Journal of Scholarship & Practice

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

BROUGHT TO YOU
AS AN AASA MEMBER
SERVICE

Stand Up

Table of Contents

A Message From the Editor

Christopher H. Tienken
Seton Hall University

This issue marks the last set of manuscripts accepted for publication in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* under the editorship of Dr. Fred Dembowski. Fred provided the leadership and vision that propelled the Journal into the top tier of publications for our profession and made it a must read for school leaders across the country. I thank him for his insights and support during my transition to the editorship. Fred willingly answered my questions and helped ensure that I tied the loose ends.

I would be remiss if I did not thank several other folks who made this transition possible. Dr. Robert McCord worked with me to fill in the last minute blanks and was instrumental in making sure that submission and review processes remained seamless while I was learning the ropes. Dr. Ted Creighton of Virginia Tech and Dr. Gary Martin of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration worked with the leadership at AASA, through Claudia Mansfield-Sutton and the staff in her office, to upgrade the Journal's submission and review system to a web-based operation. It was a great example of the professoriate collaborating with education leadership practitioners to provide a high quality service.

This new professional partnership will ensure that the Journal continues to thrive for years to come. Barbara Dean deserves special thanks for her role as my sounding board. I would also like to thank my dean, Dr. Joseph Depierro, from Seton Hall University's College of Education and our department chair, Dr. Michael Osnato, for their generous support through the allocation of graduate assistants and travel funds.

This issue is expansive and speaks to the comprehensive nature of Fred Dembowski's work. You will find research articles about principal preparation programs, burnout among elementary school principals, and novice superintendents. The issue also presents best practice articles about leading change and preparing principals to work with guidance counselors. A commentary and book review anchor the winter issue and bring it to a proper conclusion.

Confronting the Unknown: Principal Preparation Training in Issues Related to Special Education

Pamela Angelle, PhD
Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator
Department of Educational Leadership and
    Policy Studies
College of Education, Health, and Human
    Sciences
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN

Lisa M. Bilton
Doctoral Candidate
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN

Principals face increasing demands to create learning environments that meet the needs of all students. Recent reform efforts through the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) (USDOE, 2002) and the *Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act* (IDEIA) (USDOE, 2004) place greater emphasis on improving student achievement.

The principal's role has expanded to include providing supportive environments that encourage reflective teachers, raising the academic bar, increasing student engagement and motivation, providing focused, sustainable professional development, building relationships, and monitoring improvement through data-based decision-making (Hoachlander, Alt, & Beltranena, 2001; Reitzug & Burrello, 1995).

From improving the problematic attrition rate among special education teachers to improving student performance among students with disabilities, principals have lasting effect on special education (DiPaola & Walther-Thomas, 2003; Gersten, Keating, Yovanoff, & Harniss, 2001). As Katsiyannis (1994) notes, "School principals are responsible for ensuring the appropriate education of all students, including those with disabilities. They must provide the leadership to develop the knowledge base and must have the competence to ensure compliance" (p. 6).

Shouldering this responsibility proves more difficult if principals are not fully prepared to meet these issues with confidence. Novice leaders require special education foundations as they begin their role as school administrators. Research suggests that most principals lack any background from coursework and field experience which may be required to exert strong leadership in special education (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Dipaola & Walther-Thomas, 2003).

This study examines principal preparation programs from the perspective of readiness to confront and/or support special education issues at the school building level. The purpose of our research was to answer the following questions:

- What is the principal's readiness level upon program completion in dealing with special education issues in the school?
- Are there differences between perceptions of preparedness to deal with special education issues in principals whose programs included an internship and those whose programs did not?
- Do recent graduates of principal preparation programs feel more prepared to confront and support special education issues than do long time graduates of principal preparation programs?

Perspectives

School leaders are often unprepared to assume the increased responsibility for special education (Crockett, 2002; DiPaola & Walther-Thomas, 2003; Doyle, 2001). DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2003) reported that the greatest need expressed by principals was help and information about implementing successful special education programs.

Elliott and Riddle (1992) found that although building principals may indicate they have assumed greater responsibility for special education programming in their buildings, they often refer problems to the central office special education administrator. Furthermore, building principals often do not have the required knowledge to evaluate special education personnel or to contribute to their growth (Doyle, 2001; Elliott & Riddle).

These issues have critical implications for how prepared principals are to deal with special education issues upon entering the principalship. Current reform efforts within both general education and special education aim to create a more unified system of educating all students (Gaddy, McNulty, & Waters, 2002) reinforcing the need for principals to understand special education.

Given the call throughout the literature to incorporate a knowledge base in special education into principal preparation programs, our research set out to elicit perceptions from practicing principals regarding the need for and usefulness of this foundation.

Data Collection

Based on current literature that suggests areas of necessary knowledge in special education for practicing principals, researchers constructed items related to the emphasis placed on special education issues in principal preparation programs.

Fifteen items using a dichotomous affirmative or negative response as well as items using a Likert type response array were posted as an online survey. E-mails explaining the study, ensuring anonymity, and requesting participation were sent to 553 practicing principals across one southeastern state, with a link to the site where the survey was posted.

Results from the survey were downloaded approximately sixty days after the initial e-mails were sent. Completed surveys resulted in n = 215 for a return rate of 39%. Descriptive statistics and preparation program differences were examined.

Findings

Thirty percent of the principals in this study reported an internship or practicum was

associated with their preparation program. Of this 30%, 74% reported that the duration of the internship was one college semester or less. When asked approximately how many internship hours were spent on special education-related matters, 69% indicated less than 50 hours while 25% indicated that no time was spent in this area of school leadership.

Respondents were asked how many courses in special education were completed during the preparation program. Participants reported the following: no classes = 53%; one class = 32%; two classes = 9% and three classes 6%.

When asked to detail where information about special education matters was most frequently obtained, sources included professional development (51%), professional conferences (42%), independent reading (41%), and collaborative work with special education personnel (89%) (participants were allowed to list more than one source; therefore, totals equate to more than 100%).

The comfort level of the principals in dealing with special education matters in light of their preparation was also examined. Respondents were grouped by those who did (n = 64) and did not (n = 151) have an internship as part of their preparation program. We found no statistical significance between the comfort levels of the groups in dealing with special education, regardless of the internship requirement.

When we examined the principal responses in terms of the length of time since they completed their preparation programs, along with the extent of their comfort, no statistical significance was found. Whether they completed their program less than five years ago (n = 30) or more than 15 years ago (n

= 73), their comfort level with special education issues did not significantly change.

However, we did find that the extent of comfort was statistically significant when we examined the respondents in terms of the number of special education courses included in their preparation programs. During the first year of administration for those who had at least one course in special education (n = 69) and those who had none (n = 113), principals reported an increased level of comfort with special education.

Conclusions

Our results suggest that internships do not provide sufficient preparation to assume a leadership role in special education matters within their buildings.

This finding is troubling given the emphasis administrator preparation programs place on the internship to provide real-world, hands-on experience to prepare principals for the responsibilities they will face in the principalship. Providing supervision of special education services for students with disabilities within their buildings is certainly one of those responsibilities.

On the other hand, our results indicate that even limited exposure to special education issues through coursework significantly improves comfort level in beginning principals. These results suggest that providing a knowledge base through formal coursework, even if this includes only one course, increases beginning principals' comfort level in dealing with special education responsibilities.

An examination of recent graduates of principal preparation programs with those principals who completed preparation program some years ago is particularly salient in light of

the requirements of federal legislation for schools.

Our results suggested that recent graduates of principal preparation programs felt no more comfortable with special education than graduates of fifteen or more years. This finding suggests that principal preparation programs have failed to address an area pertinent to the success of novice principals, that is, improving the knowledge base in special education issues.

Preparing future principals to lead in inclusive schools begins by creating truly inclusive leadership preparation programs. Findings from this study point out that even one course in the preparation program can significantly increase a novice principal's confidence in dealing with special education matters.

However, rather than simply adding on coursework, at the risk of further creating separate and exclusionary programs (Collins & White, 2002), embedding skill and knowledge areas into existing curriculum and integrating general education issues with special education issues will certainly better serve the aspiring administrators. In so doing, administrative

preparation programs will be created that ready principals for more inclusive practices upon assuming a leadership role.

This study points out the critical role that district level special education personnel play in the beginning stages of a principal's career. As noted here, principals turn to the knowledge core found at the district level for guidance and direction in dealing with special education issues. Thus, it is imperative that special education supervisors are provided with professional development opportunities so that knowledge will be current, accurate, and shared. Above all, district personnel should be available to school building level leaders, not only to increase the comfort level of principals regarding issues in special education but to ensure that federal mandates are being met.

While this study offers intriguing insights into the level of preparedness of principals to deal with special education issues, expanded research is needed to uncover more detailed information across a wider sample of preparation programs. As universities mold programs to better fit the needs of aspiring principals in an era of accountability for all children, consideration of special education issues remains critical.

Author Biographies

Pamela Angelle is assistant professor and program coordinator for the educational administration and supervision program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Her research interests include teacher leadership and distributed leadership in collaborative school communities.

Lisa Bilton is a special education coordinator with the student support services department in Williamson County school system in Franklin, Tennessee. She is a candidate for the PhD in leadership studies at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville.

References

Crockett, J. B. (2002). Special education's role in preparing responsive leaders for inclusive schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 23,* 157-169.

DiPaola, M. F., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the condition and concerns of principals. *National Association of Secondary Schools Bulletin, (87),* 43-67.

DiPaola, M. F., & Walther-Thomas, C. (2003). *Principals and special education: The critical role of school leaders* (COPSSE Document No. IB-7). Gainesville: University of Florida, Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education.

Doyle, L. H. (2001, April). *Leadership and inclusion: Reculturing for reform.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Elliot, B. & Riddle, M. (1992). *An effective interface between regular and special education: A synopsis of issues and successful practices. CASE information dissemination packet.* Bloomington, IN: Smith Research Center.

Gersten, R., Keating, T., Yovanoff, P., & Harniss, M. K. (2001). Working in special education: Factors that enhance special educators' intent to stay. *Exceptional Children, 67,* 549-553.

Gaddy, B., McNulty, B., & Waters T. (2002, April). *The reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: Moving toward a more unified system.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning, Aurora, CO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED467140)

Hoachlander, G., Alt, M. & Beltranena, R. (2001). *Leading school improvement: What research says. A review of literature.* Atlanta: Southern Region Educational Board.

Katisyannis, A. (1994). Individuals with disabilities: The school principal and Section 504. *NASSP Bulletin, 78,* 6-10.

Reitzug, U. C. & Burrello, L. C. (1995). How principals can build self-renewing schools. *Educational Leadership*, *52*(7), 48-50.

United States Department of Education. (2002). *No Child Left Behind.* ACCT-B2. Jessup, MD.

United States Department of Education. (2004). *Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act.* Jessup, MD.

Burnout Among Elementary School Principals

Julie Combs, EdD
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX

Stacey L. Edmonson, EdD
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, TX

Sherion H. Jackson, EdD
Director
TECS Faculty Development Lab
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC

Despite long hours Despite long hours and increasing demands, elementary school principals generally report high levels of satisfaction with their work (Doud & Keller, 1999). Yet over the past two decades, principals have reported increased levels of exhaustion, resulting in declining physical and mental health (Brock & Grady, 2002). Generally, burnout refers to an extreme form of job stress (Cherniss, 1988; Maslach, 1982), and stress has been found to be the most common predictor of burnout (Torelli & Gmelch, 1992).

For the school principal, researchers have identified conditions that cause stress in the daily demands of the job (Buhler, 1999; Friedman, 1995). Common stressors have been students' lack of poor academic achievement, student discipline issues, declining resources, and the public's misunderstanding of the principal's role. Researchers have stated that these role conditions contribute to principal burnout (Allison, 1997; Gmelch & Gates, 1997; Whitaker, 1996).

