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Recognition of the significance of the role of the principal in school improvement is increasing. Mediocre principals do not lead excellent schools. Research in the past decade has identified the characteristics and behaviors of effective principals that influence student achievement. In order for new principals to become effective leaders, there is a need for support and assistance during their first
years in the position. This study examined two systems of support in place for new principals in the Sunnyside School District. The research sought to understand what differences existed between the district programs of coaching support and mentor support for new principals. Interview and survey data from eight new principals were used to examine the supports and barriers that were identified as significant to beginning principals achieving or failing to achieve their goals during the first year.

The study determined that new principals in the study district were satisfied with the level of support they received during their first year on the job. An influencing factor for the reported satisfaction with the district support may have been the level of previous principal experience. Areas of concern for accomplishing goals included: (a) Change in school level, (b) Construction issues, (c) Lack of information or training, (d) Learning or changing the school culture, and (e) Time management. Recommendations for further research include a need to examine the program impact on the coach or mentor, the selection and matching of mentors and mentees, and coaches and coachees, and the length of the formal program. The findings and their implications are discussed.

Programs of support for new administrators from trained, experienced principals are one way to provide additional support and training for the beginning principal. Staffing schools with strong principals ready to meet the challenging demands of today’s schools is important to the academic achievement of students.
CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Public schools are facing one of the biggest challenges in educational history. Meeting the federal government requirements of educating “all” children under the “No Child Left Behind” legislation is the daunting task facing principals throughout the country. Because of the impact school leaders have on school improvement (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003), this challenge will only be met if schools are led by highly effective school administrators. Better recruitment, encouragement, and support of candidates to stay in leadership positions are becoming pressing needs for all school districts (Zellner, Jinkins, Gideon, Doughty, & McNamara, 2002).

New principals face different challenges and responsibilities today than existed just five years ago and districts around the country are struggling to find strong leaders willing to face these increased demands. With the advent of “high stakes” testing, performance mandates, and government sanctions for schools failing to meet federally mandated benchmarks such as Adequate Yearly Progress goals and Academic Performance Index measures, fewer and fewer candidates are eager to enter the political arena of public school leadership. Many factors are driving prospective as well as practicing administrators away from the principalship. Most often cited are long hours, increasing responsibilities, work related stress, salary constraints, and institutional interference (Lashway, 2003). According to the United States Department of Labor, 40 percent of the nation’s 93,200 principals are at or close to
Retirement age (Lovely, 2004). Although more than half the United States teachers have advanced degrees, Malone (2001) notes few are interested in pursuing administration, thus creating a shortage of qualified candidates to replace retiring administrators. One result of the dearth of candidates for administrative positions is that new school leaders are entering administration much earlier in their careers, with increasingly less experience as either a teacher or an assistant principal.

Throughout the past decade, the role of the school principal as instructional leader was recognized as a critical component in the quest for school improvement and increased student achievement. Changes in the role and responsibilities of the school principal have transformed the position into a job that is multifaceted, complex, and extremely demanding. The high stakes of the position, the increasing shortage of administrators, and a school district’s ability to recruit, train, support, and retain competent leaders, is an issue being debated and studied by many in the field (Beaudin, Thompson, & Jacobson, 2002; Cunningham & Hardman, 1999).

Purpose of the Study

There has been a call in recent years for professional development and inservice support for principals, especially during the first three induction years (Daresh, 1986; Daresh, 2001; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Key researchers agree that leadership preparation can no longer end with the awarding of a certificate, degree, or credential. Rather, professional development needs to be embedded throughout the professional career of the principal.
The purpose of this study is to examine the benefits of two induction programs, one of coaching and the other of mentoring, for new principals in a Southern California School District. In 2005, the Sunnyside School District (SSD) implemented a Leadership Academy program to strengthen and expand leadership capacity across the organization. The academy includes coaching and mentoring support for new administrators through two different programs. Principals new to the district or new to the principalship were assigned the support of either a mentor or a coach for the first year.

The first program, coaching support for new administrators, involves new administrators working with trained coaches to provide support during their first year. It began in the Fall of 2006-07. These administrators are new to an administrative position or new to the school district. In this program, Sunnyside coaches attended a three-day course, Coaching Leaders to Attain Student Success (CLASS) by the New Teacher Center (NTC) at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Coaches are trained to provide both instructional and facilitative support for their new principals based on the established guidelines of the coaching program.

The second induction program is known throughout the district as the principal mentor program. Mentor principals were selected to serve as support for several new principals. Mentors were instructed to function as the person the new administrator should contact with specific questions or concerns during the year. The addition, during the 2006-07 school year, of the mentor support program was based on a lack of trained coaches, specifically at the secondary level, and the reported pressure from the
school board to ensure the success of the newly-hired principals. Mentors were assigned based on their willingness to participate and their current assignment at the same level site as well as their excellent reputations as district principals.

During the 2006-2007 school year, five new principals participated in the formal coaching program of support while three new principals were assigned informal mentor support. Consideration was made for matching coaches and coachees as well as mentors and mentees, based on the same site level experience, background knowledge of the school by the coach, and the superintendent’s confidence in the expertise of the coach or mentor.

Setting of the Study

Sunnyside Unified School District¹, located in Southern California, encompasses 100 square miles and serves approximately 33,000 students in kindergarten through high school. The district is comprised of 34 schools, 23 elementary schools, 6 middle schools, 4 comprehensive high schools, 1 Alternative Program, 21 preschools, and an adult education program. Although enrollment has declined slightly in the past few years, the district is committed to opening new schools and has plans to add an additional two elementary schools and a high school in the next two years. The demographics of Sunnyside School District divide into the following categories: 3% African American, 0.5% American Indian/Alaskan, 15% Asian, 7% Filipino, 10% Hispanic, 0.5% Pacific Islander, 60% White, and 4% other.

Statement of the Problem

¹ Sunnyside is a pseudonym for the study school district.
In the study district, there is a recognized need to support new administrators. Currently, there are two programs in place to provide support for new principals and assistant principals: an informal mentor program and a formalized coaching program. Of concern is that no formal method for receiving feedback or examining the impact of these programs exists at this time. This study will explore whether the Sunnyside School District is providing sufficient support for their new principals.

Succession to the principalship is important to the effectiveness of the school’s mission, and new principals need continuing support if they are going to be successful in meeting the challenges of educating all children (Aiken, 2002). Daresh (2001) reported that beginning principals did not truly understand the school leader’s job, even though they had studied, read about, talked about, and practiced the principalship. Recent reviews of research on school effectiveness and organizational change suggest that the school principal can have a discernible effect on student achievement (Waters et al., 2003). Hallinger and Heck (1998) found in their mega-study of the work related to principals’ effectiveness “the general pattern of results drawn from this review supports the belief that principals exercise a measurable, though indirect effect on school effectiveness and student achievement” (p.1).

Overall, the literature is supportive of the importance and value of mentoring and coaching relationships; however, some negative barriers have been identified (Daresh, 2004; Villani, 2006). Time to meet with a mentor or coach is a constraint frequently mentioned in both the mentoring and the coaching processes. Availability and location of mentors or coaches can also be a barrier as well as the relationship or
match established between the mentor and the protégé (Daresh). For a relationship to be successful there must be trust as well as open and honest communication on the part of the mentee or coachee. He or she also needs to appreciate and understand why the assistance is being provided (Daresh).

Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to answer the following research questions:

1. Are there identifiable differences of job satisfaction and perceptions of district support for new principals enrolled in an informal mentor program in comparison to new principals enrolled in a formal coaching program?

   Proposition 1: Principals participating in a formal coaching program will report greater levels of job satisfaction and district support than principals assigned to district mentors.

2. What supports and barriers are identified by beginning principals as significant to their ability to achieve their goals during their first year?

   Proposition 2: First-year principals perceive receiving greater support in achieving goals and overcoming barriers from trained coaches than from district-assigned mentors.

3. How do new principals who participate in a formal coaching program report spending their time in terms of the themes identified by Hallinger and Murphy (1985)?

   a. Defining the School’s Mission

   b. Managing the Instructional Program
c. Promoting a Positive Learning Climate

Proposition 3: Principals supported by coaches will focus on school goals, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate with greater frequency than principals supported by mentors.

4. How do new principals who participate in an informal mentor program report spending their time in terms of the themes identified by Hallinger and Murphy (1985)?

   a. Defining the School’s Mission

   b. Managing the Instructional Program

   c. Promoting a Positive Learning Climate

Proposition 4: Principals supported by mentors will focus on school goals, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate with less frequency than principals supported by mentors.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, and as utilized by the participating school district, the following define the specific roles of mentor and coach.

Mentoring- a relationship in which a senior person oversees the career development and psychosocial development of a less-experienced person. It is the process by which an experienced principal is the person a new principal is to call regarding questions, concerns, and need for advice.

Mentee- the novice principal receiving support from an assigned principal mentor
Coaching- coaching as defined by the study school district is a formal relationship between the new administrator and the district designated, trained coach. The focus is on providing deliberate support to assist new principals to clarify and achieve the goals they have identified.

Coachee - term used by the study school district to refer to the novice administrator supported through a coaching relationship.

Significance of the Study

The significance of strong leadership in schools has been documented through the work of effective schools research conducted throughout the 1980s and beyond. The work of the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Institute (Waters et al., 2003) in its meta-analysis report, Balanced Leadership, has demonstrated the substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement. This report described three major findings. First, the researchers found that the average effect size between leadership and student achievement is .25, which translates to a one standard deviation increase in principal leadership behavior corresponding with a 10-percentile point difference in student achievement on a norm-referenced test. Of equal note, however, is the finding that leaders can have a marginal or negative impact on achievement. The latter is hypothesized by Waters, et al. (2003) to be a result of strong leaders who may not be focused on the “right” practices to make a difference on student performance. This study further identified 21 leadership responsibilities with statistically significant correlations to student achievement and 66 behaviors or practices for fulfilling these responsibilities.
If staffing schools with effective principals ready to meet the challenging demands of today’s schools is important to the academic achievement of students, filling vacancies with skilled and knowledgeable leaders is the next important step. Following hiring new administrators, continuous support and training throughout the career of a principal is necessary (Peterson, 2002). The cost of an unsuccessful administrator to a school, teacher morale, student achievement, and the district as a whole cannot be considered only in dollars. Nor can one calculate the personal toll on the individual leader who has studied, aspired, and finally achieved the goal of leading a school, only to fail. The cost of failure of leadership in schools is too high a financial and educational price to leave to chance. It is necessary as new administrators take on the incredible challenges of leading schools today that they have support structures in place to assist them in being successful. In turn, districts must carefully evaluate and assess such support structure to ensure that they are in fact providing the individualized support, knowledge and tools necessary to develop effective instructional leaders. Districts are beginning to acknowledge the requirement for a new type of administrator, understanding that it is no longer sufficient for schools to be led by efficient and effective managers.

This study will contribute to the needed dialogue about innovative methods of providing support for new administrators assuming the role of principal. By examining factors that contribute to their successful induction into the role, district leaders will be better equipped to support new administrators. Of the few programs that are in existence, little research has been conducted to evaluate the effectiveness.
Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study include the small sample size of eight participating principals in one school district. Although the formal coaching program is part of a much larger program overseen by the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, it will only be examined as implemented by the participating school district. The less-formal mentor principal program is in its first year and has not been formalized within the district. The support and assistance of the mentor is available, but it is up to the individual principal to seek out the support.

The researcher is a colleague within the district, which may influence the honesty and candor of the respondents in interview situations. As a trained and participating coach, I may be seen as favorable to the coaching program or otherwise biased, although I am not a coach for any of the participating principals. The use of scripted interview questions, tape recordings, and transcribed sessions will ensure that all participants are asked the same questions and that responses are accurately recorded and coded.

Time is an additional limitation of this study. Principals began working at their schools in August and data were collected in May, thus not allowing a full year’s program for any of the participants. Coaches were not formally trained until late September, and they began meeting with principals in October. Mentors were assigned in September and contacted principals at that time. Ideally, the assignments of mentors or coaches would be made in August and the support would be in place prior to the beginning of the school year.
This chapter outlined the purpose of this study. Chapter 2 provides a critical review and analysis of the literature on mentoring and coaching in the educational context. Chapter 3 delineates an overview and the rational for the qualitative methods utilized in the study while Chapter 4 reports the results of the study’s data analysis. Last, Chapter 5 discusses study findings in greater detail and presents suggestions for practice and future research.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Literature

Expectations from the standards movement, renewed school reform efforts, and advances in technology pose challenges that school leaders must be prepared to face. The business of schooling has become increasingly complex over the last decade and will certainly continue as the new century progresses. These higher expectations come in the midst of teacher and administrator shortages; unprecedented competition in the workplace for professionals in other fields; and the diverse learning, social, and emotional needs of today’s children. This focus has applied unrealistic pressure on those who choose to lead in our schools today (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000a).

The purpose of this literature review is to examine the current role and expectations for beginning principals and the existing programs that provide support to them during the crucial induction phase of their career. New principals need support if they are going to be successful in meeting the challenges ahead. Daresh (1986) reported that beginning principals did not truly understand the principalship, in spite of spending considerable time and energy learning about administration. Similarly, Dukess (2001) found:

School leaders do not emerge from training programs fully prepared and completely effective. Their development is a more involved and incremental process, beginning as early as their own schooling and extending through their first years on the job as leaders. Becoming a school leader is an ongoing process of socialization (p. 261).
The literature review examined (1) the role of the principal, (2) recruitment of administrative candidates, (3) administrative preparation and training, (4) induction of new principals, and (5) beginning principal support programs.

The significance of strong leadership in schools has been demonstrated through the work of effective schools research conducted for the past 25 years. Hallinger and Heck (1998) reviewed the empirical literature on principal effects from 1980 to 1995. In order to meet their criterion for inclusion, studies had to be designed to examine the school principal’s beliefs and leadership behavior, had to have an explicit measure of student performance as a dependent variable, and needed to take place in various countries. This review included 40 published journal articles, dissertation studies, and papers presented at peer-reviewed conferences. Hallinger and Heck (1998) found in their mega-study of the work related to principals’ effectiveness “the general pattern of results drawn from this review supports the belief that principals exercise a measurable, though indirect effect on school effectiveness and student achievement” (p.1).

The work of the McREL Institute (Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning) in its meta-analysis report, Balanced Leadership (Waters et al., 2003), also demonstrated the substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement. The data from this meta-analysis found that the average effect size between leadership and student achievement is .25, which means that increasing the effectiveness of school leaders can raise student achievement scores 10-percentile points higher. Of
equal note, however, is the finding that leaders can have a marginal or negative impact on student achievement.

Waters et al. (2003) have concluded that there are two primary variables that determine whether leadership will have a positive or negative impact on achievement. The first is the focus of change: Has the leader properly identified and focused on improving school and classroom practices that have a positive impact on student achievement? The second variable is whether the leader properly understands the magnitude of the change and is able to adjust their leadership practices accordingly. Without significant support and continuous learning, it is unlikely that any beginning principal will be able to successfully identify and focus on improving school and classroom practices that contribute to increased student achievement. New leaders are more likely to underestimate the magnitude of changes undertaken and therefore are unable to mitigate the negative influences. If new principals are to be successful in changing schools in order to better address the needs of today’s children, additional support and training while in the position of principal will be required.

The Role of the Principal

Public schools in the United States are facing one of the most extensive transformations in school leadership today. Throughout the past decade, the role of the school principal as instructional leader has been recognized as a critical component in the quest for school improvement and increased student achievement (Waters et al., 2003). Despite the attention given to the leadership role, the term instructional leader remains inconsistently defined. The very title of principal comes from principal
teacher, during the time when one teacher assumed responsibility for looking after the
details of managing a school. Over time, principals left their classrooms to become
school leaders, accumulating ever-growing responsibilities (Moir, 2003). As schools,
communities, and educational policy grow increasingly complex, so does the work of
the building principal. Increased demands require new skills as well as a greater time
commitment (Beaudin et al., 2002; Lashway, 2002a). In describing today’s principal,
Richard DuFour (1999) stated

They must have a sense of urgency, balanced by the patience to sustain
the school for the long haul. They must focus on the future, but remain
grounded in today. They must see the big picture, while maintaining a
close eye on the details. And they must be strong leaders who give
away power to others. (p.12)

The role of the school leader has evolved into one of growing complexity.
New principals entering schools today face unprecedented challenges and
expectations; they enter a dramatically different school system than existed just five
years ago. This change has taken place over the last decade during a time of increased
accountability and public scrutiny and in an era of high-stakes testing. The job of the
school principal has become nearly impossible (Grubb et al., 2003). Principals are
responsible for hiring teachers, disciplining students, soothing angry parents,
overseeing the cafeteria, supervising special education and other categorical programs,
managing the budget, maintaining facilities, coordinating enrollment and scheduling
of students, as well as all other areas of need. In a recent study, Cooley and Shen
(2000) surveyed more than 4000 secondary principals from across the nation. They
concluded
Many principals find themselves mired in situations beyond their control that involve labor strife, students, and parents with numerous social problems and school violence. These complexities in schools and communities demand the amount of time that principals must spend on management areas just to ensure the school operates at acceptable levels at the expense of leadership initiatives (p.12).

The principal’s job is fraught with fragmentation and constant interruption (Peterson & Cosner, 2005). Many exchanges last only a minute or two and decisions are made almost instantaneously. These brief encounters force a principal to analyze problems and identify solutions quickly and effectively. Trying to anticipate and respond to the various groups of people while juggling the day-to-day tasks of the job can be emotionally taxing and lead to feelings of being overwhelmed. Further isolation of the position can cause a leader to second-guess him/herself and, consequently, feel insecure about making decisions (Harvey & Donaldson, 2003; Zellner et al., 2002).

Principals today face perhaps the greatest challenge ever. They are responsible for educating all children; including those the public schools have traditionally failed (Aiken, 2001; Goldring & Greenfield, 2002). Public education has evolved from mandated attendance for all students to mandated learning and achievement for all (Peterson, 2001). In addition to the traditionally identified tasks, principals work with increasingly diverse communities, parents, and students. Now, more than ever, principals assume the role of instructional leader, working actively to improve teacher and student performance in the classroom. Moreover, we know such engaged school leadership matters, as it does make a difference in student achievement (Waters et al., 2003).
Waters, et al. (2003) have examined quantitative research spanning 25 years and 70 studies that reported standardized, objective, and quantitative measures for student achievement. The following conclusions regarding the impact of leadership were reached:

(a) Leadership matters. The researchers found a significant, positive correlation between effective school leadership and student achievement.
(b) Effective leadership can be empirically defined. They identified 21 key areas of leadership responsibility that are significantly correlated with student achievement.
(c) Effective leaders not only know what to do, but how, when and why to do it. (p. 2).

The literature is replete with examples of bright, powerful, well-intentioned leaders who failed in their leadership initiatives because they simply did not understand what they needed to know, how to proceed with implementation, or when they needed to use various practices and strategies. Thus, the preparation and support of school leaders is crucial as we move forward in educational reform and support for all students learning. The question of how leaders can be cultivated and readied for the challenges they will face needs to be addressed.

Recruitment of Administrative Candidates

As the complexity of the school leadership role increases, the numbers of interested applicants continues to decrease significantly. Tucker and Codding (2002) report that very few teachers today express interest in entering administration. They indicated that this is rapidly becoming a national dilemma. In 1998, 50% of school districts reported a shortage of qualified candidates for principal positions (Tucker & Codding, 2002). Because of this shortage, many assistant principals and novice
teachers began moving into the principal role relatively quickly. Novice school leaders often enter the job with little preparation and with increasingly less experience as either a teacher or an assistant principal (Bloom, 2004; Zellner et al., 2002). They spend little time in preparatory roles or working with other leaders from whom they can learn the skills and knowledge needed to succeed as a principal (Lovely, 2004).

At the same time, most beginning administrative roles are very limited in both scope and range of responsibilities. Many assistant principals are given the responsibility for student discipline, facilities, and student supervision, with much less accountability for and experience in instructional leadership (Bloom, 2004). Future administrators need to engage in activities that go beyond the “four Bs of bells, behavior, books, and bats” (Zellner et al., 2002).

Ambiguity abounds in the work of school administrators. Although there is National Board Certification available for teachers, no such national certification exists for school administrators (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2006). National certification would provide clear documentation about the professional expectations for those in leadership roles. Going through a certification process would help clarify job expectations. Although ISLCC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) standards for administrators do exist, and were adopted by many states, these standards do not necessarily reflect the research evidence about effective practices for effective schools (Adams & Copland, 2005).

