



**Defining
Effective
Leadership
For Connecticut's Schools**

*A Monograph
Prepared By*

Kenneth Leithwood
Ontario Institute
For Studies in Education

And

Daniel L. Duke
University of Virginia

Connecticut Advisory Council for
School Administrator Standards

and

Connecticut State
Department of Education
October 1998

**Defining Effective Leadership for
Connecticut's Schools**

**A monograph prepared for the
Connecticut State Department of Education
Division of Teaching and Learning
Bureau of Research and Teacher Assessment**

by

**Kenneth Leithwood
Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education**

and

**Daniel L. Duke
University of Virginia**

July 1998

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	v
1. Introduction	1
Basic Assumptions	2
Basis for Defining Effectiveness	2
Building a Model of Effective School Leadership	3
2. The Educated Person	8
Introduction	8
Assumptions About the Educated Person	8
Implications	8
3. The Learning Process	11
Introduction	11
Assumptions About the Learning Process	11
Implications	15
4. The Teacher	16
Introduction	16
Assumptions About Teachers	18
Implications	20
5. The Purposes and Culture of Productive Schools	21
Introduction	21
School Goals: Assumptions and Implications	21
School Culture: Assumptions and Implications	23
6. Structural and Organizational Characteristics of Productive Schools	27
Introduction	27
Policies and Procedures: Assumptions and Implications	27
Organization and Resources: Assumptions and Implications	29
Teaching Faculty: Assumptions and Implications	31
Programs and Instruction: Assumptions and Implications	32
School-Community Relations: Assumptions and Implications	35
7. Keys to School Order and Stability	38
Introduction	38
Communications and Coordination: Assumptions and Implications	38
The Management of Time: Assumptions and Implications	43
Budget and Resource Management: Assumptions and Implications	46

Contents (continued)

School Governance: Assumptions and Implications	47
Student Discipline: Assumptions and Implications	49
8. Postscript– Emerging Developments in School Management	52
Management of Mission	52
Management of Competition	54
Management of Accountability	55
Management of Empowerment	56
Management of Organizational Culture	58
References on Educational Reform	59
References on Business Reform	59
A Final Thought	59
REFERENCES	61
APPENDIX A - Summary of Assumptions about Productive Schools	75
APPENDIX B - Summary of Implications for Effective Principals	79
APPENDIX C - Connecticut Standards for School Leaders	85

DEFINING EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP FOR CONNECTICUT'S SCHOOLS

Executive Summary

What do administrators need to know and be able to do as learning-focused leaders of more productive schools where students achieve worthwhile and challenging standards?

This question was the point of departure as Connecticut embarked on the task of developing new standards for the preparation, certification and evaluation of school administrators. Initially, this question was addressed by convening focus groups of successful school administrators and later, through a comprehensive review of the literature on administrator competencies and proficiencies. But as the product of these efforts was reviewed, it became clear that the essence of what was envisioned at the beginning of the project was not captured. Thus, the more traditional job analysis approach to identifying new standards for school administrators was abandoned in favor of a somewhat different approach. This approach consisted of first developing a set of assumptions about what productive schools would look like in Connecticut and then from these assumptions drawing implications for school leadership. This monograph is a compilation of the assumptions and implications which resulted from this process, including the supporting literature.

This monograph aims to identify key aspects of effective leadership in the context of Connecticut's current educational policies and practices, as well as the state's aspirations for future school development. Serving as a guideline for the preparation and evaluation of both school- and district-level administrators, the monograph develops its description of effective leadership from a set of basic assumptions about: those qualities schools aim to develop in their students, the learning process through which students acquire those qualities, and the nature of teachers and teaching. Also important to the conception of effective leadership described in the monograph are the implications of leadership for productive schools. Each of these sets of assumptions is justified by a synthesis of relevant research-based knowledge. As a result of several rounds of assessment and refinement of the monograph by many school and district leaders in the state, the monograph also reflects the experience and wisdom of those currently providing leadership in Connecticut schools.

Each chapter of this monograph describes key aspects of effective leadership by identifying assumptions and implications of these assumptions for effective school leaders.

Copyright © 1998 by the Connecticut State Board of Education in the name of the Secretary of the State of Connecticut

In Chapter 2 assumptions about the qualities that schools endeavor to develop in their students are based on *Connecticut's Common Core of Learning*. One of these implications, for example, is that "The principal possesses an extensive understanding of the school's state's image of the educated person and their implications for the school's program and for students."

In Chapter 3 assumptions about the learning process are derived from a cognitive, constructivist perspective. This perspective views learning as a process of constructing personal meaning from experiences, such as those provided by a school curriculum, a process that is both individual and social in nature. Similarly, motivation depends on students' personal goals, values and aspirations interacting with some critical conditions; examples include sense of self-efficacy and beliefs about how supportive the environment is for learning. Assumptions about the learning process also reflect knowledge about individual differences in the time required for learning, processes used for learning, and specific aptitudes brought to the learning task. One implication of these assumptions for effective leadership is, "The principal assists parents and the wider community in understanding and developing support for the school's assumptions about the learning process and the nature of human motivation.").