Personal characteristics such as gender, age, and years of experience have been examined related to job burnout. Some have theorized that lack of experience can lead to higher levels of burnout because one may lack the skills needed to cope with the job demands (Callison, 1993; Linthicum, 1994). Conversely,

Kelley and Gill (1993) found that a longer tenure indicated higher burnout levels. Moreover, the role that gender plays in burnout is not clear. Some researchers have found higher rates of burnout for males (Thompson, 1985) whereas others have reported higher rates for females (Blix et al., 1994; Kelley & Gill, 1993).

As the understanding of burnout continues to be refined, studies that examine school principals and burnout will be helpful to those who provide support to school leaders and are concerned about principal attrition and pending shortages. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between burnout and gender, age, and years experience for elementary principals.

Method

The sampling frame consisted of 4,206 elementary principals in a southwestern state. Principals were randomly selected to receive a mailed questionnaire and 228 questionnaires were returned. The sample size in this study was deemed to be adequate for statistical purposes to represent a population of 4,000 with +/- 5% sampling error at the 95% confidence level (Dillman 2007).

Most principals in this sample were female (64%). Principals were from all regions of the state, with 43% working in rural areas, 30% representing urban, and 26% representing suburban. Participants had been principals for a mean of 7.92 years ($SD = 6.56$) and had been appointed to their first principal position at the mean age of 40.67 years ($SD = 7.19$). Principals worked in schools with a mean school enrollment of 533 students ($SD = 213.9$).

The instrument constructed for the study was based on previous principal profile studies (Combs, 1994; Nelson, 1983) so that trends in the elementary principalship could be examined. Items included forced-response questions, Likert-format items, and open-ended items. To address validity and reliability concerns, the questionnaire was revised with input from subject-matter experts and used in a pilot study conducted with 30 principals.

The variable of burnout was measured with items based on Maslach's (1982) definition of burnout and included the participant's (a) general morale related to their work, (b) feelings of being burned out, and (c) desire to become a principal again. Answers were summed to represent a burnout score, with a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.64. In addition, respondents identified their gender, age, and the number of years work experience. Principals described challenging and time consuming areas in their jobs in open-ended questions. Responses to the open-ended questions offered multiple perspectives and added to findings in this study.

Results

Most principals (64.5%) reported relatively low levels of burnout; the mean burnout score was 5.99 out of 15 ($SD = 2.22$). Twenty principals (8.8%) reported high levels of burnout with scores of 11 or higher; 26.8% reported moderate levels of burnout, with scores of 7 to 9.

To address the extent to which principal gender was related with burnout, a Pearson chi-square analysis was performed. A statistically significant relationship between gender and burnout was not present, $X^2(2, N = 211) = 2.568$, $p = .277$. Similarly, the principal's age was not related to burnout. A Pearson chi-square analysis did not yield a statistically significant relationship, $X^2(6, N = 228) = 9.147$, $p = .165$. Most principals were in their 50s and 34.2% were in their 40s. Almost all of the principals in their 60s (17 of 19) indicated low or no levels of burnout.

Elementary principals had a mean of 23.20 years experience as educators ($SD = 8.16$) and a mean tenure as principals of 7.9 years ($SD = 6.56$). A Pearson chi-square did not yield a statistically significant relationship between years experience in education and burnout, $X^2(4, N = 228) = 7.026$, $p = .134$ or between burnout and years experience as a principal, $X^2(4, N = 228) = 2.305$, $p = .68$. Thus, in this study, gender, age, years of experience in education, and years of experience as a principal were not related to principal burnout.

In addition to the statistical analyses, the open-ended questions were separated into two groups by burnout level (high, low). Almost all principals (97.3%) responded to the open-ended questions. Two of the researchers, independently, used constant comparative analysis to code phrases into themes. Themes for the high burnout group were compared to those of the low burnout group.

Tasks related to accountability for student achievement and relationships with parents offered the greatest challenges for all principals, regardless of burnout levels. One principal noted that "I have a 70% limited English population and 97% economic need. Keeping up with their needs and accelerating their instruction is a challenge."

Managing parental interactions was another commonly noted concern. Principals used words such as "difficult parents," "parents who are uninvolved," and "dealing with adults who do not parent their children" to describe parental interactions. Principals in this study cited a variety of challenges when working with parents, regardless of the level of burnout.

Challenges noted by principals experiencing high burnout were categorized as motivating teachers and balancing a variety of responsibilities. One principal reported challenges in "managing all areas I need to manage (curriculum, training, special programs, and classroom monitoring)." Another principal experiencing burnout found the most challenging part of the job to be "keeping all the balls in the air with no assistant [principal]. There is really too much to do!"

Discussion

In this study, 8.8% of the elementary principals reported that they were experiencing burnout. Generally, principals with burnout had lower levels of morale related to their work. Maslach's (1982) stages of burnout (i.e., emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, decreased personal accomplishment) are supported by these findings. Reasonably, as principals experience higher levels of burnout, career satisfaction and general morale decline.

Gender and age were found to be independent of burnout, thus supporting the inconclusiveness of gender and age as a predictor of burnout for school administrators. Similarly, years experience as educators and principals were not related to levels of burnout and did not appear to be predictors of burnout among principals in this sample.

Principals cited pressures related to testing and accountability for student achievement, regardless of burnout levels. The most distinguishable differences between principals experiencing burnout occurred in the list of challenges; principals experiencing high burnout more frequently noted that the balancing of multiple responsibilities and the motivating of teachers for improvement were obstacles. Such findings support the Job Demands-Resources Model (Demerouti et al., 2001) which postulates that burnout occurs when the demands of the job exceed one's capacity and available resources. Principals

experiencing burnout frequently reported "feeling pulled in many directions."

Conclusion

Differences in the interactions of individual principals, as opposed to specific demographic variables, may provide greater insight into understanding burnout. The challenges and hindrances cited by principals suggest that the principal's job is demanding, unrelenting, and overwhelming; however, not all principals experience burnout.

Qualitative responses in this study provided some insight into the idea that the pressures experienced by principals with varying levels of burnout, although similar in many ways, were also different in areas involving interactions, relationships, and the ability to handle multiple and competing tasks.

Additional studies are needed that compare the responses of principals in situations involving interpersonal conflicts and complex decision-making. A more cogent description of the factors predicting burnout among school principals can be used to provide support and resources necessary to retain effective school leaders.

Author Biographies

Julie Combs is an assistant professor for the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling at Sam Houston State University. Combs served as an elementary principal for 10 years and held positions as an elementary and secondary teacher and an assistant principal.

Stacey Edmonson is an associate professor for the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling at Sam Houston State University. Edmonson has served as a central office administrator and principal and held positions as a middle school and high school teacher.

Sherion Jackson is currently director of the TECS Faculty Development Lab at East Carolina University. Jackson served as a K-8 principal for five years and held prior positions as an elementary teacher, middle school math teacher, and interim assistant superintendent.

References

Allison, D. G. (1997). Coping with stress in the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration, 35*(1), 39.

Blix, A. G., Cruise, R. J., Mitchell, B. J., & Blix, G. G. (1994). Occupational stress among university teachers. *Educational Research, 36*, 157-169.

Brock, B. L., & Grady, M. L. (2002). *Avoiding burnout: A principal's guide to keeping the fire alive.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Buhler, P. M. (1999). Stress: A concern for everyone. *Supervision, 60*(12), 14-16.

Callison, L. M. (1993). Burnout, personality, and the school administrator. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*, 03A. (UMI No. 0576075)

Cherniss, C. (1988). Observed supervisory behavior and teacher burnout in special education. *Exceptional Children, 54*, 449-454.

Combs, J. P. (1994). A profile of the elementary school principalship in Texas in 1993. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*, 02A. (UMI No. 9519792)

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 499-512.

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (1999). *A ten-year study: The K-8 principal in 1998*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Friedman, I. A. (1995). School principal burnout: The concept and its components. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 191-198.

Gmelch, W. H., & Gates, G. (1998). The impact of personal, professional, and organizational characteristics on administrator burnout. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*, 146-159.

Kelley, B. C., & Gill, D. L. (1993). An examination of personal/situational variables, stress appraisal, and burnout in collegiate teacher-coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 64*(1), 94.

Linthicum, G. H. (1994). An analysis of the extent to which school district superintendents experience burnout. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55*, 08A. (UMI No. 9501593)

Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nelson, D. K. (1983). A profile of the elementary school principalship in Texas in 1982. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 44*, 05A. (UMI No. 8409705)

Thompson, J. W. (1985). Stress and burnout: A comparison of principals in North Carolina school districts. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*, 04A. (UMI No. 8605653)

Torelli, J. A., & Gmelch, W. H. (1992, April). *Occupational stress and burnout in educational administration.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Whitaker, K. S. (1996). Exploring causes of principal burnout. *Journal of Educational Administration, 34*(1), 60.

Novice Superintendents and the Efficacy of Professional Preparation

Theodore J. Kowalski, PhD
Kuntz Family Chair
Educational Administration
University of Dayton
Dayton, OH

George J. Petersen, PhD
Professor and Chair
Educational Leadership and Administration
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA

Lance D. Fusarelli, PhD
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC

The preparation of superintendents is a critical component and essential element of systemic education reform. However, Cooper, Fusarelli, Jackson, and Poster (2002) remind us that, "the process is rife with difficulties" (p. 242), including synchronization of preparation and actual practice, the theory-practice disconnect, the need for life-long learning, and development of an adequate knowledge base.

In light of these complexities, two facts are especially noteworthy: the vast majority of research on the efficacy of administrator preparation programs has focused on the principalship (Kowalski, 2006b) and most doctoral programs in educational

administration have de facto become preparation programs for superintendents, even though some contain little coursework specifically tailored for the position (Andrews & Grogan, 2002).

Scathing reports, most critical of university-based preparation programs, and state legislative interventions have prompted significant changes in licensure for school administrators over the past two decades. This is particularly true in relation to requirements for superintendents (Kowalski, 2004). As examples, nine states no longer require a license for this position; among the remaining

41 states, 54% grant waivers or emergency licenses and 37% allow or sanction alternative routes to licensure (Feistritzer, 2003).

Equally disconcerting, recommendations to make administrative licensing voluntary across all states (e.g., Broad Foundation and Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2003; Hess, 2003) and to discontinue doctoral programs for practitioners (e.g., Levine, 2005) have received an inordinate amount of national media attention.

This study focuses on arguably the most important evidence related to preparing and licensing school district superintendents—the first year of practice in this challenging position. Subjects in this research were novice superintendents in office during January, 2005, in four states: California, Missouri, North Carolina, and Ohio. The primary objectives of this research were to (a) produce a profile of the novices, (b) produce a profile of their employing school districts, and (c) determine the opinions of the novices toward their academic preparation.

Literature on Novice Superintendents

The critical nature of the induction year in professional education has long been recognized in relation to teaching.

Unfortunately, research on novice superintendents and efforts to strengthen the induction year in this pivotal position have not received an equivalent level of attention (Kowalski, 2004). In part, the lower level of concern may be explained by age, education, and experience.

Whereas, first-time teachers typically are 22 or 23 years old, and with the exception of student teaching, totally inexperienced practicing in schools, novice superintendents are usually much older (typically, in their early

50s) and they have had considerable experience as both teachers and principals (Glass, Björk, & Brunner, 2000).

Therefore, age and experience may lessen concerns about superintendent induction (Kowalski, 2006a). However, anecdotal evidence (e.g., Cegralek, 2004; Yeoman, 1991) suggests that such a conclusion is unwarranted; novice superintendents, much like novice teachers, experience uncertainty, anxiety, and feelings of isolation.

Once in office, first-time superintendents usually discover that their new position is quite dissimilar from previous administrative positions they have held (Glass et al., 2000; Kowalski, 2006a).