Administrative Preparation and Training
The demands of the job of principal have changed over the past decade, yet little appears to have changed in the universities to prepare professionals to take on this role (Young & Creighton, 2002). A recent public agenda survey found that 69% of principals and 80% of superintendents believe that the typical leadership programs “are out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today’s school district” (Lashway, 2003c, p.4). Facing new roles and heightened expectations, principals require a new form of training. Lashway (2003) noted that entrance into most preparation programs has been determined by “self selection,” with “half-hearted screening and little outreach to talented individuals” (p. 3). There is little in the admissions requirements that are linked to the kinds of personal qualities (such as developing vision) desired in school leaders today. Preparation programs cannot turn mediocre teachers into “visionary, exciting school leaders,” no matter how good the pre-service program might be (McCarthy, 2002, p. 9).

Universities face the difficult task of linking academic knowledge to professional experiences. Pre-service programs equip aspiring principals with just a small portion of the knowledge that is necessary to master the realities of the principalship. The real learning for the principal begins when he or she is handed the keys to the school (Young, Sheets, & Knight, 2005).

In the move to reform school administration preparation, two schools of thought have evolved. One is the belief that refinement and bolstering of existing programs can address the limitations and shortfalls of programs as they are currently administered (Adams & Copland, 2005). Others believe that a complete departure
from traditional licensure and training models is necessary and desirable. The latter reformers argue that accountability and information technology, as well as the many changes in the organization and management of schools, have changed the principalship so much that “schools should cast a wide net in seeking individuals with useful skills, experiences and training” (Hess & Kelly, 2005, p. 12). In light of this debate, some proponents of radical change have proposed rethinking the principal’s job definition. A new approach may be needed to restructure the principal position in order to create a job “that mere mortals” (Grubb et al., 2003, p. 3) could carry out and therefore allow a different model of school to emerge.

The Wallace Foundation recently commissioned a study of innovative principal professional development programs through a team of researchers from the Stanford School of Education (LaPointe & Davis, 2006). They were able to identify eight exemplary programs across the country that included the structures and methods described in the literature on effective preparation programs. These exemplary programs contained a variety of approaches with respect to design, policy context, and the nature of collaboration with universities and school districts. Programs such as these, serve as models for others across the nation as exemplars of the positive impact an effective principal preparation program can have.

In an effort to describe the role of the principal, a consortium of more that 30 state education agencies and all of the major professional organizations involved in school administration developed an extensive set of attitudes and skills contained in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School
Leaders (1996). Many university programs have redesigned their preparation programs around the ISLLC standards. There is however, concern that these standards represent a narrow view of the principalship and may contradict efforts to expand the talent pool or skills that principals possess. In efforts to align their programs to the new ISLLC standards many states and universities have simply matched old course titles and content to new expectations and standards (Cohn, Fry, Bottoms, & O'Neil, 2002). Fundamental change in administrator preparation programs will only occur when the influence of the traditional gatekeepers is reduced in order to allow for the expansion of the range of ideas, skills, providers, and candidates.

Improving the internship has been suggested as one way to enhance the pre-service training of administrators. The National Policy Board for Educational Administration created a guide to articulate standards for the training of school leaders. The guide, entitled Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership for Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors (2001) lists the following standard in relationship to the internship:

Standard 7.0: The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skill identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned, and guided cooperation by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit (p.16).

According to the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) report (2002), The Principal Internship: How Can We Get It Right? preparing new principals to be leaders of change is not a top priority of most university programs. In reference to internship programs designed to prepare candidates for leadership positions the report
states: “Today, in far too many principal preparation programs, the internship ‘vessel’ is leaky, rudderless or still in dry dock” (p. 1). Very few programs at present offer a developmental continuum of practice that begins with the intern observing, then participating in, and then leading important school reform work. More than one-half of the universities in the SREB survey sample have graduated aspiring principals without evidence that they are prepared for the job. While field-based knowledge has practical value it is oriented around existing practices rather than reforms that may be needed (Lashway, 2003b).

Principal preparation programs and training have evolved over the past decade to include a wider variety of providers and formats. Universities continue to be the primary source for state licensure for educational administrators (McCarthy, 2002). However, more districts and states are developing programs to address the need for recruitment of, and better preparation and support for administrators. In addition, on-the-job support and training for administrators new to their positions has previously been limited to a sink-or-swim induction period in many districts and states (Lashway, 2003b; Lovely, 2001). In response to the difficulties encountered by new administrators, and the shortage of interested applicants, various districts are developing support networks and formalized programs to provide mentoring, training, and support for administrators throughout their induction period and beyond (Bloom & Krovetz, 2001; Cohn & Sweeney, 1992; Lashway, 2003b; Lovely, 2001). Darling-Hammond and Orphanos (2007) reported

Many states are introducing requirements for full-time administrative internships under the direct supervision of veteran principals as part of
their overhaul of administrator preparation. A number of states have developed innovative funding streams for administrator internships that address issues of both supply and quality” (p. 6).

In California, of interest was the passage of Senate Bill 1655 in 2002, establishing unconventional methods for satisfying both the preliminary and professional clear levels of the Administrative Services Credential, including examination alternatives. Currently, the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) has been selected as the preliminary Administrative Services examination alternative. These six-hour written tests assess the candidates’ skills in situational analysis, problem solving, and decision making in educational leadership scenarios. Although the testing option was intended to accommodate experienced administrators from out of state, the passage of this exam now allows a teacher to move directly into education administration with no formal training, background, or preparation programs. The fact that this route is open to candidates about whom there are no other indicators of experience, training, or competence concerns education leaders who question if such a measure can adequately evaluate a candidates capacity to meet the demands of the principalship (Darling-Hammond & Orphanos, 2006). Due to the newness of this exam, there is little research as to the success of administrators entering the profession through this alternative to a formal credential program. There seems, however, to be little resistance by school districts to hire candidates qualified by exam.

Recognizing the limited preparation and experience of administrative candidates, many districts and states are developing networks and programs to support
new principals through the induction phase of their career. Several have launched mentoring and coaching models to support principals. These formalized induction experiences are viewed as a welcome addition in helping administrators succeed in their beginning years as a principal. This support can assist in addressing the issue of isolation and job socialization and can help as new administrators learn the technical skills necessary for the job (Bloom, Catagna, & Warren, 2003). Leadership preparation can no longer end with a certificate, certification or degree; it must be ongoing, continuous, and supportive throughout the career of the principal, with a special emphasis on the first three years of induction (Zellner et al., 2002).

*Induction of New Principals*

Induction for teachers, with a strong emphasis on mentoring, has been widely recognized as an effective practice (Villani, 2006). While the need for induction programs for administrators has been expressed in the literature of the past 20 years (Coleman, 1996; Daresh, 1986), it is only recently that the success of teacher induction programs has been applied to administrators (Aiken, 2001; Bloom, 2005; Ricciardi, 2000). In 1999, Vermont created an institute to support new principals through an 18-month long, statewide effort organized to provide new administrators with one full day of staff development training every six weeks. In addition, experienced administrators were selected and trained to work with small groups of new principals at each session. Mentors were also available to provide support or answer questions outside of the staff development sessions. In Kentucky, the Kentucky Principal Intern Program (KPIP) provides job-embedded development for
new administrators through a one-year mentoring and internship program. In their review of six types of principal mentor programs offered in six New York City community school districts, New Vision for Public Schools found significant differences in programs that influenced the success of the mentoring (Dukess, 2001). Based on these findings, recommendations were made for effective principal mentor programs.

According to Ricciardi (2001), beginning administrators commonly identify the following areas of concern (a) role clarification, (b) technical expertise, and (c) professional socialization, for which there has been little formal support or training (p. 42). Daresh (1986) further explained role clarification as the extent to which first and second-year administrators felt comfortable with or believed in the authority and leadership role that had been assigned to them (p. 169). Technical expertise refers to both the ability to handle the mechanical and procedural issues of the job as well as the interpersonal skills essential to the job. In terms of interpersonal skills, new administrators identified the need for better conflict management skills, improved school-community relations, and decreased tension with teachers concerning the performance of assigned job responsibilities and evaluation processes (Daresh, 1986). Professional socialization refers to understanding the proper routes to be taken to solve problems and to survive in the job. It also suggests an understanding of the political and social system of the school district and often includes seemingly simple behaviors such as how to dress, which meetings to attend, and when to bend the rules to get things done.
New leaders often find themselves struggling with feelings of isolation; problems of time management; the complexity of student/family problems; and the unfamiliar challenges associated with working in the political arena of school boards, teacher unions, and state department mandates (Aiken, 2001). For some principals, moving from the collegial context of being a teacher, a role in which they felt secure and competent, into new arenas in which they are consistently challenged, leaves many feeling isolated, overwhelmed, and disenchanted with the job of principal. Such feelings often lead to a rapid turnover of new principals.

Further complicating the successful induction of school administrators are the different perceptions that experienced and inexperienced administrators hold of the job skills needed for success in the position. Whereas aspiring principals give priority to technical skills and knowledge, experienced principals give higher priority to higher-level skills that include self-awareness and job socialization (Lashway, 2002b). With limited experience, the new administrator may, for example, solve a problem of classroom assignments in what seems to be a fair way and create problems that are more serious because he or she has not consulted the faculty, taken history and school culture into consideration, or simply not thought through the human side of the problem. Bloom (2005), writes that “school leaders fail not because they lack brains, determination, knowledge and technical skills but because of what is characterized as ‘style’ or ‘people skills’” (p. 3). Emotionally intelligent principals must be self-motivating and empathetic. They must be persistent in the goal of educating all children, able to manage their own emotions and stress, and capable of keeping
everyone in the school focused on student achievement (Lambert, 2003). New principals’ success, when facing the steep learning curve during the first critical years of service, depends on their ability to “meet external expectations, develop interpersonal relationships, turn obstacles or barriers into goals and positive outcomes, and maintain their self-esteem and sense of pleasure in the work they do” (Young et al., 2005 p. 12).

The majority of administrators, in a study by Zellner, et al. (2002), agreed that the primary reasons for unsuccessful campus leadership include the principal’s (a) lack of ability to disseminate leadership throughout the campus, (b) inexperience with problem solving, (c) lack of reflection on leadership practice, (d) lack of experience in keeping the campus vision as a target, (e) lack of experience in self initiated leadership activities, and (f) lack of opportunity to be mentored and supported during initial stages of development as a leader. As teachers move from the comfortable and known role of teacher to the new and demanding role of administrator, support during this transition time is needed.

*Role socialization.*

Administrators are suddenly thrust into the role of being one of “them” as opposed to the socialization and camaraderie of being one of the many teachers at a school site (Aiken, 2002; Lovely, 2004). Browne-Ferrigno (2004) found that changing educational careers requires an individual to “relinquish the comfort and confidence of a known role- such as being a teacher- and experience the discomfort and uncertainty of a new role- being a principal” (p. 470). The transition from teacher
to principal is a complex process of learning and reflection that requires socialization into a new community of practice and assumption of a new role identity. The initial socialization stage is usually a time of emotional difficulties. The excitement and pride of being selected as a principal is countered by anxiety about success in the new position (Alvy & Robbins, 2005).

Teachers and administrators are vertically separated in the hierarchy of positions within a school. Teachers are in the trenches of the core work of the schools, teaching, while administrators remain ensconced in their offices, removed from the core technology of the school (Fishbein & Osterman, 2001). The teachers who do cross over into administration undergo an extensive and sometimes painful socialization process. Occasionally known as traitors for leaving the ranks of teachers, new leaders are treated differently, sometimes by people who have been friends. Findings by Fishbein and Osterman in their study of nine administrative interns indicated that teachers and administrative interns did not trust each other, their communication was guarded, and they assumed that their relationship was adversarial and acted accordingly. Characterized by inexperience while facing increased and unfamiliar job demands, new administrators often undergo anxiety, frustration, and self-doubt during their early years (Peterson & Kelley, 2001; Ricciardi, 2001). Supervising adults is not the same as providing direction for students. New leaders often have difficulty living in the spotlight. Faced with multiple problems on multiple levels, new leaders must learn to balance their own emotional responses and adjust to a loss of control (Bloom, 2004).
Friedkin and Slater (1994) found that in the culture of increasingly professional egalitarianism that often prevails in schools, teachers are likely to accord power only to expert principals, thus creating weak coordination and control of the school’s instructional activity by the novice administrator. Resistance to change in schools is essentially a cultural challenge requiring teachers and administrators to speak openly and honestly in order to reduce the resistance to and build support for change (Goldring & Greenfield, 2002).

Crow and Mathews (1998) discuss the process of socialization as the continuous learning whereby new principals put into practice the knowledge, skills, behaviors, and values necessary to perform the work of administrator. Unfortunately, on-going professional development and support for new principals is limited in most districts and non-existent in many (McCay, 2001). However, it is through continuous, collaborative learning structures that new principals may find their potential for success and for sustaining their work as principals. How well new principals are able to be socialized and to continue learning in their new contexts is significant to their success. There are a few notable programs developed to support principals during this crucial time of induction. The inclusion of coaching or mentoring support during this induction phase is a trend worthy of further investigation and study.

Beginning Principal Support Programs

Two programs of note in California include the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and programs developed internally by the San Juan Capistrano School District in Southern California. In collaboration with the
Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), the New Teacher Center has developed a program for training coaches who then assist by coaching new administrators. This professional development program, Coaching Leaders to Attain Student Success (CLASS), prepares individuals to coach new and experienced school principals, and supports the establishment of programs for principal induction (Bloom, Catagna, & Warren, 2003).

*Coaching Leaders to Attain Student Success (CLASS).*

Although mentoring is not a new concept, the CLASS program provides a structured and specific level of support and confidential assistance to new administrators that is distinct from informal mentoring programs that have existed. External coaches (outside of the school system) are trained to provide confidential and expert support for the wide-ranging, problematic, and often deeply personal issues that novice principals must face. Assistance is targeted to lead new principals through the cultural, emotional, and political conflicts they encounter on a daily basis. This is accomplished through listening, observation, and inquiry and through helping beginners see the difference between their intentions and actions. By discussing and validating the coachees’ experience, the coaches question and challenge, provide feedback, and test beliefs and assumptions through active discussion (Cranton, 1974).

Argyris and Schon (1974) identified the values, beliefs, and assumptions that guide behavior as theories-in-use. Guided reflection about actual experiences helps individuals to confront their theories-in-use; thus, they better understanding why they have done what they did, preparing them to imagine alternative responses. Through
reflection and conversation with their coaches, coachees are able to develop their own vision or platform (espoused theory) and begin to test it within the organization (Argyris & Schon, 1974; Creasap, Peters, & Uline, 2005). Trained coaches work with the novice administrator with complex issues such as emotional intelligence and cultural proficiency. Trust is an essential component of self-reflective practice; self-inquiry entails risk and can only take place through a trusting, confidential relationship between coach and coachee. Coaching in the CLASS context is distinctly defined as different from training, as the coachee determines the focus of each session and the meeting is designed to provide support and a focus on goal accomplishment. In contrast, training conveys a particular curriculum or content that is predetermined by the trainer and is to be absorbed by the participant.

In the course of the CLASS program, coaches are trained in the use of blended coaching strategies. The blended coaching approach provides a “fluid and flexible model that supports growth and change for both the coach and the coachee” (Bloom et al., 2005, p. 5). The blended model includes instructional coaching strategies (in which the coach serves as the instructional expert), a collaborative model, as well as reflective coaching in which the principal’s skills and effectiveness is increased through reflection and metacognition. A secondary benefit of such a coaching model is that it may more effectively support individuals who have not traditionally assumed positions of school leadership, such as minorities and women. The non-hierarchical model of coaching, combined with the absence of evaluation, may provide to those
that have traditionally lacked access to systems of support the bridge that they need in order to enter school administration.

*San Juan Capistrano School District.*

In addition to incorporating the CLASS training into its staff development plan, San Juan Capistrano School District (SJCSD) has developed other programs to recruit, train, and support administrators in their district. The district has addressed the need to support and develop quality educational leaders from within their district with a unique administrative career ladder that allows teachers to venture into the roles and responsibilities of school leadership while still in the classroom. The district has also taken a proactive role in providing support and training for both novice and experienced site administrators (Lovely, 1999).

The SJCSD *Teaching Assistant Principal Program* (TAPP) allows teachers to continue in the classroom while also taking on additional duties and responsibilities at the school. They receive a small stipend for their extra work, as well as the opportunity to receive feedback on their progress and expand their leadership skills. Successful TAPPs are then considered for future administrative positions, such as an assistant principal. In order to provide professional development SJCSD has developed the *Principal Support Network.* Activities that are a part of this support network include: (a) family meetings organized around principal groups of K-12 feeder schools, (b) area meetings, (c) principal focus groups, (d) buddy programs, and (e) leadership happy hours. Additionally, professional growth for administrators is provided on a regular basis through the *Standards, Teamwork, Assessment, Reading*
Across the Curriculum (STAR) professional development series. All site and department level administrators attend curriculum-training sessions during alternating months.

The National Staff Development Council (2002) has made recommendations concerning professional development for school leaders. It has suggested that effective programs should be long term, carefully planned, jobs embedded, and focused on student achievement. Programs should provide opportunities to work, discuss, and solve problems with peers (Peterson, 2002). Creasap, et al. (2005) found that “reflection reached its greatest transformative potential within the context of substantive; data focused reflective dialogue between mentors and protégés” (p. 21). Additionally, Conger and Benjamin (1999) identified four major objectives for leadership training. These objectives address both the structural and cultural features of administration and include:

a) developing individual leadership effectiveness
b) enhancing career transition into leadership positions
c) instilling the vision, values, and mission of the organization
d) developing skills and knowledge to implement long-term strategic objectives.

While some professional development programs may include one or more of these components, many lack a balanced emphasis on all four.

Across the nation, states and districts are taking greater responsibility for providing mentoring and induction support for new principals. In response to the lack of opportunities for on-going professional development and support for new
administrators, the state of Vermont developed a statewide New Principal Leadership Development Institute (Aiken, 2001). Targeted participants of the institution were current principals with four or fewer years experience. Participants came together for a full day every eight weeks around a variety of topics focused on visionary leadership, instructional leadership, quality leadership, and management as a leadership tool. Additionally, mentors were selected to work with each of the beginning administrators. At this time, there are no published results for the effectiveness of this program.

*Mentor and coaching programs.*

Zellner, et al. (2002) reported that mentor relationships are a key component in successful models. They found that a mentoring network of principals, as well as a framework of continuous support throughout the career of the principal is of primary importance. Programs that incorporate mentoring of new principals have become more common in recent years (Daresh & Playko, 1990). Dukess (2001) evaluated eight New York City Community School District mentor programs. Dukess’ findings reveal the assignment of experienced, expert principals as mentors was “clearly one of the most promising avenues for providing instructional, emotional, and managerial support to new principals” (p. 1). The Kanawha County School system in West Virginia responded to their future loss of current administrators and a shortage of qualified applicants by developing a Leadership Academy, which provides to identified individuals a two-year training program of increasing complexity (Cunningham & Hardman, 1999). In St. Paul, Minnesota, the district established an
Aspiring Principals Academy, offering summer training as well as additional work during the year (Peterson, 2001). The Chicago Public Schools have also developed a comprehensive series of sequential training programs for principals. Also called CLASS, this set of coordinated programs offers training that is sequenced, in depth, and continuous throughout a principal’s career. The main programs begin with LAUNCH for aspiring principals, moves to LIFT for first year principals, and the Chicago Academy for School Leaders (CASL) for experienced principals and other administrators (Peterson, 2002). North Carolina has also responded to the need to establish a leadership program through Principals’ Executive Program, one of a series of programs that the North Carolina Center for School Leadership Development offers to support aspiring, novice, and experienced educators (Pounder & Crow, 2005). This program familiarizes aspiring leaders with various administrative responsibilities and provides leadership opportunities for structured reflection.

One of the earliest professional development programs for aspiring and practicing principals began in California in 1985. The California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) was funded by the state and the program was delivered in regional centers with participants spending 15 days each year, for periods of two or three years, in training (Peterson, 2002). Although currently undergoing major reform and redevelopment, according to Peterson, for many years CSLA was considered the nation’s leading program for prospective and practicing principals.