Chapter 4 describes central assumptions about teaching: knowledge concerning how to bring about lasting school improvement and an evolving appreciation for the power of school-based leadership. These assumptions are about critical teacher beliefs and values (e.g., value inquiry, reflection and continuing professional growth), knowledge and skill (e.g., "a large repertoire of instructional and assessment strategies consistent with a sophisticated understanding of the learning process"), and behavior (e.g., "encourage students to examine issues from multiple intellectual perspectives"). One of the implications for principals of these assumptions, for example, is "The principal provides teachers regular opportunities to remain well-grounded in knowledge of the curriculum areas for which they are responsible."

Chapters 4-7 discuss the contributions of school goals, culture, policies and procedures, and organizational resources to foster student learning.

As a whole, the implications for leadership developed in this monograph encompass most of the models of leadership advocated in contemporary educational leadership literature (e.g., moral, instructional, transformational). This emphasizes the importance of developing a comprehensive orientation to leadership among those who assume such roles in Connecticut's schools and districts and the capacities required to act accordingly.

This monograph serves as the foundation of the Connecticut Standards for School Leaders. The standards were developed by an advisory committee of practicing school

Copyright © 1998 by the Connecticut State Board of Education in the name of the Secretary of the State of Connecticut

administrators and representatives from higher education. The committee worked in subgroups and developed standards for each domain of the monograph. Each committee member also was asked to write descriptive accounts (vignettes) of a principal's performance that centered around a problem or task related to the implications for that domain. As group members shared vignettes, themes began to emerge. From this list of themes, standards were drafted which encompassed the essence of the themes for each domain. Once standards were drafted for all of the domains, they were shared with the entire advisory committee for review, discussion and consensus. Specific areas of the monograph which informed the development of each of the *Connecticut Standards for School Leaders* are presented on the next page.

**Sections of the Monograph which Informed
the Development of Each of the
Connecticut Standards for School Leaders**

Domains of the Monograph

The Educated Person (p. 8)

The Learning Process (p. 11)

The Teacher (p. 16)

All Domains

Purposes and Culture of Productive Schools

- School Goals (p. 21)
- School Culture (p. 23)
- Structural and Organizational Characteristics of Productive Schools (p.27)
- Programs and Instruction (p. 32)

- Organization and Resources (p. 29)
- Teaching Faculty (p. 31)
- Policies and Procedures (p. 27)

- Policies and Procedures (p. 27) & Organization and Resources (p. 29)

- School-Community Relations (p. 35)

School Leader Standards¹

I. The Educated Person

II. The Learning Process

III. The Teaching Process

IV. Diverse Perspectives²

V. School Goals

VI. School Culture

VII. Student Standards and Assessment

VIII. School Improvement

IX. Professional Development

X. Integration of Staff Evaluation, Professional Development, and School Policies

XI. Organization Resources, and School Policies

XII. School-Community Relations

¹A Full text of the Connecticut Standards for School Leaders is found in Appendix C.

²This standard is based on issues of diversity, which are embedded throughout the monograph.

1.

Introduction

Schools exist so that students can learn and teachers can assist that learning. This truism is central to any effort to define effective leadership for Connecticut's schools. A model of school leadership that fully embraces the central importance of teaching and learning is described in this monograph. School leaders, of course, do not teach students on a full-time basis. Therefore, their impact on student learning must be accomplished indirectly.

What effective school leaders do to promote teaching and learning can be characterized as a wedding of opposites. On one hand, they must ensure that the time and energy of school personnel are committed to continuous improvement, a goal demanding nothing less than the institutionalization of change. On the other hand, school leaders are expected by the community to maintain order and stability. Order and stability should not be confused with reactionary resistance to legitimate innovation, or with unthinking defense of the organizational status quo. In fact, stability often is a prerequisite for successful organizational change; disorder rarely spawns worthwhile improvement. Effective leaders realize that stability and change are not mutually exclusive.

This monograph is comprised of three major components. The first, and most important, component encompasses *leadership functions* associated with the continuous improvement of teaching and learning. For the most part, these functions are derived from cognitive learning theory, beliefs about the needs of students and teachers, and empirical research on teaching and school effectiveness. Given the ever-changing context of public schooling, the continuous pursuit of excellence in teaching and learning, is ultimately more important than achieving some particular milestone along this endless road.

The second component of the monograph outlines functions which might best be termed *managerial*. These functions make it possible for schools to support and sustain the continuous improvement of teaching and learning. They are derived primarily from the laws, policies and regulations governing schools and the literature on organizational stability and maintenance.

A final component looks to the future in describing emerging *developments in school management* from the perspectives of educational and business reform literature.

Basic Assumptions

What counts as effective school leadership? Two central assumptions guide our answers to this question: 1) teaching and learning are the fundamental missions of the school, and 2) the improvement of teaching and learning is never-ending. While others have acknowledged similar assumptions, their descriptions of effective school leadership sometimes are crowded with expectations only loosely connected to teaching and learning. In addition, their work tends to be lack connections to contemporary understandings about the nature of learning.

Effective school leaders, as we describe them, know a lot about learning and teaching and their implications for schooling. They are able to work closely with their staffs and communities to create school organizations that serve the mission of teaching and learning. Even when they are engaged in activities that seem peripheral to the central mission, they infuse these activities with a clear sense of purpose and direction.