Knowledge of novice superintendents has been clouded by the failure of some authors to distinguish between "first-year" superintendents and "first-time" superintendents. Defined correctly, the former classification focuses on the locus of employment; that is, it includes both experienced and inexperienced superintendents in the first year of an employment contract with a new employer.

For example, an administrator with 10 years of experience as a superintendent is technically a first-year superintendent when she changes employers. The latter classification focuses on the practitioner; that is, it includes only persons who previously have not been superintendents.

The problem stemming from a failure to separate these populations is axiomatic. For example, an article, titled "Superintendent Rookies" (Lueker, 2002) reported that approximately 20% of all superintendents in 2001-02 were part of the population being studied (based on the article's title, one would

infer that this was a population restricted to novices).

However, data reported a year earlier in the national study of superintendents sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and conducted by Glass et al. (2000) reported that the turnover rate for all superintendents in 2000 was about 20%. Since persons employed as a result of turnovers are both experienced and inexperienced superintendents, it is not plausible that 20% of all superintendents in a given year would be novices. Consequently, the failure to distinguish between first-year and first-time superintendents probably has contributed to erroneous conclusions about the induction year in this position.

Using data from the 2000 AASA study, Glass (2001) developed a limited profile of first-time superintendents. He then compared these data to data for all superintendents in five areas as shown below:

Variable	First-Time Superintendents	All Superintendents
Women	24.3%	13.2%
Age	slightly over 50	slightly over 50
Racial/ethnic minorities	7.9%	5.1%
Marital status – not married	11.3%	7.5%
Less than 5 years of teaching experience	21.6%	37.7%

Though the title of the article in which they appear refers to "first-year" superintendents, the data above were actually restricted to "first-time" superintendents. However, these data subsequently were not extracted from the data collected from all superintendents; therefore, actual differences between the novices and experienced superintendents are somewhat more pronounced than reported.

Studies clearly show that a trend toward higher levels of formal education among district superintendents. In their national study, Glass, et al. (2000) reported that the percentage of superintendents possessing a doctoral degree had increased substantially between 1971 and 2000—from 29.2% to 45.3%.

However, district size was found to be an important factor; 83% of superintendents in very large districts (i.e., those with over 25,000 pupils) and only 17% in the smallest districts (i.e., those with fewer than 300 pupils) had a doctorate. A study published one year earlier (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 1999), reported that 64% of the participating superintendents had doctorates.

Regardless of education level, superintendent ratings of their professional preparation have remained consistently high between 1982 and 2000. In 1982, 74% of all superintendents nationally rated their preparation as being excellent or good; in 1992 and again in 2000, that percentage remained the same (Glass et al., 2000).

Nonetheless, these and other findings pertaining to professional preparation have been largely ignored by anti-professionists wishing to deregulate the superintendency.

Instead of refuting empirical evidence, they have consistently offered anecdotal accounts of non-traditional superintendents (i.e., those with no professional degrees and experience in teaching and school administration) employed in large, urban school districts. Hess (2003), a leading critic of professional preparation and state licensing, admits that isolated examples from large school systems may not be universally relevant.

Conceding that some professional superintendents may be necessary, he wrote: "In those schools or systems where no one else is available to work with teachers on curricular or instructional issues, it is obviously essential that a school or system leader be willing and able to play this role" (p. 8). He then incorrectly asserted that "such situations are quite rare" (p. 8). In fact, less than 2% of the nation's school systems have 25,000 or more students but 71% enroll fewer than 2,500 students.

Even more noteworthy, 48% of all districts enroll less than 1,000 students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). Since district enrollment usually determines administrative staffing, we can estimate half of all school districts in this country provide neither superintendents nor principals with regular access to curriculum and instruction specialists. Rather than being rare, the schools Hess identifies as requiring the services of a professional superintendent are the norm.

Study Methods

The study population was identified from records obtained from the state departments of education or the superintendent state associations in California, Missouri, North Carolina, and Ohio. It was defined as all school district superintendents in the four states, employed at the beginning of the 2004-05 school year, who had no previous experience as a superintendent.

Each person in the population was sent a packet of materials via regular mail in 2005; it included: (a) a cover letter explaining the nature of the study and inviting the recipient to participate, (b) a two-page survey (see Appendix A), and (c) an addressed return envelope.

The survey was developed by the authors and content validity was addressed by having two former superintendents evaluate the clarity and purposes of the questions and statements. Statements in the survey pertaining to the adequacy of academic preparation were developed from five widely-accepted role requirements for the superintendency: teacher-scholar, manager, statesman, applied social scientist (Callahan, 1962; 1966), and communicator (Kowalski, 2001).

Data were tabulated by research associates at the University of Dayton. Open-ended items were tabulated by assigning a numeric value to responses and then ranking the responses according to total points.

Findings

The number of local districts located in the four states differs markedly, both because of

substantial variance in state populations and because one state (North Carolina) has only all-county school districts. Collectively, there are 2,316 superintendents in the four states—or approximately 17% of all superintendents in the United States. Of these, 7.5% were first-time superintendents and two thirds of them (117 superintendents) participated in the study. Of the 117 respondents, 38% were from California, 34% were from Missouri, 23% were from Ohio, and 5% were from North Carolina.

The typical novice superintendent was a male (76%) and a mid- to late-career professional (the modal range was 46 to 55). He was experienced in both teaching (95% with four or more years of experience) and administration (92% with four or more years of experience), had an advanced graduate degree (only 1% had less than a master's degree and 36% had a doctorate), and had completed an approved academic program for superintendent licensure (82%).

The typical employing district was rural (62%) and enrolled fewer than 1,000 students (46%). Two-thirds of respondents (67%) were employed in districts that had below average district wealth (determined by the amount of taxable property supporting each student enrolled in the district in the respective states). A majority (58%) were employed in districts in which less than half of the school board members were college graduates and in which the average board member tenure was four to six years. Profiles of the typical novice superintendent and typical employing district are shown in Figure 1.

Novice Superintendent

✓ Male (76%)

✓ Mid-career (68% over age 45)

✓ Professional prepared* (82%)

✓ Experienced teacher (95% had 4 or more years of teaching experience)

✓ Experienced administrator (92% had 4 or more years of administrative experience)

✓ Highly educated (only 1% with less than a master's degree; 36% with a doctorate)

*Defined as completing an approved program of student for a superintendent's license.

Employing District

✓ Rural (62%)

✓ Small enrollment (46% fewer than 1,000 students)

✓ Below average taxable wealth (67% below respective state average)

✓ Average board member tenure (approximately 5 years

✓ Board member education level (58% had a majority of board members without a college degree)

Figure 1. Profiles of the typical novice superintendent and typical employing district.

Opinions regarding professional preparation were obtained by having the novice superintendents express their level of agreement with seven statements. Overall, the responses reveal positive opinions. The outcomes are summarized in Table 1. Only two of the statements had agreement levels below 60% (preparation to work effectively with board members and preparation for engaging in political activities).

Table 1

Opinions about Professional Preparation

Preparation area	Disposition	
	Disagree	Agree
My academic program prepared me to		
Be an instructional leader	15.4%	84.6%
Manage resources	21.7%	78.3%
Be a democratic leader	8.2%	91.8%
Conduct action research	27.8%	72.2%
Communicate effectively	19.6%	80.4%
Work effectively with board members	42.3%	57.7%
Engage in political action	58.8%	41.2%

The novices also were asked to identify the three greatest strengths, weaknesses, and omissions in their preparation. School law and finance were most commonly cited as strengths of preparation programs; others cited include: networking, internship, research, data-driven decision making, personnel administration, and intellectual stimulation.

Least beneficial aspects included over-reliance on theory and a lack of professors with experience as superintendents. When asked how preparation programs could be improved, superintendents recommended that greater coverage be given to school finance, law, school board relations, politics of education, and collective bargaining.

Opinions regarding former professors also were positive. Results are contained in Table 2. Overall, more than three-fourths of the novices agreed that the professors set high standards for students, integrated contemporary issues into course content, understood the practical challenges facing superintendents; effectively blended theory and practice, and were intellectually stimulating.

Table 2

Opinions about Former Professors

Professor attributes	Disposition	
	Disagree	Agree
My former professors		
Understood the challenges of contemporary practice	22.7%	77.3%
Blended theory and practice	23.7%	76.3%
Set high standards for students	12.3%	87.7%
Integrated contemporary issues into their courses	12.4%	87.6%
Were intellectually stimulating	15.5%	84.5%

Discussion and Conclusions

The purposes of this study were to develop demographic profiles of novice superintendents and their employers. The following are pertinent comments on the findings:

- *Erosion of state licensing.* Approximately 17% of all the novices who participated in the study had not completed a prescribed academic program for licensure. In most professions, this outcome would be alarming. Even more noteworthy, there is a distinct possibility that many of the novices who opted not to participate in the study are unlicensed practitioners; that is, the focus on academic preparation may have dissuaded them from responding.

- *Age*. The age profile for the novices is generally congruent with the limited data that exist on this topic (e.g., Glass et al., 2000). Relatively few individuals entered the superintendency before age 35; more commonly, they first became a superintendent at the late-middle or late stages of their careers in education (i.e., over age 46).

- *Doctorate*. Nationally, about 45% of all superintendents report having an earned doctorate (Glass et al., 2000); in this study, that figure was only 36%. The lower finding here is likely due to two factors. The first is the nature of the employing districts; that is, most novices were employed in rural, small-enrollment, and below average wealth districts.

  Superintendents with doctorates are least likely to be found in this type of district (Glass et al., 2000). Second, some superintendents complete the doctorate after entering the position (Kowalski, 2006b) and hence, the percent of all superintendents having this degree would be higher than the percent of novices having the degree.

- *Experience*. The novices had considerable experience as teachers and administrators prior to entering the superintendency. Again, this outcome is generally congruent with the findings from the AASA national study (Glass, 2001).

- *Board members in employing districts*. Only about one in four novices was employed in a district in which 75% or more of the board members were college graduates. The average tenure for board members was four to six years

and this suggests a moderate level of instability (i.e., most board members serve between one and two terms). If one considers board member education and continued service to be positive factors, many novices may be employed in positions generally considered "less desirable."

- *Adequacy of professional preparation*. Contrary to the findings of reports critical of university-based preparation programs (e.g., Hess, 2003; Levine, 2005), the novices reported that their preparation programs were largely effective. Since most were employed in small districts with limited resources, their experiences were arguably more normative than those of non-traditional superintendents employed in large urban districts.

- *Professors*. The novices generally had very positive perceptions of their former professors. Some, however, expressed concerns about instructors who lacked practitioner experiences.

- *Implications for licensing policy*. Data collected here confirm that the vast majority of novice superintendents are employed in small-enrollment and/or rural school systems. Conversely, advocates for deregulating superintendent preparation and licensing (e.g., Broad Foundation and Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2003; Hess, 2003) almost always base their case on anecdotal evidence of superintendents practicing in large districts.

  The need for superintendents to be both instructional leaders and organizational managers is greatest in

districts where little if any support staff is available to assist in district operations.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions reported in this study, the following recommendations are made with respect to preparation, licensing, and additional research.

Preparation

In light of the fact that practice in the superintendency and in the principalship have become increasingly dissimilar, and in light of the fact that there is no national curriculum for superintendent preparation, effort should be made to establish minimum curricular standards to ensure that novices employed in small-enrollment districts have the basic skills required in work environments where there are no professional support staff for district administration. Exposure to one or more professors who have been superintendents should be deemed essential.

Licensure

Future policy affecting school district superintendents, including licensing, should be predicated on the realities of practice. More precisely, the job requirements in small and predominately rural districts should be a major factor in determining both academic and professional experience criteria for state licensing.

Author Biographies

Theodore Kowalski holds the Kuntz Family Chair in Educational Administration, an endowed professorship, at the University of Dayton. A former superintendent and college dean, he is the author of 31 books and more than 190 other publications.