Evaluation studies of induction and coaching programs for new administrators are being developed. There is anecdotal evidence addressing the importance of
induction programs and the success of the participating candidates and their positive experiences in mentor relationships. (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000) suggests

Mentoring and coaching processes can serve to augment the succession planning and professional development of districts. They can model a culture of collaboration and collegiality in which best thinking occurs through collective judgment. In short, they are the low-cost answer to the best way adults learn. (p. 29)

Few existing program efforts have been formally evaluated for their impact on school effectiveness. The New Teacher Center at Santa Cruz has completed case studies comparing supported and non-supported principals (Strong, Barrett, & Bloom, 2002). Supported new principals are those coached for their first two years as school administrators by experienced ex-principals. Their findings suggest that intensive one-on-one coaching appears to be successful in helping new administrators cope with the challenges of the position. Supported principals reported that they were more engaged in instructional leadership, spending more time on instructional issues, and addressing the issues with more skill (Strong, Barrett, & Bloom, 2002). The specific elements of the coaching include on-site, one-on-one coaching every two weeks for first year principals and coaching every three weeks for those in the second year. Coaching sessions are focused on immediate problems and needs as well as longer-term professional growth goal, and school leadership issues. Coaches utilize a blended coaching model that draws upon both instructional and facilitative approaches. Coaches observe and assist participants in their real work, including teacher observation and supervision, meeting facilitation, and review of student achievement data.
Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent (2004) completed a structured analysis of more than 300 research based articles on mentoring across three disciplines, including education, business and medicine. Of the education studies reviewed, 35.8% reported only positive outcomes because of mentoring, and four studies (2.5%) reported exclusively problematic outcomes. In relation to the benefits for mentors, less than half (47.8%) of the education studies that reported some positive outcomes associated with mentoring identified benefits for the mentor. In contrast, substantially more studies noted positive outcomes for mentees (82.4%) than for mentors. These studies included mentoring for various roles in education. The four most commonly noted benefits for mentees are: (a) Support, empathy, encouragement, counseling, friendship (b) Help with teaching strategies, subject knowledge, resources (c) Discussion, sharing ideas, information, problems, advice from peers, and (d) Feedback, positive reinforcement, constructive criticism. The four most commonly cited problematic mentee outcomes include: (a) Lack of time (b) Professional expertise, personality mismatch (c) Mentors critical, out of touch, defensive, stifling, untrusting (d) Difficulty meeting, observing, being observed.

Skinner (2006) examined the impact of mentoring programs on job satisfaction for beginning elementary principals in the state of Florida. This research did not find a statistically significant relationship to job satisfaction for those who were in a mentor program and those who were not in a mentor program. A relationship was found however, between the frequency a mentor met with the beginning principal and increased job satisfaction. Wolfe (2005) examined mentoring
as a tool for professional development of public school administrators in Illinois. The focus of this study was the effect of mentoring on the leadership practices of principals. The results of this study were partially supportive of the effect of mentoring on leadership practices, noting that mentored principals used the practices of “Inspiring a Shared Vision” and “Encouraging the Heart” more frequently.

Summary

Educational leaders, in particular principals, play a critical role in school reform. Schools will not improve until we do a better job of enhancing the quality of our principals (Mawhinney, 2005). Increasingly, practitioners and policy makers are recognizing that increasing the quality of school leaders will require providing a continuum of training throughout a leader’s career. Professional developers are beginning to zero in on the critical induction period in which the principal’s career choice is validated or undermined (Lashway, 2003a). The old sink-or-swim model is at last beginning to be replaced by structured experiences in which mentoring or coaching plays an important role. Effective programs for training and supporting new administrators must have thoughtful structures, a clear focus and strong culture building elements.

Marzano, et al. (2005) have made the link between student achievement and school leadership. They provided evidence of specific leadership behaviors that contribute to higher student achievement. Given the focus and scrutiny of public education today, and the urgent need to prepare all of our students for their future, additional research and information is needed concerning how support and training of
new principals can affect student learning. It is no longer acceptable simply to train administrators in the managerial tasks associated with running a school; they must also be prepared as instructional leaders who positively influence student learning.

Given the paucity of empirical studies on the effects of induction programs, let alone coaching and mentoring programs, there is a great need for research in this area. This research study examined existing support programs for mentoring and coaching of new principals that are currently in place in a Southern California School District. Specifically, the influence of these programs on principal practice around identified instructional leadership behaviors was examined. Using the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS), the instructional management behavior of the principals and the support provided to them by either their mentor or their coach was reviewed through both survey and interview data. To be effective in their roles, principals must conceptualize the role of principal as an instructional leader as well as one of managerial duties. This study focused on identifying supports that may remedy the problem that new administrators lack competence and confidence, as well as focus in their early years. This study examined the Sunnyside School District’s Induction programs and made recommendations geared at better meeting the needs of novice school administrators it employs.

This chapter examined the current role and expectations for beginning principals and the existing programs that provide support to them during the crucial induction phase of their career. This review noted the paucity of empirical research about the effects of support programs for new principals and served as the impetus to
study two induction programs in a Southern California School District. Chapter 3 delineates the methodology involved in this particular study.
CHAPTER 3

Methods

The previous chapter examined the research on the role of the principal in effective schools. It also addressed the need for powerful preparation and training programs as well as induction support for new principals. Research reports have demonstrated the significance of strong leadership in schools using the work of effective schools conducted since the 1980s as a starting point. The review of literature in chapter 2 emphasized the critical role school leaders have in shaping the quality of schools. It also revealed the shortage of aspiring administrators as well as concerns for the quality and relevance of current administrative training programs. Aspiring administrators, although qualified, have observed the mounting demands on administrators and often do not seek leadership roles in education. As educators enter the principalship with less experience as either a teacher or an assistant principal, support during their induction years becomes more important.

This study used a qualitative strategy of inquiry and a case study approach to examine two induction support programs for new principals in a Southern California school district. It explored systems in place to support the success of novice principals and the influence of these supports on principal behavior and practice. There is a need to study existing programs to determine the role that these support systems play during the induction phase of a principal’s career. In addition, the value that new principals place on these programs needs to be explored. This chapter presents the methodology used for this case study analysis. Five components of the methodology
are outlined as follows: (a) Research design, (b) Context of the study, (c) Researcher’s role and ethical considerations, (d) Data collection methods and analysis, and (e) Limitations of the study. Interview protocols, survey questions, and the participant consent form are located in the appendices. (See Appendix A- Interview Questions. Appendix B- PIMRS survey self-rating. Appendix C- PIMRS survey supervisor rating. Appendix D- Participant participation form).

Research Design

A qualitative strategy of inquiry utilizing a case study research design was used to address the research questions. Unlike quantitative studies, case studies do not generate specific research hypotheses. However, Yin (2003) argues that propositions are key components to case study research design. Propositions are theoretically based and used to focus instrument design and data analysis. Propositions are presented in alignment with research questions.

Research questions.

1. Are there identifiable differences of job satisfaction and perceptions of district support for new principals enrolled in an informal mentor program in comparison to new principals enrolled in a formal coaching program?

   Proposition 1: Principals participating in a formal coaching program will report greater levels of job satisfaction and district support than principals assigned to district mentors.

2. What supports and barriers are identified by beginning principals as significant to their ability to achieve their goals during their first year?
Proposition 2: First-year principals perceive receiving greater support in achieving goals and overcoming barriers from trained coaches than from district-assigned mentors.

3. How do new principals who participate in a formal coaching program report spending their time in terms of the leadership themes identified by Hallinger and Murphy (1985)?
   a. Defining the School’s Mission
   b. Managing the Instructional Program
   c. Promoting a Positive Learning Climate

Proposition 3: Principals supported by coaches will focus on school goals, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate with greater frequency than principals supported by mentors.

4. How do new principals who participate in an informal mentor program report spending their time in terms of the leadership themes identified by Hallinger and Murphy (1985)?
   a. Defining the School’s Mission
   b. Managing the Instructional Program
   c. Promoting a Positive Learning Climate

Proposition 4: Principals supported by mentors will focus on school goals, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate with less frequency than principals supported by mentors.
The strength of the qualitative data is the focus on “naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings so that we have a handle on what ‘real life’ is like” (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The collection of data in a personal local context considers this and allows for understanding latent, underlying, or non-obvious issues. The ability to reveal complex data nested in the real context is strong in qualitative studies. Miles and Huberman (1994) advocate that qualitative data is the best research strategy for discovery, exploring new areas, and developing hypotheses.

Case study was the selected methodology based on “the need to study contemporary events, but when the relevant behaviors can not be manipulated” (Yin, 2003, p.13). According to Merriam (1998), the case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of importance to understanding the phenomenon. Merriam stated, “These insights can further be construed as tentative hypotheses that help structure future research” (p. 41). Case study was an appropriate method in this research study in order to develop a better understanding of the dynamics of these two programs. The opportunity to explore in depth the existing programs and the experiences of eight principals through a case study provided a rich description for developing themes from the data. Kenny and Grotelueschen (1980) reported, “When it is important to be responsive, to convey a holistic and dynamically rich account of an educational program, case study is a tailor-made approach” (p. 5). Creswell (2003) further justifies a need for qualitative research when “the topic is new, the topic has not been addressed with a certain sample or group of people” (p. 22).
A case study approach allowed for significant insights into the perceptions of new principals concerning their participation in a mentoring or coaching program. These insights along with identified supports and barriers will be reported to the Leadership Academy Governing Board to be considered as a first step towards a program evaluation.

*Context of the Study*

During the 2005-2006 school year, the Sunnyside Unified School District launched the inaugural year of their Leadership Academy. Sunnyside School District is a high performing, large, suburban district with an enrollment of 32,000 students in 33 schools. District averages on all academic testing measures far exceed the state averages. Elementary Schools serve students K-5 grades, middle school consists of 6-8 grades and 4 comprehensive high schools serve grades 9-12. The Leadership Academy developed in response to the needs of existing and new administrators to participate in staff development opportunities that were responsive to needs of district students. The Leadership Academy mission statement is as follows:

*In support of student learning, the SUSD Leadership Academy will strengthen and expand leadership capacity across the organization by attracting, developing, and retaining powerful leaders.*

*PURPOSE*

*Support aspiring leaders in the development of the skills and knowledge necessary for success in school leadership positions*

*Provide opportunities for professional growth of current site leaders*
BENEFITS

Aspiring leaders gain the confidence and experience to become a successful site leader.

Successful participants acquire the skills to meet complex challenges as assistant principals or principals.

Individuals learn to optimize their own strengths in a leadership capacity.

Participants may receive Tier I or Tier II credits toward attainment of their Administrative Credential (See Appendix E).

The Academy design includes three distinct levels of professional development. Level I- Induction addresses the needs of aspiring administrators interested in exploring leadership opportunities. Level II- Entry is designed to assist new assistant principals and principals to the district. Coaching or mentoring is embedded at this level. An opportunity to earn a Professional Administrative Services Credential, required to maintain continuous employment in California also exits through the Academy and the coaching program. Level III- Experienced provides ongoing professional growth opportunities aligned to the state of California’s leadership standards. All administrators are expected to participate in the Leadership Academy each year and each must provide evidence of professional growth.

A Leadership Academy Governing Board, comprised of eight district representatives and one university representative, assumes the following roles and responsibilities (a) Recommend policies and procedures, (b) Approve course offerings
and staff, (c) Oversee budget, (d) Establish/maintain university connection, (e) Monitor progress of Level 1 participants, (f) Select and evaluate administrative coaches, and (g) Monitor and assess program effectiveness. The governing board meets on a regular basis in support of the academy.

One component of the Academy offers selected staff development opportunities in a series of workshops with wide-ranging topics that included; Rethinking Leadership, Leadership for Learning, Developing and Working with Teams, Coaching for Excellence, Emotional Intelligence, and others. In addition to workshops, first-year administrators were provided with leadership coaches or assigned mentors who met with them on a regular basis to provide leadership support.

Leadership Coaching

School leadership coaching in SUSD is intended to assist inexperienced administrators in clarifying and achieving their professional goals. The ultimate goal is for school administrators, through their own behavior, to have a positive impact upon student achievement. Sunnyside coaches were identified as strong administrators with previous experience as site principals. They attended a three-day course, Coaching Leaders to Attain Student Success (CLASS) presented by the New Teacher Center (NTC) at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Additional training and on-going support for coaches was provided through regular Coaches Network training by NTC four times a year and attended by certified coaches from throughout Southern California. In addition, all SUSD coaches met on a
monthly basis to review program effectiveness, share any existing issues or concerns, practice role-play coaching, and provide feedback to each other.

Coaching in this context is defined as a formal relationship between the new administrator and the district-designated, trained coach who participates in a confidential relationship with the coachee. The focus is on providing deliberate support to assist new principals to clarify and achieve the goals they have identified. Goals are established based on the district leadership standards and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CAPSELS). The training in blended coaching strategies (Bloom et al., 2005) allows the coach to move through various types of coaching including facilitative, instructional, collaborative, consultative, and transformational coaching as appropriate. Expectations and outcomes for the formal coaching program in Sunnyside include:

1. One-on-one site meetings every two weeks for new administrators with their district assigned coach;
2. Coaching focused upon immediate problems and needs, longer-term professional growth goals, and longer-term school leadership issues;
3. A structured coaching process that is scaffolded by the collaborative logs used to structure and record coaching conversations;
4. Blended coaching strategies that include both instructional and facilitative approaches;
5. The observation and coaching of participants based on real work, including teacher supervision and meeting facilitation;
6. The signing of a participation agreement by the participant, the supervisor, and the coach, which outlines the specific commitments; and

7. Regular meetings with the coaches for collaborative problem solving and the refinement of knowledge and skills through role-play practice and sharing of resources and successes.

Coaches are assigned to coachees (beginning administrators) by members of the superintendent’s cabinet based on the coach’s previous school experience, existing relationship with the coachee, and current role and responsibility in the district.

**Leadership Mentoring**

A large number of new principals were hired during the 2006-2007 school year, and trained coaches were not available to support all new principals. Thus, the district decided to assign a number of mentors to work with some of new principals. The mentors worked in place of coaches as the district wished to provide support to all new principals. Mentors were assigned by the assistant superintendent based on their reputation as excellent leaders in the district and their experience at the same school level as principals. Although the district assigned mentors to mentees, there was neither training nor formal job descriptions or explicit expectations shared with the mentors or participating new principals. No formal agreements as to the frequency of contact or level of support were made. The mentor was told to function as the “go to” person for their assigned novice principals, answering questions, being available, and generally being on call to the principal.
District selected mentors had a great deal of knowledge and relevant expertise to assist their mentee. The mentors were selected based on their instructional knowledge and record of success in the district. Mentors were available to assist and support the mentee principals as needed, sharing strategies, and ideas that they were using successfully in their own schools. Mentoring has been an established and proven support system, often utilized in business and other professions, however, the introduction of mentor programs to education has been formalized and structured as a part of professional development only recently (Dukess, 2001).

During the first year of the academy (2005-2006), eight administrators served as coaches to twelve new site administrators, both principals and assistant principals. For the purpose of this study, only new principals starting during the 2006-2007 school year were included. Eight principals met this criterion for inclusion in the research study. During the 2006-2007 school year, eight principals were hired in Sunnyside School District, a unified suburban school district in Southern California. The new principals assumed responsibility for four elementary schools, two middle schools, and two high schools during the 2006-2007 school year. Five newly appointed principals were assigned coaches to support them throughout the school year. Deliberate attention was given by the superintendent’s cabinet (Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, Associate Superintendent Personnel, and Assistant Superintendent for Learning Support Services) to the matching of coaches and coachees with consideration of similar personalities, matched school level experience, coach expertise and experience, and receptiveness of the coachee to outside support.
One of the high school principals had two years previous experience as a principal. Of the elementary principals, one had four years experience as a principal in a different district. She was assigned a coach external to the district who had experience as a principal in the study district and experience as a teacher at the coachee’s school site.

Participants

Patton (2002) suggests “the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth” (p.169). Information-rich cases are those that have the potential for providing maximum information about the primary issues within the research questions. Participants selected for this study were the eight new principals hired for the 2006-2007 school year by the Sunnyside Unified School District. Selection of the participants was based on accessibility to this researcher, existence of principal mentoring and coaching support programs, and the availability of new principals. Merriam (1998) reports that purposeful sampling is based on the belief that the researcher wants to “… discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (p. 61). Given the existence of two different programs of support for new principals, this logical sample allowed the researcher to gain a comprehensive view of the ways in which this district is supporting new principals through coaching and mentoring. Selection of sites and principals to study included all first year principals in Sunnyside Unified School District, five of whom participated in a formal coaching program and three who were assigned an informal mentor with whom to work.
Research participants included eight new Sunnyside principals, two principal supervisors (assistant superintendents), five coaches, and three mentors. Inclusion of these various groups who were surveyed with identical questions allowed for the inclusion of differing perceptions across role groups.

Locations included two high schools, two middle schools, and four elementary schools. Of the principals, five were female, three were male, and all were Caucasian. Three of the principals had previous experience as principals in other school districts; five were new to the position of principal. Either a principal mentor or a trained coach supported each principal during the 2006-2007 school year. The district administrators including the superintendent, two assistant superintendents, and the deputy superintendent made assignments of mentors and coaches. Consideration was made for matching coaches and coachees based on the same site level experience, background knowledge of the school by the coach, and the superintendent’s confidence in the expertise of the coach. Mentors were assigned based on their willingness to participate and their current assignment at the same level site. The addition of the mentor support program was based on a lack of trained coaches, specifically at the secondary level, and the reported pressure from the school board to ensure the success of all newly hired principals. Consideration in matching was also made of the previous experiences of the principals either as a principal in another district or a prior administrative position in the study district.

Demographics vary among the schools; however, all are part of the Sunnyside Unified School District. District enrollment figures show the following demographics:
African American, 3.0%; Asian, 15%; Filipino, 7%; Hispanic, 10%; White, 58%; and
other, 7%. English Language Learners represent 9.2% of the district population while
low-income students make up 10% of the students in the district.

Researcher’s role and ethical considerations.

My interest in this study stems from my role in helping to develop the
Leadership Academy in the Sunnyside School District and my work as a coach in the
school district. As a coach, I have participated in all of the training sessions as well as
the continuing contact provided by the New Teacher Center, Santa Cruz. I have
worked with a new principal during the past two school years as his assigned coach. I
have not worked directly with any of the selected case study participants and have
only a collegial relationship with each of them. As a veteran principal in the school
district, I have, however, worked with both the coaches and the mentors. Because I
have been an inside observer, I have a clear understanding of the goals of the program
as well as the intent.

The following steps were taken to protect the identities and the rights of the
study participants. I completed the Human Subjects Approval process with the
Offices of Research at The University of California, San Diego; San Diego State
University; and California State University, San Marcos. Pseudonyms were assigned
to the study district and participants and were used throughout the study. All of the
participants signed informed consent letters allowing for their participation in the
study (Appendix D). All survey and interview data, in addition to collected
documents, are stored in a locked file cabinet or private computer in a private home.
Data Collection and Management Methods

This study utilized surveys and interviews to investigate beginning principals’ instructional leadership behaviors, perceptions of support from mentors or coaches, and perceived barriers to goal attainment identified by beginning principals.

Interviews.

Individual interviews (Appendix A) were conducted face to face with eight participating principals identified as new principals in the Sunnyside Unified School District. In describing approaches to asking questions and different types of questions that may be used in interviewing, Patton (1990) suggests an interview-guided approach and open-ended questions. Using an interview-guided approach allows the participants to share their experiences in their own words. Additionally, an interview-guided approach allows the discussion to remain conversational and flexible and yet ensures that each participant covers consistent material. In this case, an interview-guided approach was utilized in order to ensure that the same set of questions was asked of each new principal and yet allowed flexibility to explore certain subjects in more depth as appropriate.

All interviews were conducted during a time and a place convenient to each interviewee. Interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes to one hour, were audio taped (with permission of the participant), and were transcribed by the researcher within one week of the interview. Additionally, the researcher noted all non-verbal responses that could not be captured on tape. Interviews were used to identify supports and constraints as perceived by new principals to their attaining their
identified goals during the first year on the job. This interview specifically addressed
the role of coaches and mentors in supporting new principals and their influence on
principal behaviors as they are linked to student achievement. Questions were
grouped around the three themes identified by the Principal Instructional Management
Rating Scale (PIMRS): Defining the School’s Mission, Managing the Instructional
Program, and Promoting a Positive Learning Climate. Questions focused on specific
support provided by either mentors or coaches in these areas and included such topics
as frequency of contact, types of support, initiator of support (who called whom), and
location of meetings. Principals were asked to identify ways in which the district and
or their coach or mentor had supported them in each of these areas. Interview data
were transcribed and coded to identify themes common to beginning principals’
experiences during their first year on the job.

Surveys.

Another source of data was The Principal Instructional Management Rating
Scale (PIMRS) (Appendix B and Appendix C) developed by Dr. Phillip Hallinger to
assess principal instructional management behavior. The PIMRS contains 10
subscales and 50 items that assess the frequency with which the principal enacts a
behavior or practice associated with a particular leadership function. Each item is
rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from (1) almost never to (5) almost always. The
instrument is scored by calculating the mean for the items that comprise each subscale.
This results in a profile that yields data on perceptions of principal performance on
each of the 10 instructional leadership functions. The data generated were useful to
highlight patterns in the instructional leadership behaviors of principals. The original validation study found that the PIMRS met high standards of reliability, face validity, content validity, and discriminate validity (Hallinger, 1983). All ten subscales exceeded .80 using Cronbach’s test of internal consistency. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) has subsequently been used in over 100 studies (Hallinger, 2003). This survey was administered to the participating principals, principal supervisors (assistant superintendents) and each principal’s mentor or coach.