The Basis for Defining Effectiveness

Determining the basis upon which leader effectiveness will be defined is an important issue to resolve before proceeding further. As Duke (1992) explains, concepts of principal effectiveness may have different roots. Such concepts may focus on (a) principals' *traits*, (b) the extent of principals' *compliance* with designated tasks specified in a job description, (c) principals' *competence* in the performance of designated tasks, and/or (d) the extent to which organizational *outcomes are achieved*.

A focus on traits as the basis for assessment is fraught with problems of reliability and validity. Furthermore, such a focus implies that effective administrators are born, not made. Duke suggests this position is "hardly compatible with contemporary values, nor is it justified by current research or administrative performance" (1992, p. 8).

As described in this monograph, leader effectiveness is a function of compliance, competence and outcomes. Each is necessary, but insufficient alone to define effectiveness. To achieve learning outcomes without complying with the laws and policies of the state and nation is deemed unacceptable in a democratic society.

To achieve learning outcomes despite the incompetence of leaders places in serious doubt the need for leaders in the first place. Compliance and competence without desired learning outcomes renders schooling somewhat meaningless.

The model of effective school leadership offered in this monograph assumes, therefore, that the school's mission must be achieved within the boundaries of law and professional competence. Judgments of the effectiveness of school leaders should include information regarding compliance, professional competence and the achievement of desired learning outcomes.

Building a Model of Effective School Leadership

Once a conception of leader effectiveness has been determined, the next step is to identify how a detailed model of an effective leader can be constructed. Sergiovanni (1992b, p. 311) suggests that it "makes more sense to design out from shared values, ideals, purposes and commitments than down from objectives and work structures." Following this advice, we began by specifying the qualities possessed by the educated person--the ultimate "outcome" of schooling. Chapter 2 presents a set of assumptions about the educated person derived largely from *Connecticut's Common Core of Learning* and a set of implications for principals. How individuals become educated is the domain of learning theory. Our attention in Chapter 3, therefore, moves to the learning process that must be in place for students to progress toward the ideal of the educated person. The learning process which undergirds our vision of effective schooling is based on understandings derived from contemporary cognitive science (a view of learning typically labeled "constructivism"). Chapter 3 presents assumptions about the learning process and implications for principals.

Equipped with a normative and theoretical foundation for schooling, we turn to processes and structures that are most likely to facilitate effective learning. We consulted a vast array of scholarship, including empirical investigations and logical analyses, in order to generate assumptions regarding the roles of teacher and principal. It should be noted that we refrained from relying exclusively on empirical research. Our reasoning was based on the fact that such research, by definition, focuses on past or current practice. The constantly changing context of schooling, however, requires consideration of the future. Empirical research alone is unlikely to anticipate those practices of teachers or administrators necessary to meet emerging educational needs.

Principals tend to influence learning indirectly (Duke, 1992; Dwyer, et al., 1983; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Pitner, 1988), most obviously through their impact on teachers and instruction. Chapter 4 describes assumptions regarding teachers and instructional practice, along with their implications for principals.

Teaching and learning are inherently contextual; the context which concerns us here is the public school. It is the primary responsibility of the principal to see that this

organizational context is as conducive to effective teaching and learning as possible. Those functions of school leadership that have been associated most closely with the support of teaching and learning are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 5 focuses on school goals and culture, while Chapter 6 covers policies and procedures, organization and resources, teaching faculty, programs and instructional support, and school-community relations.

Chapter 7 identifies leadership functions that are associated primarily with organizational stability and maintenance. While clearly less influential with regard to teaching and learning, these functions are nonetheless essential to school effectiveness. Derived mainly from the literature on sound organizational management, the functions are clustered under the following headings: communications and coordination, time, budget and resource management, school governance, and discipline. Readers doubtless will be struck by the overlap between certain "managerial" functions and the "leadership" functions presented in Chapters 5 and 6. In truth, it is virtually impossible to separate effective leadership and management. We do so in this monograph to distinguish functions primarily associated with improvement and change, and functions associated with stability and maintenance.

The monograph closes with a brief discussion of emerging trends in school leadership. While still too early to tell whether these trends will "take hold," they are worth noting. Recent books on school reform and organizational change serve as the source for most insights.

Appendix A summarizes the various assumptions upon which our model of effective school leadership is based. Appendix B lists implications of these assumptions for a principal's vision of effective schools, while the implications identify capabilities principals need to achieve the vision. Vision without capacity leads to frustration and discontent. Capacity without vision results in wasted effort. To be effective, school leaders require both.

Use of Language

Throughout the monograph, principals' *practices, functions, qualities, behaviors* and *school leadership* are used in reference to the implications. While these terms are not synonymous, trying to clearly distinguish among them is probably as pointless as efforts made to distinguish among the terms *knowledge, skill* and *affect*. Suffice it to say that school leadership has a lot to do with establishing directions which most of those with a stake in schools believe to be sensible and worthy of their initiative and commitment. Principals' practices, functions and behaviors refer mostly to their overt actions--actions designed to set directions, promote change and maintain order. Such actions, in turn, arise from principals' thoughts, feelings and other internal states. Such qualities (not discussed in the monograph) predispose

principals to act in some ways and not in others. Readers should assume a common-sense rather than technical use of this and other language in the remainder of the monograph.

A Note on Sources

In order to develop our model of effective school leadership, we reviewed four bodies of literature, including works on "the new management," transformational leadership in schools, educational restructuring and empirical studies of leader effects. Together, these references touch on virtually all aspects of what school leaders actually do and should do. A brief description of each body of literature follows.