George Petersen is professor and chair of educational leadership at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. He was previously a professor at the University of Missouri and associate director of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).

Lance Fusarelli is associate professor and chair of educational leadership at North Carolina State University. A leading scholar in the area of policy and politics, he formerly was on the faculty at Fordham University.

References

Andrews, R., & Grogan, M. (2002, February). *Defining preparation and professional development for the future.* Paper commissioned for the First Meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation. Wingspread Conference Center. Racine, WI.

Broad Foundation & Thomas B. Fordham Institute. (2003). *Better leaders for America's schools: A manifesto*. Los Angeles: Authors.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of public schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Callahan, R. E. (1966). *The superintendent of schools: A historical analysis.* East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 0104 410)

Ceglarek, N. E. (2004). *Lonely at the start: A first-year superintendent. School Administrator, 61*(2), 13.

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., & Carella, V. A. (1999). *Career crisis in the school superintendency? The results of a national survey.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., Jackson, B. L., & Poster, J. (2002). Is "superintendent preparation" an oxymoron? Analyzing changes in programs, certification, and control. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1*(3), 242-255.

Feistritzer, E. (2003). *Certification of public-school administrators.* Washington, DC: The National Center for Education Information.

Garn, G. (2003). A closer look at rural superintendents. *Rural Educator, 25*(1), 3-9.

Glass, T. E., (2001). Study of first-year superintendents. *ERS Spectrum, 19*(3), 26-32.

Glass, T. E., Björk, L., & Brunner, C. C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency, 2000: A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Hess, F. M. (2003). *A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools.* Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.

Kowalski, T. J. (2001). The future of local school governance: Implications for board members and superintendents. In C. Brunner & L. Björk (Eds.), *The new superintendency* (pp. 183-201). Oxford, UK: JAI, Elsevier Science.

Kowalski, T. J. (2004). The ongoing war for the soul of school administration. In T. J. Lasley (Ed.), *Better leaders for America's schools: Perspectives on the Manifesto* (pp. 92-114). Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

Kowalski, T. J. (2006a). Evolution of the school district superintendent position. In L. Björk & T. Kowalski (Eds.), *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice and development* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Kowalski, T. J. (2006b). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice, and cases* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders.* Washington, DC: Education Schools Project.

Lueker, D. H. (2002). Superintendent rookies. *The School Administrator, 59*(9), 6-7.

National Center for Education Statistics (2002). *Number of public school districts and enrollment, by size of district: 1989-90 to 2000-01*. Retrieved February 1, 2004, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/PDF/table88.pdf

Yeoman, D. R. (1991). Diary of a first-year superintendent. *School Administrator, 48*(7), 22-27.

Principals Priority for Technology as an Indicator of Observed Use in Schools

Debra Lecklider, PhD
Associate Professor
College of Education
Butler University
Indianapolis, IN

Jody S. Britten, PhD
Assistant Professor
College of Education
Butler University
Indianapolis, IN

Jon M. Clausen, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Studies
Ball State University
Muncie, IN

School principals play an important role concerning technology use within their schools (Anderson, R.E. & Dexter, S. L., 2000, Creighton, T., 2003). While school districts across the nation are spending considerable resources in order to provide technical infrastructure to teachers and students, questions remain concerning the priority principals place in how teachers and students use technology within the school context.

The National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (NETS-A) identify the knowledge and skills that school administrators must acquire to successfully guide the effective use of technology by students and teachers. These standards emphasize six categories important to school administrators and include: (a) leadership and vision, (b) learning and teaching, (c) productivity and professional practice, (d) support, management, and operations, (e) assessment and evaluation, and (f) social, legal, and ethical issues (International Society for Technology in Education, 2002).

The International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) also acknowledges school administrators' important role concerning technology use by providing access and support, and, helping to create the vision that makes effective technology integration possible for teachers and students (International Society for Technology in Education, 2000). The role of the school principal is integral to effective technology integration in their school, but this role has evolved over time.

Over the last two decades, principals' roles in schools have evolved from managers to facilitators of instructional change (Jenkins & Bebar, 1994). Principals have become leaders, responsible for instructional progress, staff

development and curriculum improvement. The concept of the principal as instructional leader became popular during the 1980's (Wilmore, 2000). Shared governance concepts that emerged during the 1990's embedded accountability systems within schools that have also increased the demands placed on administrators.

National attention and concern about school performance has made the need for quality leadership paramount in addressing educational issues. Leadership in education has never been more critical for public school systems (Fullan, 2002a). School improvement literature focuses on the principal as the key agent in the improvement of schools (Barth, 1991; Hawkins, 1992). Simply, it is without question that the quality of any educational program relies on the school principal.

Strong leadership by the building level administrator is likely to create an effective school (Fullan, 2002b). As Sergiovanni (1995) argues, where there is an effective school, there is an effective principal. The direct responsibility for improving instruction and learning rests in the hands of the building leader. While increasing student achievement and learning has been a focus for the instructional leader, this is only the first step in improving student learning.

Fullan (2002b) notes that principals of the future have five essential components characterizing leaders including (a) moral purpose, (b) an understanding of the change process, (c) the ability to improve relationships, (d) knowledge creation and sharing, and (e) coherence making. Administrative leadership also makes a difference in whether technology is used effectively for teaching and learning. As Anderson and Dexter (2000) state, "Because technology implementation requires policy, budget and finance, and various other

organizational mechanisms, technology programs are doomed unless key administrators, as well as teachers, play active roles in these programs (p. 17)."

Effective school administrators provide leadership, resources, and professional development for teachers, setting the stage for technology use that supports instructional change and student learning.

The relationship between administrative priorities for technology use and the observed teacher and student use of technology by administrators remains an area of research not fully explored in the literature.

The relationship between priorities and observed technology use can begin to be probed through an investigation of budgeting and professional development decisions of administrators, as well as their observations of technology use by teachers and students.

The following questions guide this study:

1. How do administrators prioritize technology within school improvement plans, budget decisions, teacher use, and student use?

2. How do administrators prioritize technology use by teachers and students?

3. What types of technology use do administrators observe from teachers and students?

4. How does the observed technology use by teachers and students correspond with budgetary and professional develop priorities toward technology use?

Theoretical Framework

Type I and Type II criteria of technology use as defined by Maddux, Johnson, and Willis (1997) provided the framework for examination of administrator observations of teacher and student instructional technology use by considering various technologies and their use within instructional practice.

Type I uses of technology are those technologies like e-mail, Internet, word-processing, and presentation software that require little change in practices (i.e., we use e-mail instead of memos to communicate with our staff). Type II technologies are those that change both the instructional process and the products produced.

Type II technologies might include digital supplements to text books, digital cameras or video cameras, MP3 players or digital assessment tools.

Participants

During the summer and fall of 2006, 57 school leaders were invited to complete a survey of their views on technology. The survey included 35 questions constructed to identify principals priority for technology in basic administrative tasks (i.e., budgeting and school improvement) and their observations of technology use in their schools.

All items were ranked on a Likert scale. Seventy-six percent of the total participant sample is currently a building level principal., Forty percent of the participants reported working in urban - suburban areas, while 60% work in settings that are more rural. The sample included 35% elementary school administrators, 15% middle school administrators, 30% high school administrators, and 20% in either K-7 or K-12 schools.

Results

Technology as an Administrative Priority

The study investigated administrator perspectives of technology within four specific priority areas including budget, teacher use, student use, and school improvement. With approximately 60% of participants identifying that technology has a critical impact on student achievement, they also identified their schools as being average or below average in terms of student and teacher technology use. Overall, participants in this study saw technology as a high priority in all four of these areas:

1. 74% rated technology as a high priority for planning the school budget.

2. 87% rated technology use by teachers as a high priority.

3. 95% rated technology use by students as a high priority.

4. School improvement included improving access to technology (90%), improving instructional use of technology (89%), and improving professional development for technology (97%).

Results suggest that building level administrators place a higher priority on use, access, and professional development, but not budget. Mirroring the results of Boethel, Dimock, & Hatch (1998), the trend away from budgetary support for technology represents a disconnect between stated technology priorities and the ability to support them.

With expectations for schools to succeed being high, and available funds being low building level administrators are being forced to provide funds to other areas that may not support school improvement plans.

Observed Use of Technology by Teachers
The observed technology use of teachers by school administrators focused on Type I uses of technology. Participants identified e-mail and use of the Internet as a daily activity by teachers (98% of participants observed teachers using e-mail daily, while 85% observed daily Internet use). Only thirteen percent of participants in this study reported observing teachers use one or more Type II technologies on a daily basis. This contrasts dramatically with the stated administrative priorities for teachers to incorporate more Type II forms of technology to meet school improvement goals (i.e., instructional use of technology to impact student learning).

Observed Use of Technology by Students
Type I use of technology by students was observed as a daily occurrence by 89% of participants. Participants reported a possible disconnect between home use and school use of Type II technologies. Only 22% of participants observed students using one or more Type II technologies on a daily basis during school, while over 90% of participants perceived home use of Type II technologies as being a daily occurrence. In fact, 80% of participants never observed students using these Type II technologies.

Discussion
The purpose of this study was to identify principals' priority for technology in basic administrative tasks (i.e., budgeting and school improvement) and their observations of technology use in their schools. Data from the study suggest that if principal perceptions of technology use are accurate, then there is a connection between those schools that integrate technology at the Type II level and the priority which the administration places on technology in relation to budgeting and school improvement.

Technology as an Administrative Priority
In this area we see a strong presence of administrators who place a high priority on technology in their schools, and have expectations for how technology is used to support teaching and learning. The disconnection between budgetary priority and technology goals has been, and continues to be, an issue faced by both current and future administrators (Boethel, Dimock, & Hatch, 1998). Analysis of these data offers possible solutions and avenues for further inquiry into this issue.

One way to resolve this challenge is to consider technology integration as a component of all the work we do in schools, including technology use that supports learning. This conceptual change regarding technology use for learning can help to bridge this gap and help embed technology within instructional practice. Two areas could benefit from further inquiry:

1. *Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress.* Cross tabulation of data demonstrated that there is a connection between administrator perspectives of technology and the success of schools in achieving adequate yearly progress. Forty-eight percent of participants whose schools met adequate yearly progress stated that technology is a high priority for them in school budgeting.

   While only twenty percent of participants who did not achieve adequate yearly progress stated the same support for technology. This presents a basis for further investigation of correlations between achieving adequately yearly progress and principals' budgetary priority for technology use.

2. *Utilizing the NETS-A Standards.* Data from this study also portrays little to no knowledge of National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (nearly 60% had no awareness of these standards) or the conditions that support technology use by teachers developed by the International Society for Technology in Education (71% of participants noted little to no awareness).

It is worthwhile to further investigate how these standards and conditions are (a) being embedded into principal training programs, (b) being address through professional development for principals, and (c) being utilized as a guide for technology use in schools by principals in our K-12 public schools.

Observed Use of Technology by Teachers
Examining technology use by teachers through the lens of either Type I or Type II use will allow an administrator the opportunity to set very clear goals for professional development, and provide the opportunity for teachers to successfully embed technology into their teaching practice. Having tools that allow principals to evaluate lesson plans and bridge discussions with teachers about technology integration can impact the overall success of true integration (Britten & Cassady, 2005).

While Type II technology use leads to more significant instructional change, we cannot achieve Type II technology use if we continue to see technology as hardware alone. In this study, 82% of participants identified technology in their schools as computer hardware and software (not digital media tools or equipment). With the advent of more

personalized technologies, principals have the opportunity to seek broad instructional change that is empowered by technology and focused on curricular change.

Data from this study provides evidence that there is a critical need to educate school leaders in how technology can support school improvement, change instructional practice, and improve student learning. Simply put, current conceptions toward technology access and use do not effectively support the goals and priorities of instructional leaders. Technology will continue to be underutilized without a holistic view of how technology supports school improvement goals.