Data collection took place in May and June of 2007. Survey data were gathered and inputted by category of respondent into a database. Interview data were transcribed and coded, utilizing a software program, Nvivo7, during August 2007. All interview transcriptions and survey data are secured in a file on the researcher’s personal computer.

Data Analysis

A colleague and the researcher conducted a pilot study (See Appendix F) in the spring of 2006. Interviews were conducted with four new principals in two different Southern California School Districts. Two of the participating principals worked in a small district that had no formal mentoring or coaching program for new principals. Two principals worked in a larger district and participated in a formal coaching program during the pilot study year. Overall, the new principals in the pilot study reported satisfaction with the level of support they received from their respective school district, through either a coaching program or other form of support. Each
principal identified issues that were substantiated by the literature as challenges faced by beginning principals. The principals also were able to identify support systems in place to assist them in these areas. Although the pilot study did not find the support of a specific one-on-one coach as a significant factor, the need for an on-demand support system was noted. Pilot principals identified the need for a system of support to help them face the myriad challenges of the job.

The pilot study revealed a number of common themes in the interviews of the principal participants. The themes identified by principals included the importance of relationships, time and other resources, a focus on academic achievement for students, and support for the principal. Utilizing these primary themes, further analysis of interview data revealed a large layer of sub-themes imbedded within each of the primary themes. Creswell (2003) writes that data analysis “is an on-going process involving continual reflection about the data” (p. 190). Miles and Huberman (1994) describe data analysis as a process to describe and analyze a pattern of relationships. They speak to the advantages and disadvantages of starting with presumed relationships (deductively) or getting to them gradually (inductively). Given the revelation of themes in the pilot study as well as through the literature review, the four common themes served as the initial grounds for coding the current study. Merriam (1998) advocates the need to analyze data while in the process of data collection. This can serve as a way to rich and meaningful analysis and a guard against being overwhelmed by the shear volume of data generated.
In order to support the compilation of data and the discovery of themes and codes, computer-aided analysis using Nvivo was utilized. Computer analysis can reduce analysis time, eliminate or reduce drudgery, make procedures more systematic and explicit, ensure completeness and refinement, and permit flexibility and revision in analysis procedures (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

In the current study, the pilot interview questions were revised and organized around the broader leadership themes identified by Hallinger (1985) in the PIMRS. Original interview questions from the pilot study included rating scales for district support on unrelated topics that did not yield significant information and thus were eliminated. Additional questions probing specific support provided by the mentor or coach and questions related to the frequency of contact were added.

Limitations of the Study

The small sample size of a single school district could be seen as a limitation to this study. The programs of mentor and coaching support for new principals is unique in the study district. The Leadership Academy is also a unique component that is not replicated in most other districts at this time. The inclusion of eight new principals in the study district allows for a sample population that is significant enough in size to warrant study.

Although the formal coaching program examined in this study is part of a much larger program overseen by the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, it was only examined as implemented by the participating school district and generalization to the larger program would be inappropriate. The
mentor principal program is in its first year, has not been formalized within the district, and was implemented based on the individual mentor’s choice.

The researcher, who is a colleague within the district, conducted the interviews, which may influence the honesty and candor of the respondents. As a trained and participating coach, I may be seen as favorable to the coaching program or otherwise biased, although I am not a coach for any of the participating principals.

Time was an additional limitation of this study, as all principals had just begun working at their schools in August and data were collected in May and June. This did not allow the participants a full year in either of the programs. An additional limitation to the analysis of the data was the differences in previous experience of the participating principals. Although all were new to the position principal in the study district, three administrators came with experience as principals in other school districts. This experience influenced their need for support as first-year principals in the Sunnyside School District.

This study investigated the differences in support for new administrators through two programs provided by the Sunnyside School District. During the 2006-2007 school year, either an assigned coach or a mentor supported eight new principals. Interview data and survey data will be summarized in the next chapter for significance of these programs on influencing principal behavior.
Chapter 4

Findings

This study examined the implementation and benefits of mentoring and coaching programs for first-year principals in a Southern California school district. The district assigned either a mentor or a coach to assist administrators new to the position of principal. Specifically, the study examined the support provided to new principals from these two newly-initiated programs. Interviews with principals and survey data collected from principals, coaches, mentors, and supervisors were examined for recurring themes and issues surrounding the work life of new principals. This chapter presents a summary of the research project and addresses the specific research questions posed in Chapter 1. Data are first presented by themes that emerged during an investigation of each research question. This section is followed by individual participant data gathered from the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) survey and each principal’s individual interview. Both these sets of data are then cross-analyzed for each participant. Finally, a short vignette of one coached and one mentored participant’s story concludes the chapter.

The Study

During the 2006-2007 school year, eight principals were hired in Sunnyside School District, a unified suburban school district in Southern California. The new principals assumed responsibility for four elementary schools, two middle schools, and two high schools during the 2006-2007 school year. Five newly-appointed principals were assigned coaches to support them throughout the school year.
In addition to coaches assisting new administrators, the district assigned mentors to work with new principals who were not assigned coaches. Mentor principals received no formal training, had no formal expectations for working with the mentees, and functioned primarily as the “go to” person for newly hired principals as needed. The addition of the mentor support program was based on a lack of trained coaches, specifically at the secondary level, and the reported pressure from the school board to ensure the success of all newly hired principals. The superintendent assigned mentors based on their reputation as excellent leaders in the district. Although the district made the assignment for mentors, there were no formal job descriptions or explicit expectations of the mentors or the new principals. Three newly-hired principals were assigned mentors for the 2006-2007 school year, one each at elementary, middle, and high school levels. Only the elementary principal had previous experience in another district as a principal; the other two were from within the study district, but new to the principalship.

Study Participants

Table 1 displays the unique background and characteristics of each study participant. Included in the data is the previous teaching and administrative experience of the principals, and their status as being new to the study district, returning to the district, or promoted from within the study school district.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Name and assignment</th>
<th>Coached or Mentored</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Levels of Teaching</th>
<th>Administrator Experience</th>
<th>Level of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori-Elementary Principal</td>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>Middle and High School</td>
<td>6 Years</td>
<td>High School and Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy-Elementary Principal</td>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet-Elementary Principal</td>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>7 Years</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck-Elementary Principal</td>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>20 Years</td>
<td>Elementary and District Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa-Middle School Principal</td>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan-Middle School Principal</td>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter-High School Principal</td>
<td>Coached</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana-High School Principal</td>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>Jr. High, High School, Continuation School</td>
<td>7 Years</td>
<td>High School and District Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Findings

The following section covers interview data reported by themes that emerged during an investigation of each research question. In qualitative research of this nature, it is important to look for common themes in the narrative data shared by participants. The interview covered topics determined by questions formulated to gather information about the specific research questions. The researcher utilized the Nvivo software program to analyze and code data for themes from interview transcripts. Themes were originally coded based on the research of Hallinger (1985) and expanded based on the responses of the principals, looking for common responses that then were developed as themes when cited by two or more participants. In this section, study findings are organized by interview questions addressing the research questions and propositions stated in Chapter 3.

Perceptions of coach or mentor support

In order to establish rapport and explore the understanding by the participant of the programs being examined, the first areas probed with new principals were the understanding by the principal of the role of his/her coach and the frequency and types of contacts. In addition, the level of confidence the principal had in his/her coach was explored. All the study participants reported a clear understanding of the role of the coach. They reported it as a non-evaluative, non-judgmental support person who was there to answer questions, clarify thinking, and introduce the new administrator to the district culture. One elementary principal specifically reported, “A coach is my
resource person who will come and check with me if I have questions. I have asked
her hundreds of questions so I see her as a resource rather than a person who is
watching me or evaluating me. It’s sort of the way it worked out to be.” A middle
school principal supported by a coach responded, “He was to act as my sounding
board, as a reflective listener, to try to summarize, to paraphrase my thoughts, and my
needs.”

When principals supported by mentors were asked about their understanding of
the role of their mentor, all three principals reported that mentors were the people that
they could go to and ask questions. The middle school principal reported that the
mentor was there so that “If I have a question I have someone to go to, a supportive
person in a like job who is just kind of there to help figure out where I am going.” The
high school principal reported that her mentor’s role was “to be very patient as I was
calling him with a million stupid little questions. Just understanding. He helped me to
understand more about the big picture as a leader and what is it that I do working with
people and all the things . . . .” The experienced elementary principal saw the role of
the mentor as someone to teach him the district culture and how things were done in
this system, as opposed to how to do the job overall. The principal stated,

As you know, I’m far from the new principal and he knew this was not
my first time in the saddle so he’s not going to treat me like I don’t
know what I’m talking about. He was able to adapt the advice he gave
me to what I needed which was not what the law is or what the
California code is having to deal with evaluation of teachers. It was
how they do it here, which is what I needed.

Principals in a coaching relationship reported that the coach initiated the
formal contacts, arranging for meetings on a monthly basis; however, they also
reported that they often initiated informal contact via email, phone, or at other meetings on a more frequent basis. Asked if they were comfortable contacting their coach, they all reported they felt very comfortable in this relationship and were able to solicit help as needed. One elementary principal reported, “I am comfortable being vulnerable with her. I know it’s what it is and I’m modest about what I do and what I know and I can’t get better unless I’m honest so I work and trust her and feel safe with her. I can be open.” All of the supported principals reported that their coaches were readily available and very quick to reply to questions or calls for support. The middle school principal reported, “We had our secretaries actually schedule us times so we did that from the beginning so nothing else would get in the way of the schedule.”

Each of the principals reported that the mentors were proactive in contacting them and offering support. Frequency of contact varied greatly, from formal meetings approximately once a month to casual conversations together at meetings or events. The high school principal reported that her mentor mostly contacted her for formal meetings; however, she reported that “for problems or informal help I could call him and he answered right back and then sometimes we just met during coffee breaks at a principals’ meeting or something like that. It was never added stress.” All of the principals reported that they had good rapport with their mentors, felt comfortable contacting them as needed, and used both email and phone calls to ask questions and solicit advice.

Information about the positive characteristics of the coach or mentor was solicited. Two points emerged covering what new principals valued the most. Six
principals mentioned that they appreciated the knowledge and experience of the coach or mentor. They also reported that their mentor or coach was honest and respectful of their positions as new principals and with their personal level of knowledge and experience of the new job. The new high school principal reported that in working with her mentor, “I never felt when I was talking to this guy like we were not equals. I know even when I was asking some questions that were stupid, silly little questions, but I didn’t want to get things wrong, and so even on those real little things he would always laugh and talk me through it.” Another principal reported that with her coach, “I never felt that my questions would be perceived to be stupid. I was willing to risk asking stupid questions and knew that there would be safety and comfort.” In addition, an elementary principal reported about her coach, “The biggest thing is just that she gives me so much and I trust her implicitly. I know the advice that she is giving me is right on and she pushes me back which I respect when I’m being resistant to something.”

The new principals were questioned about the qualities they value least in their coach or mentor. They had a difficult time coming up with such qualities. Five principals reported that they were unable to think of any negative qualities at all. When pressed, two mentioned that their coaches would not be present for long since both had announced plans for retirement in the coming school year. One principal mentioned that his coach was extremely busy, but also that he was always responsive and got back to him right away. A middle school principal simply reported that her mentor “doesn’t understand what I don’t know. I wish there was a little more
frontloading of information that was coming. I wish I would have had a little more
forewarning. I just didn’t know the questions to ask and when you are a successful
principal for awhile you forget what those questions are too.”

*Research Question 1- Job satisfaction*

This research question asked whether there were identifiable differences of job
satisfaction and perceptions of district support for new principals enrolled in a formal
coaching program in comparison to new principals enrolled in an informal mentoring
program. No predominant themes emerged from this research question; therefore,
only general impressions will be explored. Overall, most of the principals shared a
high level of job satisfaction, and gave only minimal responses when asked why they
rated their satisfaction as they did.

Of the five principals supported by a coach during the 2006-2007 school year,
three reported their satisfaction with their job as a principal to be a ten--the highest
score. One reported satisfaction as a nine, and one reported it as a seven. One
elementary principal who reported her satisfaction as a ten, stated, “Here I am happier
now than I was at the beginning. I am thrilled to be in that position; it is exactly where
I wanted to be. I didn’t think I would get here so quickly . . . I feel like I am good at it
and it stretches me which I like . . . .” The principal who reported her satisfaction as a
seven explained, “We’ve come a long way in a year and I don’t really know where I
thought I would be but I’m grateful that I’m here, but there are things that if I had it to
do over I would do it different, so I can’t say I have been perfect.” The experienced
high school principal explained his rating of a ten, saying, “I’d have to say I am a ten.
I mean do I know there are some things I need to learn myself, sure. How to get smarter, faster, better but I personally think I am in the greatest position I can be and I get to be a cheerleader for everybody and I can’t beat that kind of situation.”

When asked about their satisfaction with the level of support they have received from the district and from their coach, four of the five coached principals reported their satisfaction to be a ten. The fifth principal reported her satisfaction as a nine. Principals new to the district were quick to compare the support to their previous experience as expressed by this middle school principal “It is so relative to what you have experienced and I hate to bash my old district but it’s just a very different district. I would have to rate this very strong.” The elementary principal who rated district support as a ten shared, “I rank it here because I have relative experience from other districts that aren’t like this.” This same principal rated her coach support as a nine, noting, “My needs have not been that great, you know if I were a new person it would probably be higher. She would do anything I needed, I just didn’t require it.”

Mentored principals reported less satisfaction with their job, reporting a ten, a seven, and a four. The principal who reported her satisfaction as a four explained it like this, “I guess at the end of the year there are places I wanted to be by now. I’m frustrated and just dealing with being new and believing you can do anything. Then finding out what you think will take a day takes a long time. To change cultures, to build trust, and to have them understand where you’re coming from, what your goals
are, and to believe that you’re really doing it for the right reasons.” The principal who rated his satisfaction as a ten simply stated, “This is what I’ve always wanted to do.”

Of the three principals supported by mentors, district support ratings included a six, a nine, and a ten. The middle school principal rating the support as a six, explaining, “I guess I can say that a new principal certainly does not need a new principal consultant, but it would be good if there were somebody there that would help me . . . . I just don’t know what I am in need of.” Although she had been an assistant principal in the district, she felt that she had not “networked” with people at the district office and really did not know whom to call for assistance with specific problems or concerns. “I did my work on the sides [as an assistant principal previously] and I did not network with anyone so people will say I called so-and-so in the district and asked him about such-and-such but I’m like why did you call them? How did you know?” The elementary principal who was mentored reported that he felt there was a need for more formalized training for new principals in the district but that “the district office is very helpful and responsive to principal needs.”

Research Question 2- Supports and Barriers

The second research question explored whether the supports and barriers identified by beginning principals contributed in any way to their ability to achieve their goals during their first year. Interviewees were asked to share specific examples of ways that their coach or mentor had supported them during year. Principals were also asked to identify any barriers that got in the way of achieving their goals.
Analysis of the interview data was organized under the themes of support and barriers to facilitate presentation of the data.

**Examples of Support**

Examples of support include (a) Support for staff participation in decision-making, (b) Personnel issues, (c) Parent communication, (d) Programs for at-risks students, and (e) Technical issues. Examples and discussion of these supports follow.

*Staff participation in decision-making.*

When requested to share a specific example of a circumstance in which their coach had been helpful, all of the interviewees had situations in which they turned to their coach for advice or support. An elementary principal and a middle school principal in the coaching program shared specific examples of support and ideas for working with their staffs about issues of staff participation in decision-making. One principal described the staff as having seen the past principal as “the mom and wanting to be taken care of and make the decisions” and not necessarily involve the teachers in these decisions. At the same time, other staff members were pushing for involvement and input; yet they also wanted things “their way.” This principal reported that her coach was instrumental in helping her to plan and facilitate a critical staff meeting about grade level assignments. At issue was the need for teachers to be part of the discussion and decision-making in determining grade level assignments that would affect them. The principal stated, “I need to involve the staff more in terms of decision-making and giving them the opportunity to have input about the criteria used in making this decision. In my staff . . . they have for at least the past two principals
really seen the principal as the mom and it is like they both wanted me to take care of them and make the decision, but they also want input. And they want it to be what they want but some of them are not going to like any of it . . . . It got kind of ugly, but it was good because it is what it is and they are who they are. Some people came out and said some things that sounded kind of selfish, but at least everyone knew that this was their view.”

The middle school principal struggled with staff involvement with his School-Based Coordinated Plan. He was particularly concerned about getting teacher buy-in, ownership of the goals, and implementation of the plan. In working with his coach, he reported, “We were able to come up with just one or two simple questions to kind of peel off the onion and get to a deeper level of understanding and complexity of the purpose.” He shared that his coach was “… instrumental to me in bringing clarity to this, something that is basically simple but he just helped me put it all together.”

*Personnel issues.*

A coached elementary principal reported support with personnel issues of a teacher not performing well. She indicated that her coach “… went in to observe and supported that I am not crazy, that she really is bad, and now she is trying to help me find a way to come at her without it blowing up and taking the whole staff. I am thinking of it as a dance. She helps me think through the politics in that sort of situation.” When asked about specific situations in which the mentor had been helpful this year, the high school principal had several examples. One example was support for dismissing teachers who were not performing up to standard and how to approach
the problem. “Things that had to do with the rights of the teacher and to be able to bounce ideas off of him. There were a couple teachers I let go this year and to be able to do that and be respectful of the process . . . .” The second area was dealing with situations regarding CIF (California Interscholastic Federation). “There have been a few CIF situations with players where we had difficulty, and oh yes, actually we let go of the football coach . . . .”

*Parent communication.*

Another elementary principal reported that her coach was very helpful in the area of communicating messages about safety concerns with her parent community. Her coach would share ideas on how to convey messages about issues of safety that needed to be addressed but about which she needed to be careful so that she did not alarm her parents unnecessarily. “I’m thinking about like call outs and what she said to her staff and her community, because to me that was something totally out of the normal and I wasn’t sure what tone to take. Is it serious, is it not serious, and I don’t know this community well enough to know what the reaction would be.” She also reported support in dealing with student discipline issues at the elementary level since it was different from her previous experience at the middle school. “I call her when I just need to know what she would do and what I should do. I’m telling you it’s really difficult to go from a middle school where I had 27 expulsions and 175 suspensions. I had been at school about a month and I had a kid that had a fight at recess and I’m really inclined to suspend them but I called my coach to ask . . . .” The high school principal reported that he felt like his coach did a nice job of communicating with
parents and that he has learned from him in this area as well, saying, “I am a lot better communicator now and I make sure that there are certain things included in the communications. . .”

*Support for At-Risk students.*

The lone, coached high school principal shared specific examples of ideas and support that his coach had shared regarding support for student learning, specifically for English Language Learners and Hispanic students. “My coach has helped me to bring things to the leadership team and talk about some of the programs at his school that they have used specific to English Language Learners and to some of our Hispanic population. That has been extremely helpful as we don’t have huge numbers but still I feel that we are missing the boat by not trying to connect with the students.”

*Technical issues.*

Two mentored principals reported support with issues that were more technical. The elementary principal needed to know how to go about having a running track installed at his school, and the middle school principal needed support developing the school calendar. This principal said, “We share a common calendar with our schools and she has supported me in my leadership by having her calendar done and helping me.”

*Examples of Barriers*

When discussing barriers that interfered with getting school goals accomplished, responses from all interviewed principals fell into five categories:
(a) Change in school level, (b) Construction issues, (c) Lack of information or training, (d) Learning or changing the school culture, and (e) Time management.

Discussion of these areas follows.

*Change in school level.*

Three of the eight principals were new to the level at which they were principal. One elementary principal with previous experience as a high school assistant principal and as a high school teacher reported, “Probably just the new the grade level, the elementary level, that was the biggest bang. I don’t think me being out for six years had a big impact. During that time I was getting my doctorate . . . .”

A second elementary principal had previously been a middle school assistant principal, and one of the middle school principals had only been at a high school level up to that time. Although they did not personally see this as a barrier, their staffs did at times comment on their lack of knowledge about “this level,” thus indicating that they felt it was an issue. The middle school principal shared, “It is truly a different world [from High School], I announced my career goals to the staff that every student at our school will pass the High School Exit Exam the first time and that no child will be in remedial classes at high school and they think I am crazy .”

*Construction issues.*

Two of the principals were not only dealing with being in a new position but also had the added responsibility of overseeing their schools’ undergoing major modernization projects in their first year. They reported this as an additional responsibility and time commitment that took their focus away from students and
learning and caused them to be conflicted in their priorities during the year. Referring
to the previous work that the school had accomplished on professional learning
communities, the middle school principal shared, “Construction has just taken time
away from me. Before we did amazing work with staff development and now we
have to deal with all of this stuff. It has just taken time away from me and I am going
to have to try to bring all that back and capitalize on it again . . . .” The elementary
principal reported, “There is just too much to do between the modernization which is
just an overlay and trying to understand the district way and having almost no
background information.”