The "new management" literature. This body of literature is vast, aimed at both popular and professional audiences, and quite uneven in its approach to justifying the need for effective management practices. A sample of 12 books was selected for this analysis, six concerned with educational reform and six with business reform. Only books offering a relatively clear rationale for managerial reform were chosen. Each also had to have garnered reasonably high interest among school and business leaders.

The "new management" literature yielded five common administrative functions, including the management of mission, competition, accountability, empowerment and organizational culture.

Transformational school leadership. In conjunction with another project (Leithwood, in press), a search was carried out for studies of transformational leadership conducted in K-12 school contexts. Electronic searches were made of ERIC, a comparable Ontario database called ELOISE, sociological abstracts, psychological abstracts, and dissertation abstracts. The reference lists of all studies located through these sources were read and manual searches conducted for all promising study titles. Dissertation abstracts yielded by far the largest proportion of studies finally selected for the review, an indication of the recency of attention devoted to inquiry about transformational leadership in schools. Only empirical or formally designed case studies conducted in elementary and secondary schools were selected for this analysis, a total of 15 studies.

Leadership and school restructuring. This category of literature comprised 21 studies identified through searches of electronic databases, as in the case of the transformational leadership literature. Because of the recency of the research, we also relied heavily on papers given at recent conferences of the American Educational Research Association and an edited text of empirical research published by Murphy & Louis (1994).

A large proportion of the research in this category of literature was conducted in contexts

where site-based management was being implemented. As a consequence, much of this literature gives voice to administrators' concerns about how to function in a shared leadership environment and the implications for their own accountability, increased managerial functions (e.g., more responsibility for managing budgets) and ambiguous expectations for the school administrator role (e.g., How does teacher empowerment affect principals' instructional leadership?). Also reflected in this literature are the increased entrepreneurial functions of principals in (a) acquiring financial resources; (b) marketing their schools to maintain student enrollments; and (c) attending much more assiduously to their schools' relationships with and responsiveness to the parent and wider school community.

Leadership practices and effects. Nineteen studies were included in this category of literature. With the exception of one study report in 1989 (Moorhead & Nediger), these are studies reported in 1991 or more recently. Located using those forms of electronic and manual search procedures already described, the 19 studies provide two different types of evidence concerning principals' functions.

Seven studies offer descriptive evidence only--evidence about principals' functions without any attempt to determine their effects. The 12 remaining studies, as a whole, examine the relationship between a wide variety of leadership functions and 21 different types of effects (e.g., teachers' commitment, job satisfaction, motivation, morale and engagement; school climate and culture; student attitudes and performances).

In contrast to studies reviewed in the previous section, studies included in this set examine leadership in school contexts not preoccupied with major change initiatives. Such relatively stable circumstances, exceptional for schools today, have more potential to highlight different aspects of the principals' role than is the case under more turbulent circumstances. As might be expected, these studies had more to say about the day-to-day management of schools than did the other three sets of literature.

2.

The Educated Person

Introduction

Schools are expected to help accomplish wide-ranging, ambitious goals for the immediate communities and larger societies which they serve. Improving global competitiveness, developing a responsible citizenry, reducing racial inequities and providing quality care are examples of some of these goals. Such widely held social goals for education are achieved as a by-product of the enrichment of individual minds. The accomplishment of such goals depends on the learning and actions of individual students; they are not achieved directly by schools.

Assumptions About the Educated Person

In 1987 and, as revised, in 1998, the Connecticut State Board of Education adopted *Connecticut's Common Core of Learning* as a description of what "the enrichment of individual minds" means in Connecticut. The *Common Core of Learning* outlines those specific attributes and attitudes (aspects of character), skills and competencies, and understandings and applications that educated persons are expected to possess as the result of a K-12 education. Acquisition of the specific qualities included in each of those categories permits educated persons to:

- think and act independently;
- respond productively to a changing world;
- play a useful role in shaping a desirable future for self, family, immediate community and more distant communities;
- understand, appreciate and be sensitive to the diverse nature of society and to view cultural diversity as an opportunity;
- pursue further education; and,
- make a successful transition to the world of work.

Implications for Principals

A deep and abiding understanding of the qualities possessed by educated persons, as described in the *Common Core of Learning*, provides the ethical foundation upon which school principals construct their practices. Why is such a foundation important? The world of school leaders is heavily populated by ethical problems (Marshall, 1992; Starratt, 1991). The rights of parents, respect for teachers, honesty in communications with elected trustees

can, at times, come into conflict with what the principal believes is in the best interests of the student. When such conflicts arise, principals are obligated to give greatest weight to the welfare of students because of the responsibilities entrusted to them as leaders of publicly funded institutions (Green, 1987; Begley & Leithwood, 1990).

A principal's beliefs about what "the welfare of students" means, however, cannot be a matter of personal preference if they are to occupy the pinnacle of moral force. Rather, such beliefs must be aligned with those qualities of educated persons which have received legitimate public endorsement as suitable goals for schools to help their students achieve. *Connecticut's Common Core of Learning* serves this function for Connecticut principals.