The challenge for instructional leaders is to address how professional development can most effectively address technology use that supports instructional change. Future research must address the benefit of moving from skills based professional development that focuses on how to use equipment, to a focus on integration that will help teachers understand how to integrate equipment into the teaching and learning process.

Observed Use of Technology by Students
The digital native (Prensky, 2001) lives in our schools. If participant observations of student technology use outside of school are accurate, our student populations have access, experience, and skills that can be tied to learning. However, the challenge will be to break down barriers that see these new technologies as toys or games, and find critical applications for their use in schools.

As demonstrated by this study, even though students have the skills and access to use Type II technologies in school, their use of these technologies is limited. Future research could help clarify innovative ways principals can empower, encourage, and expect teachers

and students to use technology. In addition, participant comments also suggest that school rules must also be revisited in order for instructional use of new technologies to be successful.

Conclusions

While this study provides insight into the perceptions and observations of principals, it does offer a limited view of the ways principals are interpreting their own struggles, successes, and practices.

However, the study does provide data to support further investigation.

Knowing that the success of school programs depends greatly on the school principal, efforts to improve our nation's schools and raise student achievement have strong implications for building level leaders.

We can no longer ignore the critical importance of educating building-level leaders in how effective technology use can improve teachers' instructional practice. A national conversation needs to take place linking principal preparation and on-going professional development to instructional progress.

The findings indicate that observed student technology skills, use, and access far exceed those of the teacher or administrator— isn't it time for our principals and teacher leaders to find the skills and training necessary to keep up with students in the 21st Century?

Author Biographies

Debra Lecklider is an associate professor of education in the experiential program for preparing school principals in the Butler University College of Education in Indianapolis, IN. Her research interests are in the preparation of school principals in authentic environments.

An assistant professor of education, Jody Britten is also program chair in educational foundations in the college of education at Butler University in Indianapolis, IN. She serves as an instructor and consultant for using technology for learning, teacher preparation, and instructional leadership. Her current fields of research focus on the connections between K-12 education, leadership, and teacher education.

Jon Clausen is an assistant professor in the department of educational studies at Ball State University in Muncie, IN. His research interests involve study of educational contexts that facilitate technology integration, teacher education and development, and leadership.

References

Anderson, R. E., & Dexter, S. L. (2000). School technology leadership: Incidence and impact. teaching, learning, and computing: 1998 National Survey, Report #6.

Barth, R. S. (1991). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Boethel, M., Dimock, K.V., & Hatch, L. (1998). *Putting Technology into the Classroom.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Britten, J. & Cassady, J. (2005). The Technology Integration Assessment Instrument: Understanding planned use of technology by classroom teachers. *Computers in Schools, 22*(3), 49-61.

Creighton, T. (2003). *The principal as technology leader*. Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press, Inc.

Fullan, M. (2002a). The change leader. *Educational Leadership*, *59*(8), 126-127.

Fullan, M. (2002b). Leadership and sustainability. *Principal Leadership*, *3*(4), 21-26.

Hawkins, J. L. (1992). An exploratory study of the effects of the Indiana principals leadership academy on the selected practices of secondary principals as perceived by teachers. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, Indiana.

International Society for Technology in Education. (2000). Essential conditions for teacher preparation. Retrieved March 14, 2004, from http://cnets.iste.org/teachers/t_esscond.html

International Society for Technology in Education. (2002). National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators. Retrieved February 20, 2007, from http://cnets.iste.org/administrators/

Jenkins, J. M., and Bebar, L. S. (1994). Preparing instructional leaders: Perspectives on the principalship. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 3(3), 343-347.

Maddux, C., Johnson, D., & Willis, J. (1997). *Educational Computing: Learning With Tomorrow's Technology*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, Digital immigrants. *On the Horizon, 9*(5).

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wilmore, E. (2000). The changing role of school leadership preparation. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 9*(4), 349-360.

Leading Change Through Cultural Competence

Richard A. Gregory, EdD
Associate Professor
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
California State University
Northridge,CA

During the 2005 American Association of School Administrators (AASA) conference, Dr. Peter Senge presented a timely challenge. Senge shared what he and colleagues had learned through international conferences with teenage youth from all over the world. The primary concern identified by youth over past years of the conferences has been "cross-cultural literacy."

Senge (2005) stated our kids understand that, in order for us to live in the global community we must build shared understanding and connect diverse people who shape the learning community. The discussion continued suggesting that, while kids seem to get the message and see the entire, global community system, adults are not yet catching on! At this point, a number of attendees walked out of the presentation. Your point was validated, Dr. Senge!

What a profound, powerful message to send to the nation's leaders of our school systems across America. We are again reminded that we live not only in a school system, but also within a highly diverse, global community. A community that is impacted daily by the way that we behave and act toward one another. Our individual and organizational policies, practices, and behaviors, can and do impact the learning experience for those we educate. Our personal and organizational ethics become intertwined deeply with cultural competence and our moral sense of providing for all students.

According to James Banks (2004) citizenship education must be transformed in the 21st century because of the deepening racial, ethnic, cultural, language and religious diversity in our nations and states throughout the global community.

Further, Banks (2004) is very concerned about our current narrow definition of literacy in the United States. The concern is embodied in the high stakes testing of basic skills and ignores citizenship participation in national and global contexts.

Moreover, Banks contends that the world's greatest problems do not result from people being unable to read and write. They result from people of the world, through diversity and difference, being unable to get along and work together in solving the intractable problems present in our world (Banks, 2004).

Ethics and Cultural Competence

Lindsey et. al. (2003, 2005) continually reminds us that we have received our educational preparation through the dominant culture point-of-view.

As such, we must be aware of entitlements we possess as members of the dominant culture. This is the tenuous part of becoming culturally competent, now that we know about entitlements that have accrued to us as members of the dominant culture; we must not assume that these same entitlements have accrued to the minorities (race, language, ethnic, age, disabled, poor, gender, religion, and others) in equal amounts.

Lindsey, et.al. (2003, 2005) believes that in order to make the shift from cultural precompetence to cultural competence is to recognize the dynamics of entitlement and privilege and how our schools and communities contribute to the disparities in achievement. The culturally competent behavior is having the will to be ethical and make the moral choices that reflect this new understanding.

Nieto (2003, 2004) defines multicultural education within the sociopolitical context, as the process of comprehensive school reform and basic education for all students. This process rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and affirms cultural pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, gender, and others) that students, teachers and their communities reflect.

Multicultural education needs to be about much more than ethnic tidbits and cultural sensitivity, according to Nieto (2003). Moreover, this process of multicultural education permeates the schools' curriculum and instructional strategies, as well as interactions between all persons in the teaching and learning environment. Critical pedagogy, reflection and action become the basis for social change and justice (Nieto, 2004).

While all of the approaches shared previously are well-researched and deployed in various school districts, there still seems to be something missing at the center of the change approach. Fullan (2003) states that many aspects of the school principalship do not pertain to moral purpose.   However, Fullan (2003) asserts that moral purpose must be the driver above all other leader capacities.

Strike, et.al. (1998) asks why administrative ethics coursework is only offered at a few universities. Strike opines that perhaps this situation is due to administration being a science and not dealing with values and value judgments. Further, Strike, et.al. (1998)

believes that value judgments are moral judgments and should be at the heart of the school administrators' job.

Johnson (2001) approaches the question of ethics through a model he calls "Casting light or shadow." We can cast light by building ethical capacity in our future and present leaders with clear ethical outcomes (sound ethical reasoning, strong character, follow-through, ethical climate, ethical decision making, and others) in the workplace. Leaders also can cast shadows in the workplace through abuse of power and privilege, deceit, disloyalty, inconsistency, among others.

State Credentialing for Change through Cultural Competence

The state of Oregon conducted a statewide cultural competence summit in 2004, involving all university/community college partners, K-12 education and the State Department of Education. New standards for administrative licensure before Teacher Standards and Practices Commission proposed for January 2006 included knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to equity and cultural competence in leadership, instructional improvement, effective management, inclusive practice, ethical leadership, and socio-political context.

While only time will tell if the movement is successful in Oregon, it is a start in bringing all stakeholders together to address the need for culturally competent educators.

Ethics + Cultural Competence + Effective Schools Correlates = Learning for All

In the meantime, should school district leaders wait around for the U.S. Department of Education or state education departments to dictate what educator preparation should look like with regard to cultural competence and embedded ethical training? So what is the solution to begin transforming our administrators, teachers and schools to the ethical, culturally competent workplaces where all students live and learn in harmony and justice?

The late Ron Edmonds (1979, 1982), founding father of the Effective Schools (ES) movement, sheds considerable light on this question. In response to the Coleman (1966) study concluding that family background not the school determined the level of student achievement; Edmonds studied poor urban schools and found the Coleman report was flawed. Further, Edmonds (1979, 1982) went on to discuss how educators could very well use the Coleman survey to make excuses for poor minority children not learning at the levels of more fortunate children. The words of Ron Edmonds became the foundation of ES literature over 25 years ago.

> "We can, whenever and wherever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us. We already know more than we need to do that. Whether or not we do it must finally depend on how we feel about the fact that we haven't so far." (Edmonds, 1979)

Ron Edmonds' challenge is as relevant today, perhaps more so, than when spoken over 25 years ago! As Senge (2005) and Banks (2004) remind us, the kids understand what has to happen; the adults have not yet internalized the message. According to D'Amico (2001) our nation's schools closed the minority student achievement gap steadily until 1988. Since 1988 our minority achievement gap has been increasing.

We do indeed know enough today to ensure the learning of all students within our charge. Whether we do that depends on whether we can act ethically as culturally competent leaders, employing the correlates of Effective Schools Research in every learning situation.

Effective Schools Correlates

- Instructional Leadership
- Clear and Focused Mission
- Safe and Orderly Environment
- Climate of High Expectations
- Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress
- Positive Home-School Relations
- Opportunity to Learn and Student Time on Task

The Effective Schools Correlates are still relevant today. However, we now know that moral/ethical purpose and cultural competence are critical partners in achieving learning for all. The moral imperative is indeed at the center of leading change through cultural competence.

Author Biography

Richard Gregory is a veteran of 34 years of service in K-12 education as teacher, principal, curriculum director and superintendent. He is currently an associate professor of educational leadership at California State University in Northridge. His research interests are leadership development, ethics, and cultural competence.

References

Banks, J. A. (2004). Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity, and Citizenship in a Global World. *The Educational Forum, 68* no4 296-305.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F., & York, G. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Health, Education and Welfare.

D'Amico, J. J. (2001). A closer look at the minority achievement gap. ERS Spectrum, 19(2), 4-10.

Edmonds, R. (1979). "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." *Educational Leadership*, 36(8), 15-24.

Edmonds, R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. *Educational Leadership,* 40(3), 4-12.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The Moral Imperative of School Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Johnson, C. (2001). *Meeting the Ethical Challenges of Leadership: Casting Light or Shadow.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lindsey, R. B., Nuri Robins, K. N. & Terrell, R. D. (2003). *Cultural proficiency: a manual for school leaders*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks. CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Lindsey, R. B. Roberts, L. M. & Campbell Jones, F. (2005). *The culturally proficient school: an implementation guide for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Nieto, S. (2003). Profoundly Multicultural Questions. *Educational Leadership,* 60(4), 6-10.

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: the sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* 4th ed. Boston: Pearson-Allyn and Bacon.

Strike, K., Haller, E., and Soltis, J. (1998). *The Ethics of School Administration.* 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press.

Senge, P. M. (2005, February). *Keynote Address.* Presented at the annual conference of the American Association of School Administrators. San Antonio, TX.