Lack of information or training.

Lack of information or training came up as a barrier in a variety of ways. This
was mentioned by four of the eight principals and was referenced nine times during
the interviews. For one principal it was the lack of files and information about the
school from the previous principal: “I had one folder on my computer, almost no help
with anything, no files, and no practices or procedures binders so I had to develop it
pretty much from scratch.” The previous principal had been removed, and no one had
left documents, files, or information for the incoming administrator. Three principals
mentioned the slow start in meeting with their coaches and finding out who they were.
One said, “Well our only hurdle would be our slow start and networking in the district;
that’s where the job gets done.” The teams met for the first time in October, and the
coaches were not trained until late September. Another barrier mentioned was the
need to meet and learn everyone’s name and role at the district office. This was
reported as a barrier because even though the district has many support personnel, new administrators did not know whom to call on for what and therefore did not access these people as they might have. “I did not network with anyone so people would say I called so-and-so in the district and asked him about such-and-such but I’m like why did you call them? How did you know?” reported the middle school principal. In terms of training, a need for orientation sessions for new principals was mentioned by two of the principals. Specifically a request for information about the parameters for site decision-making was noted. A middle school principal reported struggling with making a decision about a health issue with her students. She later found out this was not her decision to make but one that health services would make. She was told she should have contacted the department earlier, “So there I was trying to make all the decisions on things and finally someone said to me that’s not your decision; you need to call the district office about that.” Another new principal reported her biggest barrier was that she simply did not know what she was in need of or what she did not know so she was not able to ask the right questions. “I just didn’t know the questions to ask and when you are a successful principal for awhile [referring to her mentor] you forget what those questions are, too.”

*Learning or changing the culture.*

Six principals referenced either learning or changing the school or district culture as a barrier in nine instances. Two principals specifically indicated that learning the *District way* took a great deal of time and that they needed to learn about their immediate school community. “Not knowing all the culture of the community
and the Sunnyside School District requires time to get to learn and they are all different,” stated an elementary principal. One principal indicated that following “someone who left a huge void in staff morale” had been a barrier to achieving her goals this year. A high school principal said, “I have a very seasoned staff and they are an excellent staff in some of the things that they do. But how good we have been in the past sometimes gets in the way of believing that we can change some things and get even better.” The other high school principal reported that the level of parent involvement was a new experience to her and this shift in the school culture required adjustment. She acknowledged, “How to deal with the parents, it was big because with my previous district, parents just weren’t really involved. I barely had a parent issue, even with special education or discipline. I really could not get parents to attend.” Another principal reported that following a popular and successful principal who had been at the school for eight years and was well liked the staff was a very difficult cultural barrier. This principal stated that, “I am not the same person and don’t do things the same way.” Referring to the school’s previous principal, she said, “She was a principal of the school that she came back to. She was an insider so it is kind of hard to follow her . . . they worship her.”

Time management.

Four of the principals reported time management as a barrier during their first year. They reported struggling with things that kept them incredibly busy and unable to focus fully on goals. Principals also reported frustration with the time that it takes to change and improve a school. One reported, “Change takes time and that things
move a lot slower than I would like.” Construction issues were also reported as a barrier related to time. There was “just too much to do between the modernization which is just an overlay and learning the district way . . . .” A middle school principal shared, “I guess at the end of the year there are other places I want to be by now and so I’m frustrated. Just dealing with being new and believing you can do anything then finding out what you think will take a day takes a long time . . . .”

Training and Coursework

Explored in the interview process was what training, courses, or background work had helped to prepare the new principals to guide their schools. Three of the principals mentioned their degree or credential programs as having been helpful. One principal reported that her master’s and doctoral programs were both in educational leadership and that she had learned a great deal in the programs that prepared her to lead her school. Another mentioned that she completed an ACSA (Association of California School Administrators) Academy as part of her Tier 2 administrative credential and believed this work in curriculum and instruction had been helpful.

Six of the principals referenced courses that were being offered through the district-sponsored Leadership Academy as being supportive of their role as principal. Specific courses mentioned included “Leaders=Learners” and “Building Shared Responsibility for Student Learning.” These courses were described as helpful in teaching the principals ways to use data, to set goals, and to work with staff and involve them. These six principals reported the training sessions as time well spent.

Research Questions 3 and 4 - Time and Focus
Research questions three and four inquired how new principals who participate in a formal coaching program or an informal mentoring program report spending their time in terms of the themes identified by Hallinger and Murphy in the PIMRS (1985).

a. Defining the School’s Mission

b. Managing the Instructional Program

c. Promoting a Positive Learning Climate

Each of these areas is explored as reported by coached and mentored principals in response to the questions asked to clarify these themes. The questions were designed to probe at a deeper level the behaviors associated with the identified themes. These are the same areas that are addressed through the PIMRS survey.

*Support for defining the school’s goals.*

Of the principals supported by coaches, four of five reported receiving support on working to develop and communicate the school goals, especially in the area of data interpretation and presentation. Specifically, a middle school principal stated that his coach helped him to support the staff in “tying the scores down to something very substantial” in an effort to make them meaningful to the staff and promote productive discussion and action planning about goal setting. The high school principal who reported he did not work with his coach about goal setting noted that the school had set the goals during a WASC review the prior year. He mused, “Probably not as much in defining the goals, we have talked a lot about communicating of the goals to the staff and to the community.”
None of the mentored principals reported receiving support on working to develop and communicate the school goals. The high school principal explained that this work had been done the previous year through the WASC (Western Association of School and Colleges) review process and that the goals were established and in place already. The elementary principal reported that he had a great deal of previous experience in this area and did not need any support. The middle school principal simply stated this was not something that she had worked on with her mentor.

Support for monitoring student progress.

Concerning support for monitoring student progress, four of the five coached principals reported that their coaches had supported their work in this area, specifically in the use of data to inform teachers about their students’ progress. The middle school principal reported that this was “an action and an outgrowth of trying to develop or teach my staff how to use the data effectively for instruction.” At the elementary level, two of the three coached principals reported an emphasis on using data to inform their work in the area of providing academic interventions for students who were considered to be at risk of not meeting grade level standards. An elementary principal shared, “This year our biggest focus has been on the pyramid of interventions and how we are going to help kids. She helped me become aware that I need to lead a better process.” The third elementary principal reported there was no assistance needed in this area as “I have it pretty well wired.”

Principals working with mentors described the following in regards to monitoring student progress. The high school principal reported that monitoring
student progress was an area in which her mentor had been very helpful in sharing ideas and practices that he used to address students who were not successful. She reported, “He would share things going on over there. I was able to pick his brain on how are you monitoring your students and really got quite a few ideas from him. I sent some people over there to kind of lean from them.” The elementary principal stated that this was an area in which he had a great deal of expertise and only needed support with things such as “passwords for the data base,” but not with anything else about monitoring student progress. The middle school principal reported she had not spoken with her mentor about this area.

*Support for instructional improvement and professional development.*

Principals were questioned about support provided by the coaches for developing programs for instructional improvement and staff development. This area was an overlap with providing support for student progress for three principals. The principals’ staff development efforts also incorporated the monitoring of student progress and the use of student data to develop and train teachers for instructional improvement. For the high school principal, there was a focus on the goal of cutting the D and F grade rates through instructional improvement. The high school principal confirmed that his coach supported his work in this area. “He and I have had some conversations about what has worked well at his school and some changes they have gone through, especially working on one of our big goals to cut the D and F rate.” On the other hand, of the mentored principals, only the middle school principal reported support in this area. She stated, “I just asked her questions about what she was doing,
but she is going places where I might want to go but for this school at this level we were not ready. So I would ask her questions and she was more than happy to share about it, but it wasn’t really collaborative. If I asked what she does, she would help me.”

Support for a positive learning climate.

The interviews probed issues about school culture and the development of positive learning climates. Four of the coached principals noted that they had come into what they considered to be a positive learning climate and that their goals in this area were to build trust and relationships with the staff. One principal reported, “I think that the school was set up quite nicely; it had a positive feel. I needed to come in and not change it.” One experienced elementary principal new to the district felt like the climate had not been positive and there was a need for a great deal of “healing” and action planning in this area. This principal reported that her coach “helped me to reflect and come to decisions . . .” that allowed her to move the staff forward. The coach was also able to provide insight and information specific to the staff since she had previously worked at this school.

Mentored principals did not report any need to emphasize creating a positive learning climate at their school. The middle school principal reported that construction issues due to the remodel of the school made it a very difficult year and had negatively affected the learning climate. She said, “This year, construction has made everything negative; there is only so much you can do with all of this going on every day.” The high school principal reported that she had been at the school (as
assistant principal) and it was a positive environment. This was something she had worked on previously and understood well “My job at all three high schools was curriculum and staff development so I think I have a pretty good handle on all of this. Our school is a great place. . . .” The elementary principal also reported a positive environment that did not need work. His concerns were for compliance issues with specific state programs that he believed the school had been doing wrong.

**Individual Participant Results**

In addition to participating in one-on-one interviews with the researcher, new principals completed a survey, The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) developed by Dr. Phillip Hallinger, to assess principal instructional management behavior. Both of these data sets will be used to report findings by participant.

Each participant interview used a guided approach to ensure that the same set of questions was asked of each new principal and yet allowed flexibility to explore certain subjects in more depth as appropriate. All interviews were conducted during a time and a place convenient to each interviewee. Interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes to one hour and were audio taped and transcribed by the researcher within one week of the interview. The researcher also noted non-verbal responses that would not have been captured on tape.

The PIMRS contains 10 subscales and 50 items that assess the frequency with which the principal enacts a behavior or practice associated with a particular leadership function. Each item is rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from (1) almost
never to (5) almost always. The instrument (see Appendix B) is scored by calculating the mean for the items that comprise each subscale. This results in a profile that yields data on perceptions of principal performance on each of the instructional leadership functions. The data generated are useful to highlight patterns in the instructional leadership of principals. The original validation study found that the PIMRS met high standards of reliability, face-validity, content-validity, and discriminate-validity (Hallinger, 1983). All ten subscales exceeded .80 using Cronbach’s test of internal consistency. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) has subsequently been used in over 100 studies (Hallinger, 2003). This scale was administered to the participating principals, district office supervisor (assistant superintendent), and the principal’s mentor or coach. For the purpose of discussion of results on the PIMRS, the subscale averages will be reported. It was obtained by averaging the item scores within each leadership subscale. This score portrays the administrator’s performance within a given leadership function.

The following section describes the PIMRS scores on the principal self-report survey along with each participant’s interview data for coached and then mentored principals.

Results for Coached Principals

In addition to individual interviews, the principal, his/her supervisor (Assistant Superintendent, Learning Support Services), and his/her coach completed surveys for principals in a coaching relationship. Two of the five coaches contacted were unable to complete the survey stating that they had not spent enough time with the principal
to accurately measure these areas. Comparison results for each coached principal
demonstrating the subscale score averages from each of the respondents are
represented in figure form. Results from individual interviews are discussed after each
table depicting survey results.

*Elementary principal- Janet.*

Survey results, represented in Figure 1, show Janet’s self-report, her coach’s
report, and her supervisor’s report were aligned in most areas. The coach’s rating was
slightly lower in several areas. This difference may be accounted for by the coach
reporting only four visits with Janet during the year, a lower number of visits than
most coaches in the district. This was the only coach who was external to the district,
which may also have affected the coach’s knowledge of Janet’s performance.
From her interview, we learned that Janet has seven years of previous experience as an elementary principal in another district. Prior to working as the site principal Janet worked for eight years as a classroom teacher as well as a Teacher on Special Assignment working on various projects. This is her first year in the study district. In the interview, Janet expressed confidence in knowing what her goals for her school were and where the school is headed. Janet’s interview responses indicated a confidence and emphasis on developing and communicating these goals. This level of confidence may be due in part to her previous experience as an elementary principal in a different school district. Janet indicated during her interview that she did not have
a need for assistance in monitoring student progress. She did indicate a need for instructional improvement and professional development for her staff; yet this was not an area in which she sought assistance from her coach. Janet met with her coach every six to eight weeks or so during her first year. Although she appreciates and respects her direct supervisor, she reported that she was not around much and that working with a coach allowed her to have the deep conversations she needed and served as a sounding board for tough decisions. She spent a great deal of time her first year trying to understand the “district way.” Her predecessor had been fired and left a tremendous void in terms of working files or other information that might have made her job easier. Janet liked the fact that her coach was candid with her, did not waste her time, and could relate to many of the same issues that she did. She felt that in the day-to-day work of the principal you do not have much time to stop and ask questions; working with her coach gave her permission to reflect and find time to think. She also reported a great deal of support from other principals in the study district.

In comparing the interview data with the scores on the PIMRS, Janet’s average response of 3.8 in Supervising and Evaluating Instruction, Coordinating the Curriculum, and Monitoring Student Progress demonstrates that she has provided leadership activity in these areas in spite of not working directly with her coach. During the interview, Janet indicated she had not sought assistance from her coach on Instructional Improvement and Professional Development activities for her staff. Her survey score of 3.3 indicates she did some work in this area, although less than other areas measured by the survey. Janet reported that her coach had suggested ideas for
building positive learning environments. Her survey response of 3.9 supports her effort in this area.

Table 2 presents data of Janet’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during her interview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals.</td>
<td>Frame the School Goals</td>
<td>“We have talked through this because I went to the workshop Learners = Leaders and I went to the other workshop so taking those ideas and trying to translate it into action.” “More than anything she has been my sounding board. I know where I want to get my school but I also know that I’ve got to do the dance where I support my people…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate the School Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress.</td>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate</td>
<td>“I have that pretty much wired. As part of my Tier 2 credential I went to the ACSA academy for curriculum and instruction…” “When I want to talk about challenges she’s (the coach) has been excellent for that. She helps me to reflect and come to decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction Coordinate the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor Student Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Programs for Instruction Improvement and Professional Development.</td>
<td>Provide Incentives for</td>
<td>“You know that you have to move them but it is a real challenge….this change is scary for them… you don’t want to alienate them.” “The good teachers move out of (the school) so the rest are still there and don’t want change so it is scary for them and they are not fighting me but I don’t want to alienate them so she has spent a great time with me talking about the dance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Positive Learning Environment</td>
<td>Protect Instruction Time</td>
<td>“…it has been about politics and personalities. She is my sounding board and she has shared some resources and just having another professional I could just get my thoughts out with. I love Dee, she is the best boss I’ve ever had, but she’s stealth like, she comes and she goes and she doesn’t stay and have that deep conversation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain High Visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Incentives for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary principal -Lori.

In Figure 2, Lori’s self-report, her coach’s report, and her supervisor’s report generally aligned in most areas. For a few areas, the supervisor rated Lori higher than either the coach or Lori herself. The supervisor reported more than 15 visits to the school site during the year, a number greater than most supervisor reports.

Figure 2. Survey results for elementary principal Lori.

From her interview, Lori shared that her career began as a high school music teacher in South Carolina, and she actually taught at the rural high school from which she had graduated. In addition to music, she taught drama and piano. She then moved
to southern California and went to work at a prestigious private school where she taught music and then moved into a position as assistant to the lower school director. Her work in this position focused on semi-administrative tasks including teacher observations, writing parent newsletters, and recruitment of new students. Lori then went to work for a very large suburban district as an assistant principal in a middle school that specialized in the performing arts prior to coming to the study school district as a principal.

Lori reported getting a late start working with her coach, but she received a great deal of assistance and support from the previous principal of her school, especially in the area of developing the school goals. Once she began working with her coach she found her to be very supportive and of great assistance throughout the remainder of the school year. Lori’s coach frequently shared agendas, letters, power point presentations, and other things that she had prepared to use at her own school. Lori and her coach met formally once a month but interacted informally on a weekly basis, noting often how prompt her coach was in responding to her. She felt very comfortable contacting her and frequently used email to ask a quick question. Lori reported a great deal of support from her colleagues as well and felt that she had many resources she was able to turn to during her first year. During the interview, Lori emphasized her work on building community and trying to work with the staff on true collaboration. She was quick to point out that it was a wonderful place and there was nothing bad, but she felt that they could reflect more on their current practices and work to improve.
Through both the interview process and the survey responses, Lori indicated that she worked a great deal her first year on defining and communicating her school goals. Her interview data were supported by her survey average response of 4.0. Monitoring student progress was an area in which Lori needed to learn a great deal about the elementary curriculum and ways for working with students this age since her previous experiences at been at the secondary level. She reported in the interview and in the survey data that her focus was working on monitoring student progress and supporting at risk students.

As an administrator new to the elementary level, providing staff development was a challenge for Lori. She did mention relying on her coach to support her by sharing ideas, agendas, and things that she had done successfully with her staff. In the area of learning environment Lori’s lower survey average may be due to her perception that a positive environment existed at the school. During the interview Lori spoke of the need for “true collaboration” that moved beyond being cordial and sharing materials. She may also have rated this area lower due to her desire to see change and improvement in the manner in which staff work together and focus on students--the “true collaboration” which isn’t happening yet.

Table 3 presents data of Lori’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during her interview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals.</td>
<td>Frame the School Goals</td>
<td>“She reviewed the school goals from last year and helped me with formulating what I thought they might be this year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate the School Goals</td>
<td>“I didn’t have my coach assigned to me when I first started… the previous principal kind of filled that role for me…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress.</td>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate</td>
<td>“She’s shared her work that she’s used for at risk students. She’s talked with me about interventions they have at their site and how she worked with her teachers…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction Coordinate the</td>
<td>“She makes suggestions about what might work at my site…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Monitor Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress = 3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Programs for Instructional Improvement and Professional Development.</td>
<td>Provide Incentives for</td>
<td>“I would say I started this meeting agenda would you look at it and what do you think I should do next and then she would share all her agendas…..”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers Promote Professional</td>
<td>“Our focus is writing and hers is different so it was more how are you thinking about that, she asks questions and makes me think but I figured everything out the way I need to.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development = 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Positive Learning Environment</td>
<td>Protect Instructional Time</td>
<td>“She was mostly a sounding board for issues with staff. The school was set up already quite nicely; it had a positive feel.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain High Visibility</td>
<td>“I would say I spent most of my time thinking about building community and trying to work with staff on true collaboration. They will share material and are very cordial but that’s not collaborating….”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Incentives for Learning = 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary principal - Cindy.

Figure 3 indicates that Cindy self-reported much lower scores in 7 of the 10 areas than were reported by either her coach or her supervisor. This is consistent with what Hallinger and Murphy (1985) found with new principals who often ranked themselves much lower than others. Cindy’s coach spent a considerable amount of time with her, more than most coaches, meeting bi-weekly for the first part of the year and then every three weeks in the spring. This may be one explanation for the coach’s higher rating of Cindy than her supervisor, who met with her much less frequently. Cindy also reported a great deal of conversation with her coach in each of these areas, confirming her emphasis and attention to each leadership function.
During the interview, Cindy shared that her previous experience included being a high school science teacher and the Associated Student Body director for three years in the study district. During this time, she began work on a Master’s Degree in Educational Leadership that led to a year of study in Hong Kong before returning to the United States to get married and move to Northern California. Following a short stay in Northern California, Cindy returned to the study district as an assistant principal at a different high school. She worked in this position for another three years, following which she stayed home with her two children for the next six years. During her time away from the public schools, Cindy completed a doctoral program.
Although her original intent in the fall of 2006 was to return to teaching, the study district approached her about the possibility of applying for a position as an assistant principal at the elementary level. Two weeks prior to the start of school, the assistant principal position became an opening for an elementary principal, and Cindy was offered the position.

Cindy reported a very productive and positive relationship with her coach, meeting together every two to three weeks throughout the year. She cited many specific examples of the various ways they had worked together to support student learning and Cindy’s personal growth as a leader. She trusts her coach implicitly, and believes that her coach’s areas of expertise and experience have been highly beneficial to her professional growth.

In comparing Cindy’s interview data with her PIMRS we see consistency. Her average reported score of 3.4 on questions pertaining to framing the school goals and communicating the school goals match her interview responses in which she reported a great deal of time and emphasis working with her coach in communicating the school goals and working with her staff in writing and developing goals for the school. Cindy shared that the school slogan for the year was “Believe” and that she worked with her coach to continuously tie all that they did back to this slogan with a focus on the goals for all students. Working closely with her coach, Cindy spent a great deal of time and focus developing and presenting effective staff development opportunities for her staff. Her survey results of 4.1 support her interview responses regarding her perceived importance of planning and delivering effective staff
development as well as her work with her coach in this area. Cindy also emphasized building trust and creating a positive learning environment with an average score of 3.6 in this area. Through the survey questions, Cindy reported an emphasis on maintaining high visibility and providing incentives for teachers as well as providing incentives for learning. In the interview Cindy shared that both her coach and her supervisor had emphasized the need to build trust and develop relationships during her first year and that other areas could wait.