A deep and abiding understanding of the educated person, in addition to the ethical grounding it provides for school leaders' practices, serves other important purposes. For example, it provides criteria for evaluating the objectives of the school's program; serves as a source of potential coherence in decisions about the allocation of scarce resources; and provides the platform for productive communications between the school and its communities. Because of these ethical and other important functions, the qualities 1.1 -1.5 (listed at the end of this chapter) are critical.

Such qualities are an important part of what it means for principals to provide "moral" leadership to their schools (Sergiovanni, 1992a; Hodgkinson, 1991; Greenfield, 1985). Such leadership, as Greenfield (1985) explains, depends on the development of a vision of what might be— a vision which includes images of the educated person which are both desirable and possible for the school to achieve. Initiatives taken by the principal to demonstrate the meaning of such images (as in 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5) also are part of Duke's (1986) concept of aesthetic leadership.

The following qualities are essential:

- 1.1 The principal possesses an extensive understanding of the school's/state's images of the educated person and implications of these images for the school's programs and students.
- 1.2 The principal provides a model, through his or her own behavior, of the school's/state's images of an educated person.
- 1.3 The principal encourages staff members to model the school's/state's images of an educated person in relations among themselves and with students and parents.

- 1.4 The principal assists staff members and students to see how specific school goals and

programs contribute to the development, among students, of those qualities central to the school's/state's images of an educated person.

- 1.5 The principal ensures that parents and staff members, separately and together, have sufficient opportunities to fully understand the school's/state's images of an educated person.

3.

The Learning Process

Introduction

The extent to which students in Connecticut schools approximate the state's images of the educated person depends, in large measure, on how well schools facilitate the learning of their students. Schools are by no means the only stimulus for such learning, as Coleman (1966), Jencks (1972) and others have reminded us. But they do account for a significant portion of it (Rutter et al, 1979; Wilson & Corcoran, 1988). One of the most significant factors in helping shape contemporary school reform and restructuring initiatives has been the emergence of powerful new understandings of the learning process (Gardner, 1983; Murphy, 1991). These understandings, products of the last two decades of cognitive science research, suggest forms of instruction that have yet to firmly establish themselves in Connecticut's classrooms. This presents a significant challenge for school principals.

Assumptions About the Learning Process

Traditional forms of classroom instruction assumed that the knowledge and skills to be acquired by the student existed "outside" the student; the task of the student (at least implicitly considered to be an "empty vessel"), was to absorb this knowledge and these skills more or less in the form in which it was presented. Behavioral psychology explained such absorption as a process of contingent reinforcement. This avoided the need to actually understand cognition, or how the mind functions. The mind was treated as a "black box". Within such theory, students were assumed to play a relatively passive role in their own learning. The teacher's job was to present knowledge for students to absorb.

Understandings of the learning process emerging from contemporary cognitive science research often are referred to as "constructivist" (Leinhardt, 1992; Newell, Rosenbloom & Laird, 1990). In contrast to behaviorism, cognitive science assumes a highly active role for learners in developing (or constructing) their own knowledge. The eight features of learning, presented in the following pages, describe the broad features of constructivist learning theory.

- *Learning is a process of constructing personal meaning or "sense making"* (Shuell, 1990; Marzano, 1992; Gagne, 1985). Individual learners actively seek to understand their environments– the content of the school's curriculum, for example. Such meaning will be highly personal and students may develop very different understandings of the same curricular content.

- *Meaning is constructed in the process of comparing existing understandings (organized into "knowledge structures" or "schema") with perceptions of the environment - the school's curriculum, for example-- and, (a) finding matches with existing understanding or knowledge structures and/or (b) adapting and adding new elements to existing knowledge structures (Calfee, 1981; Gagne, 1985; Lindsay & Norman, 1977). The primary cognitive resources available to learners in their efforts at sense making are what they already know. Connecting new information with existing understandings is the basis for making sense of that new information. Adding to one's knowledge and skills involves building on what one already knows and is able to do, except in the case of rote learning.*

- *Meaning is also constructed as one develops connections among chunks of knowledge (or knowledge structures) that previously had not been viewed as related (Van Lehn, 1989; Leinhardt, 1992). Hence, authentic understanding and the reconstruction of existing understandings often depend on seeing relationships among ideas within a discipline or area of study or across such disciplines or areas of study. This is the main rationale for the emphasis on curriculum integration found in many current school restructuring initiatives.*

- *Meaning is socially negotiated. Understandings often are influenced by perceptions of the understandings of others (Vygotsky, 1978; Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989; Berger & Luckman, 1967). The enrichment of individual minds, as discussed earlier, is not a solitary matter. Yet traditional views often have conceived learning as a process in which the individual learner works to absorb, from text or teacher, a fixed body of knowledge with a singular correct meaning. Constructivist views of learning, in contrast, emphasize the subjective and evolving nature of knowledge. A non-minority student may develop, for example, an understanding of the meaning of racial discrimination from text material. But the experience of seeing such discrimination through the eyes of a member of a visible minority group is likely to produce a much deeper, perhaps even qualitatively different, understanding.*

Constructivist views of learning help us to appreciate the dependence of our understandings on the context in which we encounter them. Indeed, the phrase "situated cognition" has been coined as a way of acknowledging that much of the knowledge and skills truly useful to the learner has to be acquired under circumstances much like those in which they will subsequently be used; otherwise, they remain inert (Bransford, in press). Knowledge remains inert when the person possessing it cannot recognize the circumstances in which it would be appropriately applied (e.g., not recognizing how the Pythagorean Theorem can be used to square up the outline of the foundation for a garage being built). Knowledge is also relatively passive when it is not sufficiently "conditionalized"--when the learner does not have enough specific facts about the context to see how some broad

principles she may have learned can be used in a particular and unique context (e.g., how a teacher can apply the principles of cooperative learning in a particular class, with particular children and instructional resources).