Preparing Future Principals to Work with School Counselors

Rachelle Pérusse, PhD
Associate Professor
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT

Eric Haas, PhD
Senior Fellow
Rockridge Institute
Berkeley, CA

Ian Lally, MA
Department Head
Guidance Department
World Academy for Total Community
       Health High School
Brooklyn, NY

Sarah Mische, MA
Edwin O. Smith High School
Storrs-Mansfield, CT

Recent research shows that a developmental school counseling program can be an important tool for improving student academic achievement and school community well-being (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Henderson, 1999; Kaplan, 1995; Kaplan & Evans, 1999).

Yet, it appears that school administrators do not take advantage of the school counseling resource, often assigning school counselors to tasks that are outside of their area of training or relegating them to clerical tasks, cafeteria and bus duty, or assigned disciplinary roles (Pérusse, Goodnough, Donegan & Jones, 2004; Remley & Albright, 1988).

Further, it appears that principal preparation programs do little to make their students aware of the positive results that can be achieved from incorporating school counselors into the school reform and improvement processes (Pérusse, Goodnough, Crumley, Mattimore, & Bouknight, in prep).

We contend that principal preparation programs should more explicitly prepare pre-service principals on how to include school counselors in the school improvement process. It is well established that school administrators play a central role in developing and maintaining effective, successful schools (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Further, research suggests that school administrators greatly enhance their school's performance when they combine their own transformational leadership with shared instructional leadership with teachers into an integrated, distributed model (Marks & Printy, 2003). Thus, principal preparation programs that educate pre-service principals on how to expand distributed instructional leadership to

include school counselors might improve the likelihood of their students leading effective, successful schools.

In recent years, the role of professional school counselors has been redefined, placing them in a more central role in guiding school improvement as compared to the marginalized position traditionally found (ASCA, 2005; Dahir, 2001; House & Hayes, 2002).

In 1997, two initiatives about the role of the school counselor were introduced: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) published by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA); and The Education Trust's Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) (The Education Trust, 2007a).

The National Standards were created in response to the omission of school counselors from the educational reform agenda and to inform school counselors and school administrators about comprehensive school counseling programs (Dahir, 2001).

Three areas are emphasized: (a) Academic Development, (b) Career Development, and (c) Personal/Social Development. These standards are broken down into examples of student competencies that students "should know and be able to do as a result of participating in a school counseling program," (Campbell & Dahir, 1997, p.1). The National Standards have been endorsed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National

Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP). At about the same time, The Education Trust, underwritten by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, introduced the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (The Education Trust, 2007a).

According to this view, the school counselor is expected to engage in activities along five domains: Leadership, Advocacy, Teaming and Collaboration, Counseling and Coordination, and Assessment and Use of Data. For each of these domains, The Education Trust presented specific examples of how school counselors should implement each of these domains into their school counseling programs. For example, Assessment and Use of Data includes "Establish and assess measurable goals for student outcomes from counseling activities & interventions" (The Education Trust, 2007b)

Today, elements of both the National Standards and the TSCI domains have been incorporated into the current version of the professional school counselor as established in the *The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (ASCA, 2005). The National Standards are included within the domains of Academic Development, Career Development, and Personal/Social Development and form part of the Foundation of the ASCA National Model®™, while the four TSCI themes of leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change frame the model and are incorporated throughout each of the four elements of the diamond-shaped model (Figure 1).

Figure 1. The ASCA National Model®. Reprinted with permission from the American School Counselor Association.

To meet these new standards and be consistent with the ASCA National Model, school counselors must place greater emphasis on using data, conducting program assessments and evaluation, promoting school-wide change, instructing classroom guidance activities, and using computer technology to monitor student progress and close achievement gaps (ASCA, 2005).

Further, the domain of accountability is a key concept that interfaces with the other three domains. To this end, recent school counseling research has been aimed at demonstrating the effectiveness of school counselors and their interventions (ASCA, 2006a).

Pérusse, Goodnough, Crumley, Mattimore, and Bouknight (in prep) found that few educational administration faculty prepare future school principals to work with school counselors, that the preparation is rather limited, and does not necessarily contain reference to the new, transformed role of the school counselor as set forth in the ASCA National Model (2005). In their study, educational administration faculty across the country were asked, "How do you prepare future school principals to work with school counselors?"

Results showed that less than one-fifth of the educational administration faculty surveyed collaborated with either a counselor educator or other school counseling professional, and that very few discussed the transformed role of the school counselor with future school principals. Without this knowledge about the role of the school counselor, it would be difficult for principals to fully benefit from the skills school counselors possess and to use their professional school counselors effectively to help increase student academic achievement.

When Pérusse *et al.* (2004, April) prompted educational administration faculty to share any unique or creative ideas about preparing future school principals to work with school counselors, 59 of the 171 respondents provided a response. Of these 59 respondents, 22% ($\underline{n}$=13) stated that they collaborated with counselor educators and school counseling departments in educating future school principals to work with school counselors. Some stated using the practicum and/or internship as a creative way to prepare future school principals to work with school counselors using methods such as job shadowing ($\underline{n}$=15, 25.4%).

Other comments about preparing future school principals to work with school counselors included having guest speakers from counseling backgrounds speak in classrooms (n=6, 10.2%), using case studies in the classroom (n=3, 5.1%), and using resources such as journal articles about the relationship between school counselors and principals (n=5, 8.5%).

Research also shows that pre-service principals are receptive to and benefit from direct attention to school counselor issues in their administrative preparation classes. Shoffner and Williamson (2000) and Shoffner and Briggs (2001) described a seminar course and an interactive CD-ROM aimed at increasing the interaction between pre-service school counselors and principals.

The object of the course and CD–ROM was to have students work collaboratively to solve problems presented in case study vignettes. The vignettes were created by the students and included discussion questions about the areas of potential collaboration, conflict, or both between the role of the administrator and the counselor. Rambo-Igney and Grimes Smith (2005-2006) brought

together school counseling and educational leadership students for an open dialog during a mutual class time lasting four hours. In a pretest-posttest design, they administered a 20 question Principal/School Counselor Attitude Survey before and after the collaboration to measure changes in student attitudes about the roles and responsibilities of the school counselor.

The survey contained statements based on the ASCA National Model. For pre-service principals, they found statistically significant pre/post differences regarding students' perceptions about the appropriateness of assigning certain clerical tasks to school counselors.

They concluded that even this relatively short intervention may have been effective in changing student attitudes. In each of these studies, the authors concluded that pre-service exposure helped their students take a more proactive role in establishing collaborative relationships between school counselors and school administrators.

Implications

It is clear from the available research (and to some extent, implied from the paucity of research on the topic) that the majority of educational administration faculty are not preparing their future school principals to work with school counselors, especially in regard to the ASCA National Model. Without this preparation, a perpetuation of using school counselors as clerical workers may persist (Pérusse, Goodnough, Donegan & Jones, 2004). This is unfortunate given that school counselors are being trained across the country to increase student achievement, collect data to show they are accountable (Stone & Dahir, 2007), and help close achievement gaps (The Education Trust, 2007a).

Among educational administration faculty who do prepare future principals to work with counselors, the question is the degree to which that education is consistent with the ASCA National Model. In order to meet the role definition included within the ASCA National Model (2005), school counselors must take leadership roles within whole school improvement teams.

However, without the leadership and support of principals, developmental school counseling programs can not be fully effective (Dahir, 2000; Murray 1995; Williamson, Broughton, & Hobson, 2003). Clearly, there is a critical need for principals and school counselors to work together, and for educational administration and counselor education faculty to collaborate as well.

There are many ways that this collaboration can be implemented to help improve future principal's understanding of the transformed school counselor's role. For example, educational administration faculty might use counselor education faculty as guest lecturers, have their students take required or elective courses together, and offer their respective courses in the same time slot so as to allow opportunities for future principals and future school counselors to work collaboratively on case studies or other projects.

In addition to collaborating with school counselor educators, educational administration faculty might use school counseling professionals as guest speakers by reaching out to school counselors who are at the same internship sites as their students who are preparing to be principals, or contacting the president of their state school counseling association.

Also, there exist online resources on the ASCA website (ASCA, 2006b). From the "Administrators" link, educational administration faculty can access information about their state's school counseling association, their state's comprehensive school counseling document, and information about the transformed role of the school counselor. In addition, the Center for School Counseling Outcome Research (2000) contains research briefs and monographs based on published works that show the effectiveness of school counseling interventions.

Conclusion

In their study about conceptions school administrators had about the role of the school counselor, Amatea and Clark (2005) concluded that it would be helpful for "colleges of education to initiate courses, seminars, and field experiences in which graduate students in counseling, educational leadership, and teaching are enrolled together so that they can learn what each has to offer and how to work as a team" (p. 25). Principals provide leadership for challenges such as: rigorous coursework (Werkema & Case, 2005), closing the achievement gap (Bainbridge & Lasley, 2005), high poverty rates (Balfanz, Legters, & Jordan, 2004), racial diversity (McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004), providing accountability (Cooper, Ponder, Merritt, & Matthews, 2005), and social justice (Brown, 2006; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005). If given the opportunity, professional school counselors can help principals tackle these challenges.

Author Biographies

Rachelle Pérusse is an associate professor in the counseling program within the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Connecticut. Before becoming a school counselor educator, Pérusse worked with poor and minority youth as a high school counselor in a rural school district in Georgia. As a MetLife Fellow for the Transforming School Counseling Initiative with The Education Trust, Inc., she conducts consultations with school districts about the role of school counselors and school administrators in relation to closing the achievement gap and advocating for poor and minority youth. Pérusse has several articles published about national trends in school counselor education, and has co-edited two books: *Leadership, Advocacy, and Direct Service Strategies for Professional School Counselo*rs and *Critical Incidents in Group Counseling*.

Eric Haas is a senior fellow at the Rockridge Institute in Berkeley, CA. He is a lawyer and former university assistant professor, school administrator, and teacher. His research focuses on the impact of legal decisions on education policy and practice, the use of expert information in education policy formation, and the place of public schools in U.S. democracy. Haas was recently selected as a visiting fellow at the University of Lancaster in England for his work in analyzing how newspapers represent public school issues and their impact on education policy. His work has been published in *The SAGE Handbook of Educational Leadership*, the *Peabody Journal of Education*, the *Journal of Law & Education*, and *Equity & Excellence in Education*.

Ian Lally is head of the guidance department at World Academy for Total Community Health (WATCH) High School in Brooklyn, NY.

Sarah Mische is currently on the faculty at Edwin O. Smith High School in Storrs-Mansfield, CT.

References

Amatea, E.S., & Clark, M.A. (2005). Changing Schools, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(1), 16-27.

American School Counselor Association (2006a). *Effectiveness of school counseling.* Retrieved May 15, 2007 from http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?pl=325&sl=133&contentid=241

American School Counselor Association (2006b). *Welcome to ASCA.* Retrieved May 15, 2007 from http://www.schoolcounselor.org/

American School Counselor Association (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2nd Edition). Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Bainbridge, W.L., & Lasley, T.J. II. (2002). Demographics, diversity and K-12 accountability: The challenge of closing the achievement gap. *Education and Urban Society, 34,* 422-437.

Balfanz, R., Legters, N., & Jordan, W. (2004). Catching up: Effect of the talent development ninth-grade instructional interventions in reading and mathematics in high-poverty high schools. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(641), 3-30.

Ballard, M. B., & Murgatroyd, W. (1999). Defending a vital program: School counselors define their roles. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*(603), 19-26.

Brown, K. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*, 700-745.

Cambron-McCabe, N. & McCarthy, M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy, 19,* 201-222.

Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). *The national standards for school counseling programs.* Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Center for School Counseling Outcome Research (2000). Retrieved May 15, 2007 from http://www.umass.edu/schoolcounseling/index.htm

Cooper, J. E., Ponder, G., Merritt, S., & Matthews, C. (2005). High-performing high schools: Patterns of success. *NASSP Bulletin, 89*(645), 2-23.

Dahir, C. A. (2000). The national standards for school counseling programs: A partnership in preparing students for the new millennium. *NASSP Bulletin 84* (616), 68-76.

