies

Shawn Yates is superintendent of Ada-Borup Public Schools in Ada, MN. Previous experience includes service as a teacher, coach, principal, and superintendent. He serves on multiple state association leadership committees and was appointed to the Minnesota Board of Social Work in 2017. He is passionate about education, the importance of relationships, innovations in PreK-12 education, and mentoring. He maintains a blog linking pop culture with education and is active on Twitter at @DrSWYates. E-mail: shawny@ada.k12.mn.us

David De Jong is an assistant professor in the division of educational leadership at the University of South Dakota School of Education. He teaches graduate online and hybrid courses and chairs doctoral dissertation committees. In May of 2017, he was awarded the University of South Dakota School of Education Teaching in Excellence award. Previous experience includes service as a teacher, coach, principal, and superintendent. His research production includes nine peer-reviewed journal publications, one report, and seven peer-reviewed presentations at national conferences. His research agenda includes four topics: educational leadership, innovations in PreK-12 education, mentoring, and innovations in technology for teaching in PreK-20 education. E-mail: David.DeJong@usd.edu

References

- Alsbury, T. L. (2008). School board member and superintendent turnover and the influence on student achievement: An application of the dissatisfaction theory. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 7(2), 202-229.
- Boyland, L. (2013). Principals' perceptions of the superintendency: A five-state study. *Planning & Changing*, 44(1/2), 87-110.
- Brodie, J. (2008). Playing for the home team: Superstars who stay put. *Education Daily*, 41(108), 1-4.
- Chance, E. W., & Capps, J. L. (1992). Superintendent instability in small/rural schools: The school board perspective. *Journal of School Leadership*, 2(4), 470-482.
- Cook, G. (2006). Comings & goings. *American School Board Journal*, 193(2), 14-17.
- Dlugosh, L. L. (1995). The moving puzzle: School size, politics, and superintendent tenure. *Rural Educator*, 16(2), 16-20.
- Domenech, D. (2010). AASA's status check on the superintendency. *The School Administrator*, 11(67), 47.
- Ellis, J. & Muncie, I. (2016) Why not allow school boards to choose alternatives to traditionally trained superintendents? *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 15(4), 26.
- Fornier, M., Bierlein-Palmer, L., & Reeves, P. (2012). Leadership practices of effective rural superintendents: Connections to Waters and Marzano's leadership correlates. *Journal Of Research In Rural Education*, 27(8), 1-13.
- Garn, G. (2003). A closer look at rural superintendents. *Rural Educator*, 25(1), 3-9.
- Haar, J. M., & Robicheau, J. W. (2007). A 2006 study of the supply and demand of Minnesota public school administrators. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 4(3), 26-33.
- Hawk, N., & Martin, B. (2011). Understanding and reducing stress in the superintendency. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 39(3), 364-390.
- Houston, P. (2001). Superintendents for the 21st Century. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 428.
- Johnson, J., Huffman, T., Madden, K., Shope, S., & Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia, (. (2011). Superintendent turnover in Kentucky. Summary. Issues & Answers. REL 2011-No. 113. *Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia*.
- Kamrath, B., & Brunner, C. (2014). Blind spots: Small rural communities and high turnover in the superintendency. *Journal of School Leadership*, 24(3), 424-451.

- Keedy, J. L., Björk, L. G., Winter, P. A., Rinehart, J. S., & Ricciardi, P. (2007). Is there a crisis in the superintendency? The case of Kentucky. *Research In The Schools*, 14(2), 49-63.
- Lamkin, M. L. (2006). Challenges and changes faced by rural superintendents. *Rural Educator*, 28(1), 17-24.
- McGuire, J. (1994). Visionary democratic leaders of very small districts: Getting the job done right. *Rural Educator*, 16(1), 30-35.
- Sparks, S. D. (2012). Study Dissects Superintendent Job Turnovers. *Education Week*, 32(13), 1-19.
- Student Membership Reports (<http://doe.sd.gov/ofm/documents/Pubdsgr13.xlsx>).
- The School Superintendent's Association. (2017). *2016 AASA Superintendent salary & benefit study* [PDF File]. Alexandria, VA: Domenech, D. Retrieved from <http://www.aasa.org/research.aspx>.
- Trevino, D. R., Braley, R. T., Brown, M., & Slate, J. R. (2008). Challenges of the public school superintendency: Differences by tenure and district location. *Florida Journal of Educational Administration & Policy*, 1(2), 98-109.
- Waters, J., & Marzano, R. J. (2007). School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement. *ERS Spectrum*, 25(2), 1-12.
- Wolverton, M., & Macdonald, R. (2002). The Northwest's phantom pool: Superintendent certificate holders who do not plan to apply and why.
- Yaffe, D. (2015). Forge a strong relationship. *District Administration*, 51(4), 45-48.
- Yee, G., & Cuban, L. (1996). When is tenure long enough? A historical analysis of superintendent turnover and tenure in urban school districts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32.