- *The motivation to learn arises from one's internalized goals, needs and aspirations* (Bandura, 1977, 1986; Ford, 1992). Social cognitive theory descriptions of learning contain an explanation for motivation that builds on cognitive structures alluded to above. This explanation holds that individuals actively pursue their own purposes (goals, needs, aspirations). More precisely, students are motivated to learn ideas, skills, attitudes, etc., which they believe will contribute to achieving something they value, about which they do not have aversive feelings, and about which they already have enough background knowledge to begin to understand.

Internalized goals are an especially critical element of self-motivation. As Bandura explains, they:

... represent future consequences in thought ... Many of the things we do are designed to gain anticipated benefits and to avert future difficulties ... When individuals commit themselves to explicit goals, perceived negative discrepancies between what they do and what they seek to achieve create dissatisfactions that serve as motivational inducements for change (1977, p. 161).

But it is not the goals themselves that produce motivational effects. Students' evaluations of the discrepancies between their own knowledge and skill and what they aspire to know and be able to do are the real sources of motivation:

Both the anticipated satisfactions of desired accomplishment and the negative appraisals of insufficient performance provide incentives for action. (Bandura, 1977, p. 161).

The degree to which these evaluations are motivating is a function of the level, specificity and proximity of a student's goals. For greatest motivation, goals must be ambitious but achievable (not so ambitious as to be discouraging and not so modest as to be uninteresting). Goals also must be specific and explicit enough to indicate how much effort will be required and to provide recognizable indications of accomplishment. Finally, it seems important for long-term goals to be accompanied by shorter-term, instrumental goals so that the student's efforts are reinforced and sustained along the way.

- *There is considerable variation among learners in the time required to achieve the same outcomes* (Bloom, 1976). Such individual variation is a product of the significant differences among students in both their motivation and interest, and the existing cognitive resources they have available for use in acquiring new knowledge or skill.

- *There is considerable variation among learners in the cognitive processes which they use to achieve the same outcomes* (Kagan & Kogan, 1970). Differences in the cognitive resources available to individual learners as they approach a new learning task explain this, as well. For a student who already possesses a considerable amount of the knowledge required to achieve an outcome included in the school's curriculum, adding modestly to existing knowledge structures will be all that is needed. But for students without such knowledge, significantly adding to existing knowledge structures and making connections between previously unrelated knowledge structures may be required to achieve an outcome.

Furthermore, some students may actually bring to a new learning task relevant, well-developed knowledge structures which are substantially incorrect: common-sense "understandings" or misconceptions of physical science phenomena are often of this sort (White & Tisher, 1986). For these students, acquiring more sophisticated understandings involves, first, detecting flaws in their common-sense understandings and then slowly reconstructing existing knowledge structures so as to produce more robust understandings.

- *Students often will possess aptitudes in specific areas (or domains) of human activity and will learn in these domains more readily than in others* (Gardner, 1983; Sternberg, 1985; Eisner, 1985).

As Walters and Gardner explain:

... human cognitive competence is better described in terms of a set of abilities, talents or mental skills, which we call 'intelligences.' All ... people possess each of these skills to some extent; but by virtue of innate endowment and the particular history of training, individuals differ in the profile of skills and in their combination (1986, p. 165).

Gardner (1983) identifies seven such intelligences: musical, bodily-kinesthetic, logical-mathematical, linguistic, spatial, interpersonal and intrapersonal (capacities of reflection). "Intelligences," defined in these ways, suggest that learners' capacities for acquiring new knowledge depend on the content and organization of such knowledge and on the relationship the learner perceives between the acquisition of different types of knowledge and one's own deeply-held needs, aspirations and goals.

Implications for Principals

To provide leadership in developing forms of instruction that are more consistent with constructivist and related views of learning and motivation will require principals to understand this view of learning and motivation themselves and to be able to help others develop such understanding.

When principals behave in these ways they are engaging in a broad form of *instructional* leadership (Duke, 1987; Smith & Andrews, 1989; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). This form of leadership recognizes the need for schools to develop a coordinated partnership with other significant sources of the students' learning, especially parents. Such partnerships are necessary if the ambitious outcomes associated with Connecticut's vision of the educated person are to be realized.

The following qualities are essential:

- 2.1 The principal possesses an extensive understanding of, and assists staff members in developing an understanding of:
 - 2.1.1 learning as a process of constructing meaning; and
 - 2.1.2 the needs-based and goal-oriented nature of human motivation.
- 2.2 The principal communicates the school's assumptions about the learning process and the nature of human motivation with parents and the wider community, assists them in understanding and developing support for these assumptions, and encourages parents to act on such assumptions in the home.
- 2.3 The principal assists parents and the wider community in understanding and developing support for the school's assumptions about the learning process and the nature of human motivation.
- 2.4 The principal encourages parents to interact with their children in ways that reflect the school's assumptions about the learning process and the nature of human motivation.