Dahir, C. A. (2001). The national standards for school counseling programs: Development and implementation. *Professional School Counseling, 4,* 320-327.

The Education Trust. (2007a). *National Center for Transforming School Counseling at The Education Trust.* Retrieved May 15, 2007, from http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Transforming+School+Counseling/main

The Education Trust. (2007b). *Scope of Work.* Retrieved May 15, 2007, from http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Transforming+School+Counseling/scope+work.htm

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980 – 1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9* (2), 157-191.

Henderson, P. (1999). Providing leadership for school counselors to achieve an effective guidance program. *NASSP Bulletin*, *83*(603), 77-83.

House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. Professional School Counseling, 5, 249-256.

Kaplan, L. S. (1995). Principals versus counselors: Resolving tensions from different practice models. *The School Counselor, 42,* 261-267.

Kaplan, L. S., & Evans, M. W. (1999). Hiring the best school counseling candidates to promote students' achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83 (603), 34-39.

McKenzie, K. B., & Scheurich, J. J. (2004). Equity traps: A useful construct for preparing principals to lead schools that are successful with racially diverse students. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40,* 601-632.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38* (2), 112-126.

Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*, 370-397.

Murray, B. A. (1995). Principals: Proponents of High School Guidance Programs. *NASSP Bulletin, 79*(570), 65-68.

Pérusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., Crumley, K., Gugliotta, B., Mattimore, J., & Mulvaney, M. (2004, April). *A national survey of school counselor educators and educational administration faculty about preparing future professionals to work together.* Research poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Counseling Association World Conference, Kansas City, MO.

Pérusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., Crumley, K. Mattimore, J., & Bouknight, T. (in prep). Working in
        Collaboration: A National Study of Counselor Education and Educational Administration
        Program Faculty.

Pérusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., Donegan, J., & Jones, C. (2004). Perceptions of school counselors and
        school principals about the national standards for school counseling programs and the
        transforming school counseling initiative. *Professional School Counseling*, *7*(3), 152-162.

Rambo-Igney, B. C., & Grimes Smith, P. H. (2005-2006). Changing educational leadership and school
        counseling students' view of their respective roles and responsibilities. *Connections, 7,* 27-40.

Remley, T. P., Jr., & Albright, P. L. (1988). Expectations for middle school counselors: Views of
        students, teachers, principals, and parents. *The School Counselor, 35,* 290-296.

Shoffner, M. F., & Briggs, M. K. (2001) An interactive approach for developing interprofessional
        collaboration: Preparing school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *40*, 193-202

Shoffner, M. F., & Williamson, R. D. (2000) Engaging preservice school counselors and principals in
        dialogue and collaboration. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *40*(2), 128-40.

Stone, C., & Dahir, C. (2007). *School counselor accountability: A MEASURE of student success* (2nd
        edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Werkema, R. D., & Case, R. (2005). Calculus as a catalyst: The transformation of an inner-city
         high school in Boston. *Urban Education, 40,* 497-520.

Williamson, R. D., Broughton, E., & Hobson, S. (2003, August). *Shaping the Future: Collaborative
        opportunities for school administrators and school counselors.* Paper presented at the Annual
        Conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.

Carl Upchurch: Journey from Prisoner Citizen to Educator

Robert Kronick, PhD
Professor
Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN

Denis' Thomas, MEd
Doctoral Student
Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN

Learn from those who you serve. Convicts, students, homeless people, mental patients, and others may all be excellent teachers. Carl Upchurch (1996, p. xi) stated, "The fact that I am neither dead nor still in prison is due not to any government program or fancy rehabilitation center but to some folks I met in prison: poets, playwrights, activists, theologians, and philosophers."

Upchurch was born and raised in Philadelphia in the 1950's. His mother, uncle and grandmother socialized him during his early childhood. His grandmother was his primary caregiver and a prostitute, his father drifted in and out of his life, and his uncle died in a gunfight. All this shaped Upchurch as a person and led to his development of the term "niggerization." His voice became powerful for both education and corrections.

After a class-conducted prison trip, a student wrote, "When I asked the panel of five inmates what their experiences were like in school I got mixed messages. The first person was a good student. The second said he'd had no confidence in school. He always felt stupid in school and got in fights because he could not express himself verbally. He said he never felt smart enough to argue so he always turned to blows. The third man never felt successful in school either. The fourth man did not finish middle school. He seemed to be negative about his abilities." (KS, 2002). The fifth was a contract killer. At the age of 18 he committed his first major criminal offense, killing a woman and her lover. He reported that school was not a challenge for him.

All these men reported negative home lives but did not blame their home lives for their incarceration. One had a prostitute for a mother. Others talked of learning of crime, alcohol, and drugs from their fathers, what they

termed, "doin' your daddy." They spoke of making bad choices. What most of these men lacked was a family where they were socialized to the goals of society. Neither the family nor the school taught appropriate behavior. (Straight Talk Prison Group, n.d.).

Upchurch said, "No child can suddenly become responsible, clean, courteous, respectful, caring, considerate, and cooperative without being exposed to these types of behaviors during the first five years of his or her life. Without models, without instruction, without emotional nourishment or established preparation a child cannot possibly perform to the standards set by society."

Practice to Theory

Labeling theorists such as Cooley, Thomas, Mead, and Lemert explained behaviors by the reactions those behaviors received from audiences. Audiences' reactions to behaviors were more important than the behaviors themselves. Labeling theorists believed that society socialized its members to acceptable behavior. If behavior was seen as good or appropriate, society would reinforce it. Functionalists, such as Merton, called this behavior conformity, where members accepted the means and goals of society.

Society at large, significant others, and social control agents played a powerful role in both Upchurch's and the prison panels' lives. Upchurch claimed that he was "niggerized" by significant others, namely his family. "My uncle was a convicted rapist. My grandmother who virtually raised me was a prostitute. My father spent most of his life in and out of bars and street fights, never taking responsibility for me. Needless to say, the values I learned as a youth are not the ones you will find in the pages of a William Bennett anthology" (Upchurch, 1996, p. x). Agents of social control locked him up, but did not provide

rehabilitation, which he credited to the poets and philosophers he read while in prison.

Upchurch and his Philadelphia friends did not have access to culturally and socially approved opportunity structures. Hence, they found avenues to gain access to deviant means and goals. Upchurch made more as a drug dealer than as a college graduate. Secondary deviance, according to Lemert (1951), occurred when one continued to violate societal norms and was subsequently forced by other people's reactions to assume a deviant role, a more or less lasting identity.

Labeling theory described people in a situation which made it difficult for them to act normally once labeled deviant. They were locked into a role of being socially different, creating social deviance, a role where behavior conformed to society's expectations of deviant (Cockerham, 2005).

"I grew up believing that I deserved society's contempt just because I was black," wrote Upchurch. (1996, p. x). "With each act of violence, disappointment and rejection, each stabbing each shooting each fight that I witnessed, each bitter word from my mother, each meal that was not provided, each time I had to go to school in dirty clothes, I retreated further inside myself to a place of empty distress and growing anger" (p. xi).

By studying non-conforming behaviors that gained responses from agents of social control, conforming behavior can be better understood. "Everything I had experienced in my childhood was the opposite of what I needed to survive socially, intellectually, and psychologically at schools" (Upchurch, 1996, p. 17). He was socialized to a different set of values, means, and goals from typical middle

class people. He learned behavior through interaction with others on the street. Peers influenced his behavior, but so did his family, all in a counter-cultural way that made life difficult in institutions (such as school), but not the streets.

Institutionalization and the Community

We often hear how inmates, convicts, or residents return to the community worse than they entered. They worsened from treatment. "Glen Mills taught me how to follow rules, but it didn't prepare me at all to go out and lead a moral non-violent life. It didn't change the way I viewed the world. If anything, I got tougher there, developed a bigger reputation and became even more hardened to the violence I saw and committed" (Upchurch, 1996 p. 49).

Brown (1961) made many of the same points about the tough side of being on the streets, institutionalized, and, at least in these two cases, somehow making it in the white world. The question was how did Brown and Upchurch make it? For them education was the ticket up and out.

Labeling theory and institutionalization were connected. Being locked into a role, they had no other option but to end up in prison or a mental hospital. "I arrived at Youth Development Center (YDC) November 1962. I felt no shame about being there. After all, most of the men in my neighborhood, young and old, had spent time in a succession of prisons. I figured it was a normal pattern of life – YDC was where I was supposed to be" (Upchurch, 1996, p. 39).

Not two months after Upchurch's release from the YDC, he was charged and convicted of larceny. His history resulted in a more stringent correctional school sentence where Upchurch was with hard-core youths boasting long records of theft and violence (Upchurch, 1996). Labeling theory played out in Upchurch's life as he acted the role of secondary deviant and was seen as a violent thief.

Institutions were intended to rehabilitate. Although in Upchurch's case, they did not, they did keep him off the streets. By fifteen, he was an expert on working his way in and out of institutions. He had a zigzag career from the streets to various correctional institutions. After three visits to juvenile institutions and a stint with the Army in Vietnam, Upchurch was incarcerated again in his early twenties. There he was introduced to the works of William Shakespeare, Mark Twain, and Maya Angelou. He also learned from Victor Hugo, Frederick Douglas, the *Bible*, and Malcolm X. He wrote, "They clearly changed my life" (p. 66-67).

"Through my reading I had gotten a good look at my soul and my spirit," (Upchurch 1996, p. 166). While going through this interpersonal struggle, Upchurch maintained his pose as a tough guy, but when he returned to his cell, he went back to his books. Then one day Upchurch beat a man severely with an 18-inch pipe. The beginning of change in his life was evidenced by his reflection on this fight, the first time he felt shame. To use Upchurch's own words, this was the beginning of his de-niggerization (p. 102).

Education and Empowerment

Upchurch clearly distinguished between genetic inheritance and state of mind. According to him, being black was genetic inheritance, but being a "nigger" was a state of mind. Niggerized thinking convinces that the most that can be hoped in life is to be better niggers (Upchurch, 1996). "The gang members

latched on to the concept of de-niggerization like a life line because it explained so much about their lives and at the same time it held out hope for a better future. Once they understood that they could choose to de-niggerize themselves, the healthy sense of empowerment was almost tangible. Suddenly being a nigger didn't have to be a life sentence" (p. 186).

"Empowerment is not something that can be given, but rather empowerment is a concept that the individual or group takes. Those prepared to do this are ready, eager (and able), individually and collectively. Nothing can stop this impending groundswell. The only choice we have is whether we're going to be part of the solution or part of the problem" (Upchurch, 1996, p. 198).

"The pattern of young black urban males is that they are destined for the most part to grow up to be drug users and/or sellers, to become proficient with street weapons and to end up either dead by age 21 or under the direction of the criminal justice system or both" (Upchurch, 1996, p. 199). They knew more people in prison than in college. This reflected Jerome Miller's findings (1996) that 75% of black males would be under the direction of a department of correction by 18.

Education is one key to cultural empowerment. One of the greatest gifts an education gives is perspective. We have to stop thinking of education as the simple accumulation of facts. Education is power.

According to Upchurch, a broad spectrum of African Americans have used education to de-niggerize themselves – Malcom X, Maya Angelou, Martin Luther King Jr., Carter Woodsen, W.E.B. Dubois, Cornel West and many others.

Education offers perspective, power, and self worth. A feeling of positive self worth coupled with education must be a central force in de-niggerization, but education must be meaningful, more than high stakes tests. Education must offer opportunities that lead to success within a capitalist system if education is to have value in American society (Upchurch, 1996).

Upchurch's book *Convicted in the Womb* (1996) speaks volumes to those working in urban education. His life history makes his work especially cogent and authoritative. This article attempted to tell his story, which adds important information to the attitudes, skills and knowledge necessary for competent human service education and service delivery.