APPENDIX A

Superintendent Survey

Superintendent Survey

Demographic Information

Gender?	- Male - Female
Age?	- 30-44 - 45-59 - 60+
Current Salary (Administrative Salary – NOT including additional duties)?	- \$50,000 - \$64,999 - \$65,000 - \$79,999 - \$80,000 - \$94,999 - \$95,000+
Highest Completed Educational Degree?	- Bachelors - Masters - Specialist - Doctorate
Size of Current District?	- 0 – 350 students - 351 – 700 students - 701 – 1,000 students - 1,001+ students

Personal Information

How many years have you been a superintendent (total number of years throughout your career)?	- 1 – 5 years - 6 – 10 years - 11 – 14 years - 15+ years
Number of schools you have served as superintendent (total throughout your career)?	- 1 school - 2 schools - 3 schools - 4 schools - 5+ schools
How many years did you serve as superintendent at school 1?	- 1 – 4 years - 5 – 9 years - 10 – 14 years - 15+ years
How many years did you serve as superintendent at school 2?	- 0 (N/A) - 1 – 4 years - 5 – 9 years - 10 – 14 years - 15+ years
How many years did you serve as superintendent at school 3?	- 0 (N/A) - 1 – 4 years - 5 – 9 years - 10 – 14 years - 15+ years
How many years did you serve as superintendent at school 4?	- 0 (N/A) - 1 – 4 years - 5 – 9 years - 10 – 14 years - 15+ years

Reasons for past departure from a district (Board Relations/Lack of Support)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
Reasons for past departure from a district (Compensation)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
Reasons for past departure from a district (Geographic Preference)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
Reasons for past departure from a district (Pressure/Work Load Intensity)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
Reasons for past departure from a district (Better Opportunity Elsewhere)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
Age at which you first became a superintendent in South Dakota?	- Insert number here
Career Aspirations?	- Large district superintendent - Small district superintendent - Teacher in higher education - Non-educational administrative position - Other
Contract type currently held?	- Single year - Multi-year (extending beyond May 2016) - Multi-year (ending at the close of the current year)
Hired from?	- Promoted from within the district - Came from out of district (previously in South Dakota) - Came from out of district (previously out of state)
How many hours do you typically spend on your job?	- 20 – 39 hours - 40 – 49 hours - 50 – 59 hours - 60+ hours

Job Satisfaction

How satisfied are you in your current position?	- Mostly satisfied - Somewhat satisfied - Neutral - Somewhat dissatisfied - Mostly dissatisfied
If possible, how long would you like to serve as superintendent at your current location?	- 1 - 3 years - 4 – 6 years - 7 – 9 years - 10+ years
At what age do you intend to retire?	Insert age here
Do you intend to remain a superintendent until you retire?	- Yes - No
What COULD cause you to leave your current position (Board Relations/Lack of Support)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
What COULD cause you to leave your current position (Geographic Preference)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
What COULD cause you to leave your current position (Pressure/Workload Intensity)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
What COULD cause you to leave your current position (Better Opportunity Elsewhere)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)

What of the following would entice you to stay in your current position (Compensation Increase)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
What of the following would entice you to stay in your current position? (Lighter Workload/More Assistance)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
What of the following would entice you to stay in your current position? (Improved Board Relations)?	- Rank on a scale from 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor)
How would you characterize the level of stress in your position as superintendent?	- No stress - Little stress - Moderate stress - Considerable stress - High stress

Superintendency

Characteristics of Superintendents	- Rank the following qualities on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thick Skin ○ Personable ○ Verbal Communicator ○ Relational ○ Leadership ○ Visionary ○ Educator ○ Student-Centered ○ Approachable ○ Flexible ○ Unyielding ○ Written Communicator
Rewarding Aspects of the Superintendency	- Rank the following rewarding aspects on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Helping staff achieve their goals ○ Helping students succeed ○ Meeting state standards ○ Making decisions ○ Compensation (salary and benefits) ○ Community visibility ○ Prestige ○ Diversity of daily tasks
Challenging Aspects of the Superintendency	- Rank the following challenging aspects faced by superintendents on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 = Not at all an important factor...5 = Very important factor) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Navigating politics ○ Being on display ○ Lack of family time ○ Lack of personal time ○ Making difficult decisions ○ Board relations ○ Making personal decisions ○ Meeting budgetary constraints