Table 4 presents data of Cindy’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during her interview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals.</td>
<td>Frame the School Goals Communicate the School Goals = 3.4</td>
<td>“She would have helped me a great deal with the goals but this was something I was fairly experienced with. Both my Master’s and my Doctoral degrees are in that area.” “Communicating the goals I would say she helped me with more, reminding me to revisit them and to tie them together throughout the year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress</td>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate Instruction Coordinate the Curriculum Monitor Student Progress = 3.6</td>
<td>“This year our biggest focus has been on the pyramid of interventions and how we are going to help kids. She helped me become aware that I need to lead a better process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Programs for Instructional Improvement and Professional Development.</td>
<td>Provide Incentives for Teachers Promote Professional Development = 4.1</td>
<td>“Professional development was huge. That is her (the coach) forte. We spent a lot of time there…I tend to plan too much and she helps me narrow down and to revisit spiraling through the themes and main tasks.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Positive Learning Environment.</td>
<td>Protect Instructional Time Maintain High Visibility Provide Incentives for Learning = 3.6</td>
<td>“She has helped me to build trust, build relationships, with the priority being my self-confidence.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Dan’s case, his coach shared that he was unable to fill out the PIMRS survey saying, “I do not have sufficient data in each of these areas to adequately complete the survey questions.” This interesting declaration may speak to how little the coach felt he has gotten to know Dan over the year, although they met regularly and Dan reported that he learned a great deal from his coach. His coach shared that these were not areas that he had directly observed Dan work in and did not feel like he knew enough about each item. Dan’s coach is an analytical style leader, and currently works as the Executive Director of Student Assessment, a very data-driven position. As seen in figure 4, in comparing the results of Dan’s supervisor with Dan’s self-report we note that Dan has rated himself much lower in each of these areas than his supervisor did. This is a consistent finding with Hallinger and Murphy’s (1985) research on new principals which reveals that new principals often underrate their own performance. Dan’s supervisor rated him high in all areas and reported having visited him at his site more than 15 times during the school year.
During the interview, Dan shared that he began his career as a special education teacher in a district other than the study district. After three years, he went to work for the State Department of Education serving as demonstration teacher for many districts in the county. Following this, he came to the study district as a special education High School teacher and taught for eight years. He was then appointed as a Teacher on Special Assignment at the high school which led to his hiring as an assistant principal at a middle school in the district. After two years in this position he moved to another district, as an assistant high school principal. Subsequent to spending eight years in that position he returned to the study district as the principal at the school in which he had previously served as assistant principal.
Dan spoke at length about his work in defining the school’s goals and communicating the goals but this did not seem to come through in his survey data. During the interview he shared a great deal about how he used data to help his staff see the areas in need of improvement. His survey data may be lower in this area because the goals had been previously set through an accrediting process in which his school participated the year prior to his arrival. Dan shared that monitoring student progress was an on-going area that needed improvement at his site. His survey and interview responses both indicate that this work has started; yet there is room for improvement and professional development for teachers was an area of priority for Dan. This was reflected in both his interview and in the survey data. Dan shared his frustration with some of the “traditions” that existed at the school that were not necessarily supportive of student learning or a positive learning environment but existed only because it had “always been done.” He worked a great deal in the area of creating a positive learning environment by asking questions of staff that required them to rethink what they were doing and on deciding how what they were doing related to student achievement. His survey data response of 3.7 indicates a significant emphasis on leadership behavior in this area. He truly believed that his coach’s support helped him with the confidence to take this on.

Table 5 presents data of Dan’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during his interview.
Table 5. Principal Self-Report on PIMRS survey and Interview Data
Middle School Principal Dan Supported by a Coach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals.</td>
<td>Frame the School Goals Communicate the School Goals = 3.1</td>
<td>“He most definitely helped me understand at a very fundamental level the data and how to use this to set the school goals.” “Our discussions really focused on where I wanted to take the school for the rest of this year and into next year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress.</td>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate Instruction Coordinate the Curriculum Monitor Student Progress = 3.2</td>
<td>“That was part of it, as more of an action and an outgrowth of trying to develop or teach my staff how to use data effectively for instruction.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Programs for Instructional Improvement and Professional Development.</td>
<td>Provide Incentives for Teachers Promote Professional Development = 3.8</td>
<td>“This was an area we tackled specifically. We talked about some articles and specific areas to target…he came back to data processing and developing a clear vision, goal and values around data.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Positive Learning Environment</td>
<td>Protect Instructional Time Maintain High Visibility Provide Incentives for Learning = 3.7</td>
<td>“I could not afford to come across frustrated so I read some articles and started to work on some things. I came up with three essential questions… and these really helped.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High School principal- Peter.*

Peter is an experienced principals from outside the district. Figure 5 displays Peter’s survey data. He showed a relatively consistent self-report rating with his supervisor. His coach reported that he was unable to complete the survey information, as they had not spent enough time together on these topics. On the other hand, Peter’s
supervisor rated him higher than his self-report in the areas of Protect Instructional Time, Promote Professional Development, and Provide Incentives for Learning. As an experienced principal, it would be expected that Peter would self-report at a higher level than a first year principal. Throughout the interview he also displayed a high level of confidence in the work he was doing with his site and his knowledge of the job.

Figure 5. Survey results for high school principal Peter.

During the interview Peter shared that his career in education began as a Spanish, English, and Physical Education teacher for five years at a rural high school. Following this job, he moved to the study school district and taught English for 12
years at one of the high schools. He moved high schools in the district to take a position as an assistant principal, which he held for 4.5 years before leaving the district to become a high school principal in a neighboring district. Peter worked as principal for 2.5 years before returning to the study school district as principal at the same high school where he had previously been the assistant principal. Although he came back to the school district as an experienced principal, he was assigned a coach to work with during his first year. Peter’s understanding of the role of his coach was that he was someone for him to “run issues by as they pop up, run ideas by.” His definition was much less formal than what the other principals shared. His coach was the principal of another high school in the district. Peter felt that it was valuable for him to learn about the things going on at the coach’s school and to share with his coach as a colleague. When asked about any support that might have been missing this first year Peter stated, “Sometimes I feel over supported. Sometimes I just want to say guys, I’m OK, I know everybody here because I have grown up with them all my life and they are my family . . .” Peter reported meeting monthly with his coach on a formal basis but often sat with him or interacted at other times as well.

In contrasting Peter’s PIMRS data with his interview data we find that both data sets emphasize a focus on defining school goals and communicating those goals during his first year. The self reported score of 3.93 for monitoring student progress indicates that there was an emphasis on leadership behavior in these key areas. From the interview, Peter shared that he had in fact worked on this but did not solicit the support of his coach in this area. He relied more on his staff to inform him. Peter
rated himself as working at a high rate on professional development and instructional improvement with an average of 3.6. His interview failed to reveal any specifics about this work but he did indicate a collaborative relationship of sharing and discussion with his coach in this area. Survey results indicate an average score of 4.0 in creating a positive learning environment demonstrating a high emphasis on behaviors that support this.

Table 6 presents data of Peter’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during his interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals.</td>
<td>Frame the School Goals of Communication the School Goals = 4.4</td>
<td>“…probably not as much in defining the goals, we have talked a lot about some of the communicating of the goals but as a school we worked really hard together to develop the goals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress.</td>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate Instruction Coordinate the Curriculum Monitor Student Progress = 3.93</td>
<td>“We had several good conversations about this but I think that what has been in place here is just for me to learn more about and the staff are my real go to people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Programs for Instructional Improvement and Professional Development.</td>
<td>Provide Incentives for Teachers Promote Professional Development = 3.6</td>
<td>“We share a lot of ideas and bounced a lot of ideas off each other to find out what seems to work, what does the research tell us. I think we’ve made some good progress.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Positive Learning Environment</td>
<td>Protect Instructional Time Maintain High Visibility Provide Incentives for Learning = 4.</td>
<td>“I think most of our real good conversations have come just from our own leadership teams. We meet with department chairs and a lot of different committees that we have on how we are establishing a positive learning community.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results for Mentored Principals

In addition to individual interviews, the mentored principal, his/her supervisor, and his/her mentor completed the PIMRS survey. Similar to two coaches, one mentor felt that he had not spent enough time with his mentee to accurately answer some of the survey questions. Comparison results for each mentored principal demonstrating subscale score averages from each of the respondents are represented in figure form. Results from individual interviews are discussed after each graph depicting survey results.

Elementary principal – Chuck.

Chuck came to the study district with more than ten years experience as an elementary principal in several school districts. His mentor was unable to complete the survey stating that he did not have enough information to rate Chuck on the questions. In Figure 6 we see that Chuck rated himself significantly higher in each area than his supervisor with the exception of protecting instructional time, for which his supervisor rated him 3.6 and he rated himself as 3.2. Chuck’s survey results are in line with many of the statements he made during the interview in which he referred to himself as “an old dog that has been around a few times” and stated throughout the interview that he really did not need any assistance. Chuck was the only principal to rate himself 5 in three areas: Frame the School Goals, Monitor Student Progress, and Provide Incentives for Learning. No other principals self reported at this level nor did others rate them at this level. As an experienced principal, Chuck presented with a
high level of confidence and a sense of knowing everything about the job, perhaps more than others in the district. His survey data supports his shared confidence in his own ability and performance; however, it is not mirrored in his supervisor’s response which is much lower in all but one area.

Chuck came to the district with a total of 20 years’ experience as an administrator and 35 years of experience in education. He had previously worked as a principal in a much smaller school district in the same county. Prior to this, he was both a site administrator and area administrator (supervising several school sites) in another state. The principal from a neighboring school was assigned as Chuck’s mentor for his first year. In a discussion about the role his mentor played, Chuck

Figure 6. Survey results of elementary principal, Chuck.
laughingly shared that he thought he would be his slave for the year. He went on to
add that his mentor had been helpful in initiating him to the district culture--the way
things are done in this district. He felt that his mentor was available for questions, and
that he initiated the calls every once in awhile to see how things were going and to ask
if he needed anything. Chuck valued his mentor’s experience, knowledge, and
networking skills. He also liked the fact that his mentor was at least as old as he was.
Although Chuck mentioned a lack of orientation or training for new administrators as
a barrier, he went on to identify his level of satisfaction with the support he received
from the district to be a nine. He expressed a great deal of support for and
appreciation from the administration in the school district.

In comparing interview and survey data, we find that in all areas of the survey,
Chuck rated his own leadership behaviors extremely high, much higher than any other
principals did. Throughout the interview, Chuck referenced his previous experience as
a site principal and working at the district level, as evidence to support his lack of need
for support from a mentor. Chuck reported on his survey that he was very consistent in
all the leadership behaviors that monitor student progress. He indicated having
worked on monitoring student progress for many years and having a great deal of
knowledge. Relative to Chuck’s responses in the other areas of the survey, his self-
ranking of 4.2 for developing programs for instructional improvement and
professional development was his lowest reported area. He did not reference any
specific programs or professional development programs during his interview.
Throughout his interview, Chuck reported that his site was a very positive learning
environment. His survey responses indicated a relatively high degree of leadership behavior in this area as well, although during the interview he failed to reference any specific activities or work he had done in this area.

Table 7 presents data of Chuck’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during his interview.

Table 7. Principal Self-Report on PIMRS survey and Interview Data
Elementary School Principal Chuck Supported by a Mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals</td>
<td>Frame the School Goals</td>
<td>“He was available for any question I asked and actually he would call every once in awhile to see how it was going…. I am older and this isn’t the first time I have done anything”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate the School Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress.</td>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate Instruction</td>
<td>“We were given data in Vegas before anyone in California because we needed to do that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate the Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor Student Progress = 4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Programs for Instructional Improvement and Professional Development.</td>
<td>Provide Incentives for Teachers</td>
<td>“Everything comes from just doing the job, the less support you have then the more support you need to find on your own…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote Professional Development = 4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Positive Learning Environment</td>
<td>Protect Instructional Time</td>
<td>“This is great, I love it; this is educational Disneyland.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain High Visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Incentives for Learning = 4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Middle School principal - Lisa.

Lisa rated herself lower than her mentor in 5 out of 10 areas. Figure 7 indicates that she also rated herself lower than her supervisor in 8 out of 10 areas. The tendency to rate oneself low is consistent with several of the other beginning principals in this study, as well as findings reported in Hallinger and Murphy’s findings (1985). Her supervisor rated her high in most areas, markedly higher than her mentor. It is not a surprise that the mentor rating is lower as Lisa indicated throughout her interview that she had not worked with or discussed these specific leadership functions with her mentor. Lisa reported infrequent visits with her mentor and indicated that although they had a nice relationship she did not feel that she her mentor really understood her lack of knowledge and the areas in which she needed support.
From interview data, it was learned that Lisa started her career as a high school teacher in the study district in 1975. She taught US history as well as other social studies courses and English classes. She coached gymnastics on and off for 25 years before moving into administration as a high school assistant principal in the study district. She worked in this position for six years before becoming principal of a middle school. As a first year principal, Lisa was assigned a middle school principal to serve as her mentor. Lisa felt a mentor could serve her in a supportive role, someone who was in a similar position who could answer her questions. Throughout the interview Lisa frequently commented on how much she liked her mentor.

Although it became apparent that her mentor and she did not work on many areas
explored throughout the interview, Lisa would make comments about how nice her mentor was, seeming to justify why her mentor was a good person but they had not focused on these areas. Interview responses were very short and indicated no support or collaboration with her mentor in the area of developing and communicating school goals although her survey responses indicate that Lisa did demonstrate leadership behaviors in these areas. Monitoring student progress was not an area that Lisa received or solicited support from her mentor; however, the survey indicates a moderate emphasis on leadership behaviors in the area of monitoring student progress. Although Lisa’s mentor shared activities and programs that were going on at her site, Lisa felt that her school was not at the point of readiness to implement any of these programs. Her survey results report a moderate level of leadership activity in the area of developing programs for instructional improvement and professional development in contrast to her interview report of her school not being ready for this. During the interview, Lisa failed to note any activities or supports for a positive environment and yet her survey responses report a high level of leadership behavior in this area, indicating a strong contrast in her survey results and her interview statements. During the interview, she focused a great deal on the remodel process they had been going through that year and the negative impact that construction had on a positive learning environment, which may explain the contrast in results.

Table 8 presents data from Lisa’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during her interview.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response by area</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals.</td>
<td>Frame the School Goals Communicate the School Goals = 3.9</td>
<td>“This was not something we worked on; however, she is a great person and I love her.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Progress.</td>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate Instruction Coordinate the Curriculum Monitor Student Progress = 3.4</td>
<td>“No.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Programs for Instructional Improvement and Professional Development.</td>
<td>Provide Incentives for Teachers Promote Professional Development = 3.6</td>
<td>“I just asked her questions about what she was doing and she is going places where I might want to go but for this school we were not ready….”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a Positive Learning Environment</td>
<td>Protect Instructional Time Maintain High Visibility Provide Incentives for Learning = 3.9</td>
<td>“There is nothing positive this year about the construction going on….”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High School principal - Dana.*

Dana’s survey results depicted in Figure 8 are typical of a new principal, in which she has rated herself lower than others have rated her. The ratings from the mentor and supervisor are consistent in many areas; although the supervisor rates a few areas higher. Areas of differences include the reports from the mentor and the supervisor in the area of providing incentives for learning. This may be a result of the greater number of visits by the supervisor to the school site as well as a greater knowledge of the specific programs being implemented at the school. Maintaining
high visibility is also an area in which Dana ranked herself lower than did her mentor or supervisor. The mentor reported having visited the site between 10 and 15 times during the year while her supervisor reported more than 15 visits to the site.
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**Figure 8.** Survey results of high school principal Dana.

Principal Dana began her career in the Midwest as a private school teacher, working with students in grades 7 through 12 as a Social Studies, English, Choir, and Drama teacher. In California, she worked as a special education teacher for four years, and then took a position teaching History at a Continuation High School for the next 17 years. After obtaining her administrative credential, she worked as a Teacher on Special Assignment at the continuation school and then took a position at the district office as a coordinator for k-8 educational programs. Following four years at
the district level, Dana returned to the comprehensive high school as an assistant principal. When Dana moved to Southern California, she began as an assistant principal at a high school in the study district for one year, after which she became assistant principal at her present school for one year prior to assuming the principalship.

During her first year as Principal, Dana was supported by a mentor who was a principal at another high school in the district. Her understanding of the role of her mentor was that he was to help her understand the big picture as a leader, and to assist her with her steep learning curve. Dana reported seeing her mentor formally once a month but stated that they talked by phone or email far more frequently than this and that he was always available when she needed him. She reported that some of the greatest support from her mentor has been “learning the stuff not in the books, how to play the game, who to not listen to, who to go to, what to ask, and what not to ask. . .”

Dana also reported receiving a great deal of support from her supervisor as well as another high school principal in her community. Her overall satisfaction with the support she received from the district was rated as a ten. As she compared it to support that was lacking in her previous district, she was very satisfied with all the assistance that she had received during her first year. Dana shared in the interview process that the school goals were established the previous year and this year the work was devoted to communicating these goals and keeping them in the forefront for everyone. This is reflected in her survey data that demonstrated leadership behavior in these areas with an average score of 4.2.
Dana’s struggles in the area of monitoring student progress and instructional improvement are similar to those of other high school principal colleagues in knowing when and how to intercede with struggling students. Her survey self-report score of 3.93 indicates a high level of leadership behavior in the area of monitoring student progress. Dana’s interview response indicates that she did not work with her mentor in the area of developing programs for instructional improvement and professional development. Her previous experience with curriculum and working at the district office informed her work in this area; therefore, she did not seek out the support of her mentor. Her response of 3.26 on the self-report indicates a moderate amount of leadership behavior in this area. Dana indicated that the school had a very positive culture. She did indicate in her survey responses that she spent time on leadership activities that correlated with this area with an average score of 3.7. During the interview, she shared that she felt a tremendous responsibility for determining the school environment and felt that as principal she set the tone of the school and had the responsibility for ensuring that people feel valued and supported.

Table 9 presents data of Dana’s self-report on the PIMRS survey along with data collected during her interview.
Table 9. Principal Self-Report on PIMRS survey and Interview Data  
High School Principal Dana Supported by a Mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Behavior</th>
<th>Self Survey Average Response by area</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Defining the School’s Goals and Communicating the goals. | Frame the School Goals  
Communicate the School Goals = 4.2                                                                 | “In terms of goals, we were just coming through WASC, so much of that had been done and it was important to honor that.” |
| Monitoring Student Progress.                      | Supervise and Evaluate Instruction  
Coordinate the Curriculum  
Monitor Student Progress = 3.93                                                                    | “… all of us are really trying to get a handle on how do we deal with interceding when a student is not doing well…” “He would share things going on over there so I was able to pick his brain on how are you monitoring your students….” |
| Developing Programs for Instructional Improvement and Professional Development. | Provide Incentives for Teachers  
Promote Professional Development = 3.26                                                              | “for this I would say no, we did not work in this area, I feel pretty solid on staff development, my learning curve has been CIF, facilities, some things like master scheduling....” |
| Providing a Positive Learning Environment          | Protect Instructional Time  
Maintain High Visibility  
Provide Incentives for Learning = 3.7                                                               | “I definitely talked to (my mentor) about some of those things and I have learned a lot from the people here…..” |
Principal Self-Perception on PIMRS - Mentored vs. Coached Principals

The self-reported group averages of principals who have worked with coaches were examined in contrast to principals who have worked with mentors. Table 2 compares the average of self-reported survey results of principals who participated in a program of coaching to those who participated in a mentoring program. The results demonstrate a higher degree of emphasis with coached principals about framing the school goals (4.36 for coached principals vs. 3.7 for mentored principals) and promoting professional development (4.0 for coached principals vs. 3.56 for mentored principals). These survey results support the interview data in which the principals who were coached reported a higher instance of working with their coaches in these two areas. Principals working with coaches also reported a greater emphasis on promoting professional development, an area in which they reported working with their coaches.

Mentored principals reported a greater emphasis on activities related to Coordinating the Curriculum (4.16 mentored principals vs. 3.2 coached principals) as well as work on Monitoring Student Progress (4.0 vs. 3.28). This difference in emphasis was not noted in the interview data. It is important to note that the PIMRS does not measure an administrator’s effectiveness. Rather, it assesses the degree to which a principal is providing instructional leadership at his/her school.