4. The Teacher

Introduction

An image of the educated person, as discussed in Chapter 2, is an important part of a principal's vision. So, too, is a robust understanding of how learning occurs and its implication for instruction. A third, equally important, part of the principal's vision is a detailed, defensible conception of the qualities that teachers will need to develop in order to foster the kinds of student growth required to become educated. Justification for this component of a principal's vision comes from two sources: increased understandings of how lasting school improvement is accomplished, and a growing appreciation for the power of school-based leadership.

Lasting school improvement. Efforts to improve schools have been underway as long as schools have existed. Russia's launching of Sputnik in the 1950s, however, forced us to focus seriously on the quality of America's educational system. Consequently, our understanding of what is required for school improvement has changed dramatically. Since that time, the evolution of school improvement efforts can be characterized by the following strategies:

- developing better curricula, along with providing some teachers with instruction in its use (e.g., Blumenfield, 1978; Rudduck & Kelly, 1976);
- implementing single innovations through extensive planning (e.g., Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Crandall et al, 1980);
- identifying the qualities of traditionally "effective" schools and developing these qualities in "less effective" schools (e.g., Kelly, 1990, 1992);
- holding schools accountable for achieving minimum competencies on the part of their students (e.g., Gallagher, 1979; Shoemaker, 1979); and
- holding teachers accountable for possessing minimum competencies (e.g., Shepard & Kreitzer, 1987).

While none of these strategies has lived up to expectations, neither are any of them wrong. It is simply a matter that none of them has the power individually to stimulate lasting school improvement. Without fully acknowledging that the further development of teachers' capacities is central to the success of any school improvement plan, all reform efforts are often doomed to fail. Indeed, the single-minded pursuit of measurement and accountability strategies for school improvement may be nothing more than an elaborate smokescreen hiding the lack of any authentic advice from reformers concerning better forms of instruction.

Current initiatives flying the school restructuring banner respond to the shortcomings of previous school improvement strategies in a number of promising ways. Most importantly, they acknowledge the centrality of teacher development to lasting school improvement. Furthermore, many school restructuring projects take the position that teacher development is not just a matter of providing direct opportunities (e.g., in-service training) for teachers to increase their instructional capacities. These projects recognize that teacher development also depends on reshaping teachers' workplaces into centers for professional learning and growth (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Rosenholtz, 1989), centers that empower their inhabitants (Sarason, 1990) with the commitment and capacities to serve their students equitably and effectively. (This matter and its implications for principals are developed in Chapters 5 and 6.)

School-based leadership. Formal teacher development activities, particularly those conducted outside the school, are typically viewed by teachers with cautious tolerance at best. In her analysis of the staff development "market place," Little's (1992) research shows how the centralization of relevant decision-making at the district level, the way teacher development needs usually are identified, and the need to realize economies of scale (because of limited resources) create this situation. Little suggests that frequently, "Teachers are ... cast in a fundamentally passive role with regard to the content and format of professional development, typically serving as an audience for a performance staged by others" (1992, p. 177).

In contrast, evidence depicting forms of professional development giving rise to significant teacher growth identifies the importance of teachers' participation in shaping their own professional development opportunities (McLaughlin, 1990). In addition, more productive forms of staff development often are school-based and motivated by ongoing efforts of staff members to improve their school (Greene - cited in Rudduck, 1988). The most useful learning frequently occurs informally as a result of on-the-job experiences (Knowles, 1980; Brookfield, 1984) and collaborative problem-solving with one's fellow teachers (Lieberman, Saxl & Miles, 1988; Smylie, 1992).

The implications of these conditions on school-based leadership are twofold. First, and most obviously, such conditions are unlikely to be fostered by outsiders. Teacher growth is too dependent on the opportunistic use of spontaneously occurring events in the day-to-day lives of teachers in their schools. Second, if it is to be done well, staff development must be undertaken by principals in collaboration with teachers.

Assigning teacher development to the principal presents an apparent dilemma for principals, however. Principals' jobs typically are described as hectic, fast-paced and

unpredictable (Martin & Willower, 1981; Willower & Kmetz, 1982) and seem likely to remain so in the future. It is unrealistic, as a consequence, to expect principals to create many independently-planned, formal learning opportunities for teachers. These are not the kinds of experiences that seem most helpful anyway. Rather, principals need to use their "everyday acts" (McEvoy, 1987) as opportunities to foster teacher development. Incorporating teacher development as an everyday act fits easily into the normal routines of school administrators; because they make few additional demands on school administrators' time and, can result in "working smarter rather than harder." Examples of everyday acts that effective school administrators have been observed using for teacher development include: informing teachers of professional growth opportunities; disseminating professional reading materials; encouraging experimentation and goalsetting; helping teachers to gain access to outside resources; and arranging for teachers to observe colleagues in other schools (McEvoy, 1987; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). Everyday, manageable acts such as these capitalize on teachers' informal learning from on-the-job experiences, assuming the principal's actions are guided by a detailed, defensible vision of the qualities to be developed among teachers.

Chapter 6 extends the discussion of how principals may assist in the professional growth of teachers.

Assumptions About Teachers

The purpose for describing qualities assumed to be important for teachers is to illustrate, in enough detail to be meaningful, one defensible set of outcomes for principals' teacher development efforts. Such outcomes are an important component of principals' visions for their schools. The qualities described here have been drawn from a broad research base concerning effective practice, effective schools, school restructuring, teacher professionalization, effective instructional processes and the social organization of schools.