Author Biographies

Robert Kronick is affiliated with human services, mental health counseling and counselor education at the University of Tennessee. His principal research focus is on full service schools. He currently serves on the editorial board for the *Journal of Sociologist and Social Welfare*. He has held leadership positions in the Holmes Group and U.N.I.T.E. Kronick has authored four books that relate, in part, to serving the needs of children (especially those at risk) through full service schools. He also has contributed a number of articles to professional journals. He has presented papers at state, regional, and national conferences, including the American Educational Research Association.

Kronick is recognized both in academic and political circles as an expert on full-service schools and an advocate for at-risk children. He has appeared on national television to discuss child abuse. He has received both the University of Tennessee alumni association outstanding teacher award and the Harry C. Merrill Research Award.

Denis' Thomas is a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville.

References

Brown, C. (1961). *Manchild in the promised land*. New York. Free Press**.**

Cockerham, W. (2005). *Sociology of mental disorder, 7th ed*. Upper Saddle River, N.J. Pearson.

Lemert, E. (1951) *Human deviance, human process and social control*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
    Prentice Hall.

Miller, J. (1996). *Search and destroy*. University of Cambridge. Cambridge, U.K.

Straight talk prison group, Morgan County Prison, Wartburg, TN, n.d.

Upchurch, C. (1996). *Convicted in the womb*. New York. Bantam.

Effective Communication for School Administrators: A Necessity in an Information Age
by Theodore Kowalski, George Petersen and Lance Fusarelli

Reviewed by Art Stellar, PhD
Superintendent of Schools
Taunton School District
Taunton, MA

School administrators are expected to manage the changes within their organizations and communities so controlled differences emerge as improvements. According to the authors: "Communication and cultural change are interlaced. Cultures are created and sustained by communication, and once established, cultures determine communicative behavior . . . The primary premise of this book is that administrators must be effective communicators if they are to be effective reformers." (p. vi)

Of course, most school administrators have had limited exposure to pre-service communications courses. Generally, public relations is a matter of on-the-job training for most school administrators. Unfortunately, there is so much else to do and most practitioners fail to fully understand this connection between accomplishing their goals and communications. This book helps make these connections for administrators while providing solid communications theory.

The first part of this book gives a powerful rationale for the relationship between "Public Relations, Communication, and School Reform." Readers will pick up on the complexities of communication through an assortment of figures, research studies and practical accounts. The point is repeatedly made that planned positive change is unlikely to occur unless school administrators are effective communicators. And, if that isn't enough for motivation according to the authors, school administrators need to be decent communicators just to survive.

Communication problems are inherent within all organizations. School districts are often plagued with individuals bypassing the chain of command which leads to confusion and, often, political repercussions. Other typical communication difficulties are: poor listening skills, poor language skills, lack of credibility and trust, communication oversights, inaccessibility, elitism, inadequate attention to effect, information overload, and excessive use of informal channels. (pgs. 50-54)

School culture is highly depended upon and influenced by the quality and quantity of communications. Management, however, is not the only force that uses communication to form the culture. Even competent administrators discover that cultural change can take three or four years as described herein.

The authors summarize this situation as: "Engaging stakeholders in discussion of seemingly intractable governance, power and organizational design problems, however, is a risk-laden assignment for administrators even under favorable conditions, but it is especially perilous for administrators who are not competent communicators." (p. 77)

The second half of this book is focused upon applications of communication theory to real life situations and to reform approaches such as democratic leadership. Rumors are addressed as well as classical network analysis as a counter approach. A significant chapter on "Managing Conflict" recognizes that some conflict is non-malevolent, but still hostile,

while some conflict is outright hateful and personal. Acknowledging that "Conflict is inevitable in schools . . ." (p. 182), possible management strategies are summarized. In a chapter on "Maintaining Positive Relationships", school administrators have a mini-briefing on public relations.

Those who desire a detailed manual on how to improve public relations will need to look elsewhere. The value of this book is for those who are interested in school improvement and want to make it happen. As the title and subtitle state, effective communication is a necessity. This volume is good to bring to the starting line for communities who have to change or w ant to reform.

Reviewer Biography

Arthur Stellar is superintendent of schools in Taunton, Mass.

Effective Communication for School Administrators: A Necessity in an Information Age is published by Rowman & Littlefield Education, Lanham, MD, 2007; 254 pages, softcover, $34.95

The Truth About School Violence: Keeping Healthy Schools Safe
by Jared M. Scherz

Reviewed by
Laura Holyoke, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Adult, Career and Technology Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID

The Truth About School Violence: Keeping Healthy Schools Safe is a very timely book as our nation continues to face unprecedented violence within our school systems.

Scherz thoughtfully discusses a variety of carefully selected literature about how school systems can approach the prevention of violence in schools.

His goal is to position the concept of school organizational health on the reader's radar as he lobbies stakeholders to address the factors that can build health in schools and make them more resistant to acts of violence. In the same manner we ignore our own health until we find ourselves sick, Scherz reminds us that we have not paid much attention to the seemingly "random" acts of violence which have occurred in our school systems.

The common, knee-jerk reaction that many schools take when an act of violence occurs, equates to an emergency response to treat symptoms of an acute illness, but not find its cause. Schools often adopt policies to prevent violence without proper acknowledgement of the context in which the violence occurs; such policy establishment ignores the root of the problem. While these measures may give a superficial feeling of safety and protection, they lack acknowledgement of how the school's health contributes to the condition. Just as an unhealthy body is susceptible to disease, the unhealthy state of a school may be an incubator for violence.

Health in schools lies within the intersection of three dimensions on both individual and organizational levels. Scherz explains that these dimensions include adaptability, climate, and infrastructure. Adaptability refers to the ability to adjust to change—whether incremental, transitional or transformational—in the environment.

Adaptation also includes the concepts of awareness of surroundings, resilience, and learning from the processes of the two former concepts. Scherz likens climate of a school to the temperament and mood of an individual— only it is much more complex as the school is comprised of a system of individuals that each contribute to several sub-systems that in turn form a school's climate, also known as a school's personality.

Several concepts contribute to climate, such as morale, job satisfaction, philosophical accord, communication, and autonomy and empowerment. Finally, infrastructure—which is driven by the mission and vision of the school—refers to the origin of how daily activities ought to happen. Infrastructure is comprised of policies/procedures, leadership, physical environment, espoused values, and integrity of the institution.

While this slender book may give a first impression of simplicity regarding school violence, it is anything but simple. Scherz presents data about school violence in a straightforward manner and then emphasizes the concepts that really matter: those that are representative of the complexity in our school systems that often go unrecognized. He does not take a prescriptive approach, but he does give us reasoned diagnostic information so that we can begin to understand and approach the problem of school violence in a more holistic and systemic manner. While lacking in empirical-based evidence to support his position, his recommendations to decrease violence in schools by focusing on organizational health are unusual, thought-provoking, and worth the time for school leaders to consider.

Reviewer Biography

Laura Holyoke is an assistant professor in the Department of Adult, Career and Technology Education at the University of Idaho in Moscow, Idaho.

The Truth About School Violence: Keeping Healthy Schools Safe is published by Rowman & Littlefield Education, Lanham, MD, 2006, 134 pages; softcover, $21.95.

Author Guidelines

Submissions
The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* is a refereed, blind-reviewed, quarterly journal with a focus on research and best practices that advance the profession of educational administration. Articles that express a point of view, shed light on a contemporary issue, or report findings and conclusions of a field of interest to educational administration professors and practitioners will be given preference. AASA members are also invited to submit news, notices, and announcements relevant to administrators and faculty in higher education. Reactions to previously published articles are also welcome.

Length of manuscripts should be as follows: Research and best-practice articles between 1,200 and 1,800 words; commentaries, book and media reviews between 400 and 600 words. Articles, commentaries, book and media reviews, citations, and references are to follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, latest edition. Permission to use previously copyrighted materials is the responsibility of the author, not the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*.

For review purposes, the title of the article, contributor's name, academic rank, department, and affiliation (for inclusion on the title page and in the author note), address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address should appear on a *detachable* cover page. Also please provide on the cover page current position, recently published books (within the past 18 months) and notable achievements, all for possible use in a brief biographical endnote. The contributor must indicate whether the submission is to be considered a research or best-practice article, commentary, book or media review. The type of submission must be indicated on the cover sheet in order to be considered.

Book Review Guidelines
Book review guidelines should adhere to the author guidelines as found above. The format of the book review is to include the following:

- Full title of book
- Author
- City, state: publisher, year; page; price
- Name and affiliation of reviewer
- Contact information for reviewer: address, country, zip or postal code, e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers
- Date of submission

Additional Information and Publication Timeline

Contributors will be notified of editorial board decisions within eight weeks of receipt of papers at the editorial office. Articles to be returned must be accompanied by a postage-paid, self-addressed envelope.

The *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* reserves the right to make minor editorial changes without seeking approval from contributors.

Materials published in the *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice* do not constitute endorsement of the content or conclusions presented.

Articles and book reviews are to be submitted to the editor by e-mail as an electronic attachment in Microsoft Word 2003.

The schedule follows:

Issue	Deadline to submit articles	Notification to authors of editorial review board decisions	To AASA for formatting, editing	Issue available on AASA website
Spring	October 1	January 1	February 15	April 1
Summer	February 1	April 1	May 15	July 1
Fall	May 1	July 1	August 15	October 1
Winter	August 1	October 1	November 15	January 15

Submit to:
Christopher H. Tienken, EdD
Assistant Professor
College of Education and Human Services
Department of Education Leadership, Management, and Policy
Seton Hall University
Jubilee Hall Room 405
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, NJ 07079
973.275.2874
E-mail: tienkech@shu.edu

AASA Professional Library

The American Association of School Administrators is pleased to provide school leaders and higher education professionals with the opportunity for access to cutting-edge books at a significant discount before they are offered to the general public. The AASA Professional Library is an annual subscription series of educational leadership books written by specialists, veteran administrators, acclaimed professors and skilled practitioners.

When you join the AASA Professional Library, you will receive four books each year on a quarterly basis. AASA carefully selects the books, which address timely topics that are important to superintendents and other school system leaders who are focused on student success.

Sign up by **March 6, 2009**, to receive your advance copy of *Leaders as Communicators and Diplomats*. This book offers key ideas on effective diplomacy and communication strategies for school leaders. It combines research and thought-provoking ideas for improving practice, with contributions from top leadership figures like Daniel H. Pink, 2007 AASA Superintendent of the Year Krista Parent, John Hoyle, Rich Bagin, Donald A. Phillips, former AASA Executive Director Paul Houston, and more. This book will be shipped to you on April 1, 2009.

An annual fee of $99 covers all four books and includes shipping. You'll save more than 30% by joining the AASA Professional Library.

Your books will be shipped on April 1, July 1, October 1 and January 1 to the address you provide on the order form.

This program is offered to AASA members only. Not a member? Join today at www.aasa.org/member or by calling 703-875-0748.

Additional information and a downloadable order form are available at www.aasa.org/library.

New Books from AASA!

The American Association of School Administrator's books program is growing!

AASA is pleased to present the following new books:

- *Building Strong School Cultures: A Guide to Leading Change*
- *The Gated Society: Exploring Information Age Realities for Schools*
- *From Systems Thinking to Systemic Action: 48 Key Questions to Guide the Journey*
- *Leading With Data: Pathways to Improve Your School*
- *The School Administrator's Guide to Blogging: A New Way to Connect with the Community*
- *So Now You're the Superintendent!*
- *The Strategic School: Making the Most of People, Time, and Money*
- *Succeeding as a Female Superintendent: How to Get There and Stay There*
- *Turning Average Instruction into Great Instruction: School Leadership's Role in Student Achievement*
- *Why School Communication Matters: Strategies from PR Professionals*

Learn more about these books and special discounts for AASA members! Download the AASA Publications Catalog at www.aasa.org/files/PDFs/Publications/AASABookBrochure011209.pdf.