Table 10 presents the average scores for the principal’s self-report for coached principals as compared to mentored principals.
Table 10. Comparison of Averaged Principal’s Self-Report Scores for Coached and Mentored Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Coached principal (n=5)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mentored Principals (n=3)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frame the School Goals</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>+.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate the School Goals</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise and Evaluate Instruction</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate the Curriculum</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Student Progress</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Instructional Time</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>+.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain High Visibility</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>-.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Incentives for Teachers</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Professional Development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>+.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Incentives for Learning</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Principals’ Stories

Telling the lived story of participants is another way to synthesize and report data collected in this study. Looking at stories of a coached principal and a mentored principal adds an additional dimension to the previously stated study results.

Coached Principal Cindy.

Elementary school principal, Cindy, came to be the principal at her school in the fall of 2006 through an unusual and fortuitous route. Growing up in Raleigh, North Carolina, Cindy did not venture far after high school, electing to attend Duke University, forty miles from home. At that time, she studied biology and religious studies but was unsure of what her future career path would hold. Upon graduating from college, she took a job with a computer company that relocated her to California. The following year the company moved her back to North Carolina, at which time Cindy decided that she preferred California and moved back on her own. While waiting tables and attempting to determine her future goals, she completed a number of occupational surveys that indicated she would be an excellent teacher or counselor; this inspired her to enroll in graduate school and obtain a teaching credential.

Initially, Cindy taught science and worked as the Director of the Associated Student Body for three years at a high school in the study district. During this time, she began work on a Master’s Degree in Educational Leadership that led to her final year of study in Hong Kong before returning to get married and move to Northern California.
Following a short stay in Northern California, Cindy returned to the study district as an assistant principal at a different high school. She worked in this position for another three years, and then elected to stay home with her two children for the next six years. During her time away from the public schools, Cindy completed a doctoral program that emphasized her research in Japanese lesson study.

Anticipating a return to work in the public school system, Cindy completed the requirements for a multiple subjects credential, thus allowing her to teach at the elementary level. Although her original intent in the fall of 2006 was to return to the classroom as a teacher, the study district approached her about the possibility of a position as an assistant principal at the elementary level, a job that Cindy accepted. Two weeks prior to the start of school, due to an unforeseen opening, the position of assistant principal became an opening for an elementary principal, and Cindy was offered this opportunity.

Although her route to becoming an elementary principal was a bit unconventional, it was an intentional goal for Cindy to lead at the elementary level. Frustrated with the large size of the local high schools and believing that she could make a significant difference at the elementary level led her to pursue a career at this level.

During her first year as an elementary principal, a coach was assigned to support Cindy. Cindy’s coach had previous experience as an elementary principal and was working in staff development at the district office when she served as Cindy’s coach. The two met frequently throughout the year, averaging a meeting every two
weeks during the first half of the year and a bit less as the year progressed. During these meetings, the coach always began by asking Cindy to reflect on what was going well and any celebrations or achievements she had during the past several weeks. They would then move on to discussing current challenges and areas of growth for Cindy or planning for upcoming meetings and events. One common theme that Cindy noted was that her coach would always prompt her to “begin with the end in mind.” As they would plan for different meetings or events, they first addressed the outcome by pinpointing what Cindy wanted to accomplish during the event. Cindy stated that her coach helped her to become a better principal by “helping me to stay focused on student learning and asking the right questions. She has guided me to the right research and the right resources. She has believed in me.”

In discussing each of the areas from Hallinger’s work and asking Cindy to self report how much time she has spent in each of these areas she stated that “It is all about relationships. Everything has been about relationships and climate that goes together.” She was able to provide concrete examples of the various ways in which the school was working on each of the themes however, and she stated a great deal of involvement this year on developing a pyramid of intervention to address student needs as a result of monitoring student progress. Cindy also reported spending considerable time in the area of planning for and implementing staff development. In place of a business staff meeting, Cindy would plan and present learning opportunities for her staff around specific topics such as support for English Learners, understanding the school budget, and others topics as requested by her teachers.
When asked about barriers that interfered with achieving her goals this year, Cindy stated that the biggest was being new to the grade level, as she had previously only had experience on a high school campus. She also stated that this had been a bonus for her as she knew all the people working in the district at the secondary level and had good relationships with people who were able to support and assist her as needed. Cindy identified a number of people as having been of great support to her during the first year including the school secretary who had been there since the opening of the school and knew the school history, various personalities, and other information that was very helpful. She also cited her staff as being understanding and willing to guide her as needed. Additionally, Cindy found her supervisor and her principal peers to be supportive and helpful.

Reflecting on her first year and the role that her coach played during this year Cindy stated, “I can still hear her voice, but I don’t need her now. I ask the questions of myself, but I can hear exactly what she would be saying to me as I plan and consider each action. It was a wonderful program in that she was always asking me the questions, never telling me what to do… she made me do the work which is good.”

Mentored Principal Dana.

Principal Dana began her career in the Midwest as a private school teacher, working with students in grades 7 through 12. During these years, she taught Social Studies, English, Choir, Drama, as well as other courses as needed. When she came to California, Proposition 13 had just passed, making teaching jobs very difficult to find. In order to obtain a teaching position, she elected to work as a special education
teacher for four years on an emergency credential at a public junior high school. Just as she finished the requirements for her special education credential, she obtained a position teaching History at the Continuation High School in the same district. Dana taught at the continuation school for the next 17 years. She then completed her administrative credential and worked as a Teacher on Special Assignment at the same school for the next several years, coordinating staff development and assisting with administrative tasks. Dana left the site to take a position at the district office as a coordinator for educational programs, working with programs at the k-8 level. Following four years at the district level, Dana returned to a comprehensive high school as an assistant principal. Dana then moved to southern California and began work as an assistant principal at a high school in the study district for one year, after which she became assistant principal at her school for a year prior to assuming the principalship. During her first year as Principal Dana was supported by a mentor, a principal at another high school in the district. Her understanding of the role of her mentor was that he was to help her understand the big picture as a leader, and to assist her with her steep learning curve. Dana reported seeing her mentor formally once a month but stated that they talked by phone or email far more frequently than this and that he was always available when she needed him. She shared that some of the greatest support from her mentor has been “learning the stuff not in the books, how to play the game, who to not listen to, who to go to, what to ask, and what not to ask . . .”

Although the mentor that Dana worked with was not a trained coach, he did have an insight and understanding of the goals of the coaching program through his
role on the Governance Board for the Leadership Academy. She spoke of him as being a positive role model for her in the way he interacts with people and the things that he would share in conversations that gave her insights into how he related with his staff and teachers.

When asked about barriers that may have gotten in the way of achieving her goals this first year Dana was quick to identify her own need to be perfect from the “get go” and that she was her own hardest critic. She also identified a system barrier, the classified staffing process that did not allow for flexibility of hiring and was governed by a personnel commission. Her mentor was able to help her identify who to contact and some ideas for ways to get around this system in order to do what is best for her students. When asked about her satisfaction as a principal, Dana stated she was afraid it would be a “nightmare” and it wasn’t, but the best job she has ever had was teaching history at the Continuation High School. Overall, she was able to rate her job satisfaction as a seven, stating that she was impatient with herself and felt “sometimes I make little mistakes and I don’t like making dumb mistakes especially if they hurt somebody. . . I just don’t feel like I know enough, I will get there hopefully. I just don’t want to let anyone down.” Dana emphatically stated yes when asked if her mentor had helped her to become a better principal.

Summary

The eight new principals to the Sunnyside School District acknowledged and appreciated the support received during their first year as site principals. Support for work about the study question areas of (a) Defining the school’s mission, (b)
Managing the instructional program, (c) Promoting a positive learning climate varied by the need of the principal, the need of the school in general, and the type of support provided (mentor vs. coach). This chapter reported the findings of a study regarding induction programs for the support of new principals in a Southern California School District. Chapter 5 will address conclusions drawn from data presented in Chapter 4 and provide a discussion of considerations for district action and further research in this area.
Chapter 5
Discussion and Recommendations

This chapter presents a summary of the research study and conclusions drawn from data presented in Chapter 4. It also provides a discussion of the considerations for action and further research.

Summary of the study

As discussed in Chapter 1, new principals today face a much different public school system than existed just a decade ago. Increased demands for student performance, combined with the complexity of society today and the accountability for all students learning, has led to a job that is often difficult to fill and indeed at times it is difficult to retain school leaders. Increased efforts are needed to ensure that beginning principals are supported and trained during their induction years. This study examined two systems of support in place for new principals in the Sunnyside School District. The research sought to understand what differences existed between the district programs of coaching support and mentor support for new principals. Interview and survey data were also used to examine differences in principal behavior as defined by Hallinger and Murphy (1985).

The research for this study included one-on-one interviews with eight beginning principals in the Sunnyside Unified School District. The interviews covered topics and questions formulated to gather information about the specific research questions. In addition to participating in these interviews, new principals completed an on-line survey The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale
(PIMRS) developed by Dr. Phillip Hallinger (1985) to assess principal instructional management behavior. The PIMRS contains 10 subscales and 50 items that assess the frequency with which the principal enacts a behavior or practice associated with a particular leadership function. Each item is rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from (1) almost never to (5) almost always. The instrument was scored by calculating the mean for the items that comprise each subscale. Using this survey, data were collected from the principal, the principal’s supervisor, and the principal’s coach or mentor. The researcher then utilized the Nvivo software program (July and August, 2007) to analyze and code data for themes from interview transcripts.

Study Limitations and Findings

This qualitative study analyzed the support provided to eight new principals in the Sunnyside School District and the possible impact of this support on principal behavior in specific areas. These programs of mentoring and coaching support for new principals were new to the district and therefore had not been reviewed or studied by the district. Aspects of this study limit its applicability to other settings or districts. The study was limited to one district in Southern California and eight new principals at three school levels with a wide variety of previous experience. Another limitation of the study was that the investigated programs of support had only taken place over approximately eight months. An insufficient number of principals were studied to make broad generalizations about the study findings. This study did not control for situational variables or personal factors such as age, sex, marital status, or previous experience. Any of these factors may have contributed to the perceived success or
failure of the principals or the support they received during the first year at their school site. This study’s focus was on identifying common themes among the responses of the interview participants that might be helpful in guiding other research on the topic.

Findings from the study are discussed in three sections. In the first section, results related to existing literature are discussed. Second, suggestions for future practice in the study district are presented. Finally, topics for further research related to induction of new school leaders are proposed.

Discussion of Findings

Past studies have documented the effectiveness of mentoring and coaching support for school leaders (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004; Wolfe, 2005). Mentoring and coaching are proven strategies that provide support and training to new administrators (Villani, 2006). In general, the findings of this study concur with the research. New principals in the study district were appreciative of the support they received from either mentors or coaches assigned to them during the first year. Since the purpose of this study was to answer the research questions presented in chapter 1 a discussion about each of these questions and the accompanying propositions will be addressed separately with questions three and four combined for discussion.

Research Question #1.

Are there identifiable differences of job satisfaction and perceptions of district support for new principals enrolled in an informal mentor program in comparison to new principals enrolled in a formal coaching program?
Proposition 1: Principals participating in a formal coaching program will report greater levels of job satisfaction and district support than principals assigned to district mentors.

The findings indicated that principals supported by coaches experienced a slightly higher level of job satisfaction (8 on a 10-point scale) than principals supported by mentors (7 on a 10-point scale). This finding supports Proposition 1. Although specific areas of job satisfaction were not explored in this study, the results of a higher level of satisfaction for coached principals may be explained by a greater frequency of contact between the coach and the coachee than by the mentor and the mentee. During the study period, coached principals reported meeting with their coaches an average of five to nine times (two coaches reported 10-15) for more than 20 minutes. By comparison, the mentored principals were visited an average of two to four visits. The frequency of visits reflects the stated coaching expectation that regular meetings would occur on a minimum basis of once per month or more. No such expectation exists for mentors. The expectation by the district of more frequent visits for coached principals could have signaled for the principals that the district was seriously supporting their work through the additional cost for their continued growth by training their coaches and requiring that they meet to support them. Coaches also were required to maintain a log of visitation dates, thus increasing accountability.

Referring to her experience as a first year elementary principal, this coached principal, Cindy, shared, “It was the opposite of the perfect storm; everything I needed to come into line did come in alignment for the job. If I hadn’t had the support I
wouldn’t be so happy right now.” While a new principal supported by a mentor, Lori, shared her frustration with her job as “I just don’t know the questions to ask. I solve things that I am not supposed to. I forget to ask a question but it just is not clear; it’s not the kind of work I have done before.” The lack of training of mentors may have contributed to the fact that Lori’s mentor did not “front load” her with more information and was not able to anticipate the kinds of support that she may need as a first-year principal.

Research Question #2.

What supports and barriers are identified by beginning principals as significant to their ability to achieve their goals during the first year?

Proposition 2: First-year principals perceive receiving greater support in achieving goals and overcoming barriers from trained coaches than from district-assigned mentors.

New principals’ perceived satisfaction levels of district support provided during their first year varied. Of the principals assigned district coaches, four reported a level 10-out-of-ten and one a 9. When coached principal Cindy was asked why she rated the district support as a 10 she shared, “It is so far beyond my expectations I guess from my coach, my supervisor, to my colleagues to my staff. Everyone is just so giving and they want what’s best for kids.” Mentored principals reported a level 5, 7, and 10. Chuck a mentored principal who rated the district support as a five stated, “I was controlling the support [referring to his mentor] except for the first one and I
think he felt a little guilty the last few weeks and he checked in a little more often. Probably I would rate it a five, but there again that’s my fault.”

One influencing factor for the reported satisfaction with the district support may be the level of previous experience of the principal. Principals new to the district with previous experience as a principal rated the district support as a 10, 10, and a 9. This high rating may be due to the need for less support as a new principal or the comparison of the level of support they received in the study district as compared to their previous district. An experienced principal, Peter, rated the district support as a “ten plus” and said, “It’s been nice to do the Leadership Academy stuff. Having been in a district where the only real staff development was what I created for myself this is great.” Another experienced principal ranked district support a 10 stating, “I have relative experience from other districts that aren’t like this.”

All of the principals studied were able to identify difficult situations in which they were able to turn to their mentor or coach for support and assistance. The importance of collaboration and dialogue around problems encountered in the principalship was evident in several interviews. Aiken reports on the impact of “demystification of practice” (2001, p. 5) through the support of a mentor principal. She found that working with others, new principals could bring new interpretations to the problems and were better able to prioritize the issues that they face. In the present study, principals perceived that talking to their coaches helped them become better principals. One principal reported, “She [the coach] helped me to stay focused on student learning and asking the right questions. She has helped me to know how to
have the internal dialogue so that when she’s not around I can coach myself.” The literature review indicated that new principals confronting the daily challenges of the work without the benefit of collaboration often find themselves feeling uncertain, value conflicted and stressed (Aiken, 2002). The opportunity to work with an assigned mentor or coach appears to have greatly reduced these feelings. “Working with her [the coach] has built trust, built relationships, with the priority being my self-confidence. . . . I’m really feeling comfortable now, I can ask and I can be proactive. A part of that is the structure of the program [coaching sessions] it starts with discussing celebrations, no one else is asking when they meet with me what can we celebrate, what’s going well” said Cindy, a new elementary principal.

Overall, proposition 2 is true in the sense that principals easily recalled many ways that their coaches assisted them in overcoming barriers and assisting them with their goals the first year. However, mentors were also reported to be supportive and helpful of new principals so the comparison of coaches being of more assistance can not be quantified with this study.

Research Question #3 and #4.

How do new principals who participate in a formal coaching or mentoring program report spending their time in terms of the leadership themes identified by Hallinger and Murphy (1985)?

a. Defining the School’s Mission

b. Managing the Instructional Program

c. Promoting a Positive Learning Climate
Proposition 3 and 4: Principals supported by coaches will focus on school goals, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive learning climate with greater frequency than principals supported by mentors.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the majority of new principals supported by a coach reported time spent in collaboration with the coach on the leadership themes identified by Hallinger and Murphy (1985). Coaches were trained in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and were instructed to work with new principals to support the principal’s growth and development as a leader in these areas. Documentation of meetings with the new principals (Appendix E) included a reference to the specific leadership standard that was discussed during the coaching session. The training of coaches and the explicit expectation of coaching for the leadership standards may have helped to focus the sessions on leadership behaviors identified by Hallinger and Murphy and found to support effective schools research. Mentor principals did not receive specific training, did not meet on a regular basis with each other, and had no expectations for written logs or visitation frequency. They were the “go to” person for the new principal, who could ask questions in regards to procedures, concerns, or issues as they arose.

In regards to defining the school mission, coached principals reported varying degrees of collaboration in this area. Cindy reported that she was able to develop the goals due to her experience in her master’s and doctoral programs but her coach helped her to “revisit them and to tie them together throughout the year.” Lisa reported that her coach reviewed the school goals from the previous year and helped
her with formulating what they might be for this year. Several school sites had current plans and goals in place that new principals continued.

Of the three mentored principals, none reported utilizing the assistance of their mentor in defining the school’s mission. Dana had been at the high school as the assistant principal the previous year and was familiar with the school’s mission and goals. Therefore she was able to move forward without assistance in this area. Chuck, as an experienced principal reported, “Since I am older and this isn’t the first time I have done anything I didn’t need any help.” Lori simply stated that “this was not something we worked on however she [her mentor] is a great person and I love her.”

Questions for managing the instructional program looked at aspects of monitoring student progress and improving instruction. Coached principals reported spending time focusing in on student achievement data with their coaches and looking at areas for instructional improvement. Elementary principal Janet shared “. . . I know where I want to get my school but I also know that I’ve got to do the dance where I support my people and tell them how wonderful they are without keeping them where they are. She [the coach] helped me with moving them to where they need to be.” Lisa confirmed that her coach had assisted her in these areas by sharing the work she has used for at-risk students. “She’s talked with me about interventions they have at their site and how she worked with her teachers. Mostly sharing and giving me the things that she does so together we kind of tweak it to see what looks good.” Cindy also reported support in working with the school’s at-risk student population. “This year our focus has been on the pyramid of interventions and how
we are going to help kids. She helped me become aware that I need to lead a better process.”

Of the mentored principals, Dana received support from her mentor by his sharing the things that he is doing at his high school. Meeting for coffee at a local coffee shop, he would tell her about the things that were happening at his school. Dana stated, “He is really ahead of the rest of us. He would share things going on over there so I was able to pick his brain on how are you monitoring your students and really got quite a few ideas from him. . . .” Chuck shared that he had done all of this work previously and did not need any support. Lori simply stated they had not discussed this area at all.

Promoting a positive school environment involved work on building trust and relationships for the coached principals. Lisa’s coach supported her when “she just listened to what I had problems with, my petty crimes and told me if I should be alarmed about this. I can’t talk to teachers the way I really want to so I can tell her [the coach] what I am really thinking.” Janet reported her coach helped to understand “the politics and personalities” of the school and this has assisted her in working towards a more positive school environment. The middle school principal, Don shared that his coach helped him to work on a positive learning climate by “developing a clear vision, goal, and values around data.” By using data, they were able to take the emotion and personalities out of the student achievement discussions. Interestingly, none of the principals mentioned working with the community, students,
or parents as a part of building a positive learning community. The focus was on staff relationships.

Support for a positive learning climate was not an area that the principals shared as being supported by or having been discussed with their mentors. These findings are aligned with the research of Daresh (2004) who found mentoring programs to be helpful in meeting some needs but not others. Specifically, in rank order, Daresh identified (a) reducing isolation, (b) reducing uncertainty, (c) reducing frustration, (d) establishing contacts, (e) increasing technical expertise, and (f) reducing stress were viewed as most helpful. The mentoring program Daresh reviewed was least helpful in (a) developing a vision, (b) developing interpersonal skills, (c) developing goals, (d) developing problem solving skills, and (e) planning/implementing programs (p. 15). Although all the mentored principals reported satisfaction with the mentoring program, there was a lack of focus on identified goals and improvement areas reported by the principals. Therefore propositions 3 and 4 appear to be true.

In addition to the differences in training of coaches and mentors, a possible explanation for the varying focus may be due to the level of previous experience of the principal. Of the eight principals new to the Sunnyside School District, three had previous experience as principals in other districts. The experienced principals, Janet, Chuck, and Peter demonstrated a much higher level of confidence throughout the interviews and reported less need for support than the principals new to the position. Chuck reported 36 years of experience as an educator, 20 of these years as an
Throughout the interview, he referred to his experience with statements such as “I’m far from a new principal . . . this is not my first time in the saddle . . . I am older and this is not the first time I have done things . . . I am just an old dog . . . .”

Throughout the interview, Chuck referred to previous positions and districts in which he had worked and shared the things that he had accomplished and done there. It was difficult to get a focused answer or response to the direct questions asked. Janet came from another Southern California district with 11 years experience as an administrator, seven years as a principal. Janet reported initial surprise at being assigned the assistance of a coach. She also reported that her coach “respects that I have years of experience and that she is just kind of there if I need her. She’s been a great sounding board for issues coming up at school, she’s been the one to help me as I navigate the ‘district way.’” Peter came in to the district with 2 1/2 years experience as a high school principal. He reported his relationship with his coach as follows. “For me it is kind of different. I don’t feel so much as he’s coaching me as much as he is a nice colleague.” This statement also demonstrates the experienced principal’s perspective that a coach is not necessary but sharing ideas and meeting with a colleague is a beneficial experience.

**Suggestions from the Findings for Practice**

In reviewing the results summarized above, five findings seem to be significant for those involved in supporting new principals. They include:

*Suggestion 1.*
Formal and informal support programs for new principals are beneficial to participants and should be continued. This is reflected throughout the quotes from principals such as “I couldn’t ask for anything better than [my coach] . . . she sees the big picture but she’s focused on the right things, she knows how to get the best out of me . . . .”, “It would have been much harder to reinvent the wheel without her”, “I was surprised that I got one [a coach]. I think it is excellent and I absolutely appreciate her.” None of the interviewed principals reported the support of a mentor or a coach to be a negative experience.

All of the new principals reported that the time spent with the coaches and mentors was valuable and that they were administrators they could easily turn to for support or assistance. Although the participating principals reported that they appreciated and benefited from the support provided to them by either a mentor or a coach, the findings of this study demonstrated a greater focus on identified leadership behavior for principals who participated in a coaching relationship. This finding is consistent with research studies that have demonstrated the importance of training for mentors (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Malone, 2002; Wilmore, 1995).

These researchers reinforced the idea that the selection and screening process for mentors or coaches is critical and must be clearly defined. An effective mentor or coach must be highly skilled in communicating, listening, analyzing, providing feedback, and negotiating (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). Careful consideration needs to be given to those who have the disposition and the skills to do the job. The participants in this study shared the importance of the match with either their mentor
or coach when they described their comfort level in asking questions and getting in
touch with these people. The also mentioned the qualities that they value most about
their mentor or coach. Dana reported that in working with her mentor “I always felt
like when I was talking to this guy like we were equals.” Lisa shared about her coach
“She is generous with her time, and I never felt that my questions would be perceived
as stupid.” Cindy valued the specific training and background of her coach as
demonstrated by “her area of expertise is the coaching model so she asks the guiding
questions that lead me to find answers. It is very frustrating but it works.” In the case
of the eight study principals, each of them reported a positive experience working with
the coach or mentor.

*Suggestion 2.*

Trained coaches should engage new principals in discussions and planning
that addresses the instructional leadership dimensions. As discussed above, principals,
especially those new to the position, did report a greater emphasis on the instructional
leadership areas that have been documented to be impactful of student learning. The
explicit training of coaches and specific expectations for frequency of contact and
content of coaching sessions may be a contributing factor to this increased focus. The
relationship of a coach and coachee, or a mentor and mentee should focus on
reflection and the coachee or mentee’s learning. Self-reflection requires effective
feedback received from many data sources, including the perspectives of others. New
principals also need the support of an external, objective source to add perspective and
meaning to things that are occurring (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). The support of a
beginning principal by an experienced and trained administrator can provide the assistance necessary for the novice to learn from his/her experiences.

**Suggestion 3.**

Support for new principals should be tailored to meet their particular needs. Principals new to the position have different needs for support than principals changing school districts as experienced principals. The finding that principals new to the principalship have different needs than experienced principals who have changed districts should come as no surprise. Although literature is supportive of coaching or mentoring support for experienced principals, limited district resources make it difficult to provide this level of support to all principals. However, principals changing school level or incoming principals may also need collegial support. The experienced study’s principals noted that mentor or coaching support was significant in helping them to learn the district culture and the “who’s who” in the hierarchy of getting things done. Even with knowledge of law, policy, and procedure, and with skills in teaming, collaboration and leadership, those who moved from one level to another or who were new to a district perceived that they needed a mentor and a support system to ensure success. In this situation, the assignment of a mentor for support in the areas noted makes sense. The needs of the experienced principal may not require coaching sessions on a regular basis, but the support of a friendly and knowledgable colleague may be valuable.

**Suggestion 4.**
Training and support of coaches and/or mentors should be a required component of any good support program. Program goals for both coaching and mentoring must be developed and explicitly stated for all involved to ensure that the focus and emphasis of the program are aligned with stated objectives and that the administrators providing support are clear as to the expectations. The goal of either a mentoring or a coaching program should lead to the successful induction of novice principals who will be instructional leaders who positively impact student achievement. If the mentor program is continued, it needs to be strengthened by recruiting and training high quality mentors. Convenience, seniority and proximity are not ideal selection criterion for mentors or coaches. Both mentors and coaches should be given clear guidelines about the parameters and expectations of the program, including the areas of work, confidentiality, accountability and minimum time commitments. On-going support through regular network meetings with either coaches and/or mentors is also recommended.

_Suggestion 5._

Any new principal support program should include explicit feedback for the participants. As reported in chapter 4, new principals often rated themselves lower on the PIMRS than did either the supervisor or the mentor or coach. This is a common finding according to Hallinger (1985) in which new principals and some highly effective principals tend to under-rate their performance. Daresh (1986) noted that many new principals often work months—perhaps the entire first year—without any formative feedback or evaluations from their superiors. New principals also receive
very little information or feedback from their peers or subordinates (Daresh, 1986). He noted that qualified and competent beginning principals can fail in the position if they are not given the support to succeed. Without support, even the brightest new principal may never reach a higher potential. Participation in a coaching relationship may provide new principals with the necessary feedback to support their growth as a beginning principal. In the case of the study school district, formal evaluation from the supervisor is completed once a year, in the fall of the following school year. It may be beneficial for the district to provide more timely and formative feedback to new principals during the induction period of their career.

Recommendations for Further Research

This section will focus on research that could better enhance our understanding of the mentoring and coaching needs for principals. The recommendations are based on findings from this study.

Recommendation 1.

Future research should examine the benefits and detriments of either coaching or mentoring to the coach or mentor. This study did not examine the benefits of either coaching or mentoring on the experienced mentor or coach. (Ehrich et al., 2004) report that mentoring also provides benefits for the mentor. They found that mentoring rejuvenates mentors’ careers because it enables them to assist and shape the professional development and personal development of mentees. Other benefits for the mentor include increased confidence, personal fulfillment, and increased focus on organizational goals (Walker & Stott, 1994). Walker and Stott report the process of
assisting a novice administrator provides the opportunity for the experienced principal to sharpen their own skills and thinking. Through the questioning and probing of the mentee or coachee, the veteran principal may be moved to redefine, clarify, and perhaps question their own actions.

Recommendation 2.

Research regarding the length of the coaching or mentoring relationship and the benefits and pitfalls of the length of the program should be investigated. In the case of this study, two of the new principals indicated a concern that their coach would be retiring and no longer available, indicating a desire for a relationship longer than one year. Literature has described the induction years of a principal’s career to be the first three years, and thus, there may be benefit in sustaining a formal program of support for longer than a single school year.

Recommendation 3.

Further research on the matching of either coaches and coachees or mentors and mentees would be beneficial. In this study, all of the participants reported a positive experience; however, this is not always the case. A specific process for thoughtfully matching coaches and coachees as well as mentors and mentees may be beneficial to the study district. According to Walker and Stott (1994) how mentors behave appears to be more important than who they are. There are certain personal characteristics that can contribute to the effectiveness of the mentor, but these do not appear to be as important as actions. The implication is that behaviors, unlike personal qualities, can be taught or improved through training.
Summary

The importance of the role of the principal in making a positive impact on student learning is no longer debatable (Barth et al., 1999; Bottoms, O'Neill, Fry, & Hill, 2003; P. Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Waters et al., 2003). Increased expectations of schools to teach successfully a broader array of children while steadily improving achievement has brought considerable pressure to the principalship. The demands of the principalship are even greater in California than in other states, because the levels of administrative staffing are much lower. California has fewer staff per pupil than most other states, ranking 48th in the number of district administrators, 49th, in the number of teachers and certificated school staff, and 50th in the number of guidance counselors and principals or assistant principals in 2003-2004 (NCES, 2005).

Programs that support beginning principals during the induction phase of their career are crucial to ensuring their success in meeting the challenging demands of being a principal today.

Programs of support for new administrators from trained, experienced principals are one way to provide additional support and training for the beginning principal. Staffing schools with effective principals ready to meet the challenging demands of today’s schools is important to the academic achievement of students. Filling vacancies with skilled and knowledgeable leaders is the beginning; continuous support and training throughout the career of a principal is necessary (Peterson, 2002). The cost of leadership failure in schools is too high a financial and educational price to leave to chance relationships or to a sink or swim attitude.
It is necessary as new administrators continually take on the difficult challenges of leading schools that they have support structures in place to assist them in being successful. Districts have a responsibility to evaluate and assess the support structure to ensure that it is in fact providing the individualized support leaders need and the tools and knowledge necessary to create effective instructional leaders. First, districts need to acknowledge the requirement for a new type of leader. It is no longer sufficient for the schools of today to be led by efficient and effective managers. The, districts need to develop effective programs to support, develop, and encourage the new administrators who will move our school forward and provide the leadership necessary to address the myriad of challenges facing education. That goal will require that principals continue to gain experience and knowledge through as many avenues as possible.
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APPENDIX A
Principal Interview Protocol

Beginning Principal Support
Sunnyside School District

Principal Name_______________________
School Site Location and level _____________________
Previous Positions/Districts
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
________

Years of experience as an administrator _____

Years of experience as an educator (teacher or other) ______

1. Are you currently being supported by either an assigned mentor or a coach?

2. What is your understanding of the role of your coach or mentor?

Effective Schools Research as well as Marzano’s work has identified the following areas as important to the success of schools in terms of principal behavior that support these areas.

3. How has your coach or mentor supported you, if at all-

   A. Defining your school’s goals and communication these goals?

   B. Monitoring student progress?

   C. Developing programs for instructional improvement and professional development?

   D. Providing a positive learning climate?

4. How much time each week do you believe you devote to each of these areas?
5. What courses, professional development experiences, trainings have prepared you to lead in these three areas?

6. When you receive support from your coach/mentor who initiates the contact?

7. On average, how frequently have you seen or talked to your coach or mentor this year?

8. Are you comfortable contacting your mentor or coach for assistance or advice as needed?

9. What qualities of your coach or mentor do you value most?

10. What qualities of your coach or mentor do you value least?

11. Can you describe a situation in which your coach or mentor has been helpful in supporting your role as principal?

12. What are some barriers that have gotten in the way of achieving your goals this year? Do you think that your coach/mentor can support you in overcoming these barriers? What other supports might help you in overcoming these barriers?

13. Can you think of any support that might have been of assistance to you this year that you did not have?

14. Are there other things that have been supportive for you this year? People, programs, etc.

15. On a scale of 1 to 10, where do you rate your satisfaction with your job as a principal? Why do you rate it at this level? Has your coach or mentor helped you to become a better principal?

16. On a scale of 1 to 10, where do you rate your satisfaction with the support you are receiving from the district? Why do you rate it at this level? Where do you rate on a scale from 1 to 10 the support you received from your mentor or coach this year? Why do you rate it at this level?
Appendix B

THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information if instructed to do so by the person administering the instrument:

(A) District Name: ________________________________

(B) Your Position in the District: __________________

(C) Principal's Name: ___________________________

(D) Number of school years he/she has been principal at this school:

   __1__  __5-9__          __more than 15__
   __2-4__  __10-15__

(E) Years, at the end of this school year, that you have worked with this principal:

   __1__  __5-9__          __more than 15__
   __2-4__  __10-15__

(F) Number of visits greater than 20 minutes in length to the principal's school this year:

   __1__  __5-9__          __more than 15__
   __2-4__  __10-15__

PART II: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of principal leadership. It consists of 50 behavioral statements that describe principal job practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your observations of the principal's leadership over the past school year.

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice of this principal during the past school year. For the responses to each statement:
To what extent does this principal...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. FRAME THE SCHOOL GOALS</th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS</th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)

14. Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)

15. Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)

IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM

16. Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)

17. Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions

18. Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives

19. Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement tests

20. Participate actively in the review of curricular materials

V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Inform students of school's academic progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information if instructed to do so by the person administering the instrument:

(A) District Name: _____________________________________________

(B) Your Position in the District: _________________________________

(C) Principal's Name: _________________________________________

(D) Number of school years he/she has been principal at this school:

_ 1 _ 5-9 _ more than 15
_ 2-4 _ 10-15

(E) Years, at the end of this school year, that you have worked with this principal:

_ 1 _ 5-9 _ more than 15
_ 2-4 _ 10-15

(F) Number of visits greater than 20 minutes in length to the principal's school this year:

_ 1 _ 5-9 _ more than 15
_ 2-4 _ 10-15

PART II: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of principal leadership. It consists of 50 behavioral statements that describe principal job practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your observations of the principal's leadership over the past school year.

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice of this principal during the past school year. For the reasons to each statement...
PART II: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of principal leadership. It consists of 50 behavioral statements that describe principal job practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your observations of the principal's leadership over the past school year.

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice of this principal during the past school year. For the response to each statement:

5 represents *Almost Always*
4 represents *Frequently*
3 represents *Sometimes*
2 represents *Seldom*
1 represents *Almost Never*

In some cases, these responses may seem awkward; use your judgement in selecting the most appropriate response to such questions. Please circle only one number per question. Try to answer every question.

Thank you.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS**

6. Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g., posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION**

11. Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)  

15. Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)  

IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM  

16. Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)  

17. Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions  

18. Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives  

19. Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement tests  

20. Participate actively in the review of curricular materials  

V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS  

21. Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress  

22. Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses  

23. Use tests and other performance measures to assess progress toward school goals
26. Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements
   1  2  3  4  5

27. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time
   1  2  3  4  5

28. Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time
   1  2  3  4  5

29. Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts
   1  2  3  4  5

30. Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time
   1  2  3  4  5

VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY

31. Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks
   1  2  3  4  5

32. Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students
   1  2  3  4  5

33. Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities
   1  2  3  4  5

34. Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives
   1  2  3  4  5

35. Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes
   1  2  3  4  5

VIII. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS

36. Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos
   1  2  3  4  5

37. Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance
   1  2  3  4  5
41. Ensure that inservice activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals 1 2 3 4 5

42. Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during inservice training 1 2 3 4 5

43. Obtain the participation of the whole staff in important inservice activities 1 2 3 4 5

44. Lead or attend teacher inservice activities concerned with instruction 1 2 3 4 5

45. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from inservice activities 1 2 3 4 5

X. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING

46. Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention in the principal's newsletter 1 2 3 4 5

47. Use assemblies to honor students for academic accomplishments or for behavior or citizenship 1 2 3 4 5

48. Recognize superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work 1 2 3 4 5

49. Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions 1 2 3 4 5

50. Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix D

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Rebecca Wardlow, a Graduate Student at The University of California, San Diego is conducting a study on support for beginning principals. You are invited to participate in this study because you are a first year principal in the Poway Unified School District. There will be approximately six new principals participating in this study.

This study has two objectives:

1. To evaluate the perceived differences among new principals that are being supported by a formal coaching program versus an informal mentoring program.
2. To better understand the supports and constraints that new principals face during their first year on the job or in a new district.

You will be interviewed individually. The conversational style interview will take approximately one hour and, with your permission, will be audio taped. In addition to the interview, you will be asked to complete a fifty question survey called the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. The interviews will take place at your selected time and location.

There are minimal risks attached to this study. Your interview and survey responses will be kept confidential; available only to the researcher for analysis purposes. If the length of the interview is inconvenient for you, you may terminate the interview at any time without any consequence to you.

Although there is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study, we feel your participation will likely benefit the work of PUSD and their Leadership Academy program.

Interview tapes will be locked in a safe place. Only the researcher will listen and transcribe the information you give us. The tapes will be erased or destroyed once this study is completed.
Interview responses will not be linked to your name or address, and there will be no follow-up sessions. You should know that the University of California IRB may inspect study records as part of its auditing program, but these reviews only focus on the researchers and the study, not on your responses or involvement. The IRB is a committee that reviews research studies to make sure that they are safe and that the rights of the participants are protected.

You do not have to participate in this study if you do not want to. If you agree to be in this study, but later change your mind, you may drop out at any time. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide you do not want to participate.

If you have any questions about this study I will be happy to answer them now. If you have any questions in the future, please contact our principal investigator Rebecca Wardlow, 858-442-0899. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact our Institutional Review Board at 858-445-5050.

☐ I agree to participate in this research study.
☐ I agree to be audio taped.

________________________________________
Participant’s Name

(The participant may sign here only if the language level is appropriate for the child. Otherwise, a separate child assent must be used.)

Participant’s Signature

________________________________________
Researcher’s Signature
Appendix E
Sunnyside Unified School District’s

LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

MISSION STATEMENT
In support of student learning, the Sunnyside Unified School District Leadership Academy will strengthen and expand leadership capacity across the organization by attracting, developing, and supporting powerful leaders.

LEADERSHIP ACADEMY OBJECTIVE
Introduce a systemic means of developing, strengthening, and expanding leadership.

ALIGNMENT TO STANDARDS
The Leadership Academy model is directly aligned to Sunnyside Unified School District’s Leadership Performance Standards and Evaluation.

LEADERSHIP ACADEMY DESIGN
The model is comprised of three levels:

1. Induction
2. Entry
3. Experienced

INDUCTION
✓ Targets classroom teacher leaders
✓ Requires classroom teacher to assume additional responsibilities outside of the regular school day or on a full-time/partial released basis
✓ Includes compensation on the Teacher Leadership Salary Scale
✓ Requires attendance at designed leadership training sessions
✓ Governing Board monitors progress
✓ Potential link to university credit

ENTRY
✓ Targets all first-time administrators, principals changing levels, or new to the District
✓ Predicated on coaching support by trained administrative coach
✓ Requires attendance at designated leadership enhancement sessions
✓ Professional growth opportunities linked to PUSD’s Leadership Standards
✓ Potential link to Administrative Tier credit

EXPERIENCED
✓ Targets experienced (2 or more years) administrators
✓ Administrative coaching offered to administrators new to the District or level
✓ Professional growth opportunities linked to PUSD’s Leadership Standards and individual professional growth goals

ACCOUNTABILITY AND EVALUATION
A Leadership Academy Governing Board, comprised of six District representatives and one university representative, will assume the following roles and responsibilities:

- Recommended policy and procedures
- Approve course offerings and staff
- Oversee budget
- Establish/maintain university connection
- Monitor progress of Level 1 participants
- Select and evaluate administrative coaches
- Monitor and assess program effectiveness
Appendix F  
Pilot Interview Questions:  
Principal Support by School Districts

Principal Name ______________________________________________
Site Location ________________________________________________
Previous positions/districts______________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
Years of experience as administrator ______
Years of experience as an educator (teacher or other) ______

What are the three most important aspects of your work at your school?

How much time each week is devoted to these three areas?

What courses, professional development experiences, trainings have prepared you to lead in these three areas?

How does your attention on these three areas contribute to
   Staff development?
   Student learning?

How does your district/coach assist you within these areas and other areas?

Principals have competing demands for their time from staff, parents, students, and district office. How do you cope with these demands? Think back over the last month and describe one or two significant challenges with regard to managing your time.

Discuss the ways in which support from others has contributed to your overall work in the three areas you identified.

At this time, what areas do you see as your greatest strength and what are you most proud of?

At this time, what are the areas of greatest difficulty you are facing?

What, if any support are you receiving to address these areas of difficulty?
Since your work as a principal began, in which of the following areas have you received support—please indicate by marking all that apply with either a 1, 2 or 3:

1=Very Useful
2=Useful
3=Less Useful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using and Analyzing Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing/Working on School Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Overall Vision for Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development for Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations of Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Work with Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the School Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Instructional Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on the Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management/Prioritizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Immediate Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support in Working with Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Tools/Templates/Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Time to Reflect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting an Experienced View of Principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received General Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the District Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any areas in which you would have liked support but that are not identified in the above list?

On a scale of 1 to 10, where do you rate your satisfaction with your job as a principal?

On a scale of 1 to 10, how satisfied are you with the support you are receiving from the district?

Have you received any formal binders, documents or training materials from your district that are specifically for new principals?
## Appendix G

### COLLABORATIVE COACHING LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATE:</th>
<th>COACH:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What's Working?</th>
<th>Current Focus, Challenges, Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate's Next Steps</th>
<th>Coach's Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Meeting Agenda</th>
<th>Next Meeting Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Facilitating a Vision of Learning
- Shaping the School Culture and Instructional Program
- Managing the Organization
- Collaborating with Families and Communities
- Modeling Ethics and Building Leadership Capacity
- Responding to the Political, Social, Economic, Legal & Cultural Context
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