Teacher beliefs considered particularly important in Connecticut schools also are included in this section. Characteristics assumed to be important for teachers are beliefs and values, knowledge and skills, and behaviors or overt practices. Beliefs and values. It is assumed that teachers will hold a particular set of beliefs and values regarding their students. (Mortimore et al, 1988; McCaslin & Good, 1992; Derry & Murphy, 1986; Zimmerman & Schunk, 1989; Iran-Nejad, 1990). These are supported by instructional practices that are consistent with an understanding of the learning process (described in Chapter 3) and are likely to accomplish widely valued outcomes (as described in Chapter 2).

Such teachers are likely to believe that:

- all students can learn and that teachers should assist each student to grow toward the school's image of the educated person;
- students have a significant role to play in their own learning and teachers should empower students to become self-directed in their learning;
- students bring diverse capacities and a wide range of relevant prior knowledge to bear on new learning tasks.

With respect to their own roles, these teachers are likely to believe that:

- fulfilling their responsibilities for student learning often will require considerable persistence; and
- part of their responsibilities for student learning can be met by modeling what it means to be an educated person and an active learner.

These teachers also:

- believe they have a leadership role to play with other teachers;
- value inquiry, reflection and continuing professional growth; and
- believe that strength in their own practices arises, in part, from collaboration.

Knowledge and skills. In addition to such beliefs and values, teachers will possess a complex body of knowledge and skills. Among the more important aspects of such knowledge and skills are:

- a sophisticated understanding of the learning process (see Chapter 3) and its implications for instruction (Reynolds, 1992; Leinhardt, 1992);
- a large repertoire of instructional and assessment strategies consistent with a sophisticated understanding of the learning process (Joyce & Weil, 1986; Walberg, 1986);
- the ability to choose the most appropriate strategies from one's repertoire in light of the learning outcomes to be pursued, the needs of the learner and other appropriate criteria (Joyce & Weil, 1986; Shavelson, 1973); and
- a sophisticated level of contemporary knowledge about the content of the curriculum area(s) for which one is responsible (Reynolds, 1992; Marks, 1990; Tamir, 1988).

Behaviors. Teachers holding such beliefs and values and possessing such knowledge and skills can be expected to engage in a consistent set of overt practices. Such teachers, for example, will:

- act as highly knowledgeable members of the classroom community– guides, not "interactive textbooks" (Leinhardt, 1992);

- create and maintain classroom environments that are conducive to learning (Pollack, Chrispeels & Watson, 1987; Good & Brophy, 1986; Stringfield & Teddlie, 1990);
- demonstrate respect for the dignity of each student;
- adjust instruction to accommodate variations among students in the time required and processes used to achieve the same outcomes (Corno & Snow, 1986; Good & Brophy, 1986);
- monitor student learning, using a variety of techniques, and use the results to improve instruction (Crooks, 1988; Earl & Cousins, 1991; Gullickson, 1984); and
- encourage students to examine issues from multiple intellectual perspectives (Leinhardt, 1992).

Implications for Principals

Based on discussions in this chapter concerning the importance of teacher development for lasting school improvement, qualities assumed to be important for teachers to develop and the principal's role in such development are crucial:

- 3.1 The principal possesses or develops, as part of his or her vision, a detailed, defensible conception of the qualities needed by teachers.
- 3.2 The principal assists teachers in determining the implications for their instruction, in developing an understanding of learning as a process of constructing meaning, and in understanding the needs-based and goal-oriented nature of human motivation.
- 3.3 The principal provides regular opportunities for teachers to remain well-grounded in knowledge of the curriculum area(s) for which they are responsible.
- 3.4 The principal models assumptions about the teacher in her or his staff development initiatives and relationships with teachers, students and parents.
- 3.5 The principal provides stimulation and regular opportunities for staff members to reflect on their professional beliefs, values and performance in relation to desired student learning.

5.

The Purposes and Culture of Productive Schools

Introduction

A fourth and final component of the vision principals need concerns key aspects of the school organization. To justify being included in the principal's vision, an aspect of the school organization must make a demonstrable contribution to the school's capacity to foster student learning, either directly or indirectly. School goals, culture, policies and procedures are promising indicators of such a contribution in light of available evidence. Additional indicators include the school's organization, resources, teaching faculty as a whole (as distinct from individual teachers), programs, instruction, and relationships between the school and community.

The seven aspects of school organizations examined in this and the following chapter are features of the school workplace that appear to exert considerable influence on how teachers think and feel about their work and the practices which result. Changing teachers' practices is central to the success of school improvement. Yet traditional teacher practices are as much a product of the organizational environment in which teachers work as they are a product of teachers' independent preferences (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Sarason, 1990; Shedd & Bacharach, 1991). Changed practices depend significantly on changed organizational or workplace conditions. Principals need to appreciate the interdependence of teacher behavior and workplace conditions. They need to have a defensible vision of conditions which support desirable teacher practices and the capacities to create those conditions.

School Goals: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. In her compelling analysis of what makes exemplary schools tick, Rosenholtz asserts: "If there is any center to the mystery of schools' success, mediocrity or failure, it lies deep within the structure of organizational goals: whether or not they exist, how they are defined and manifested, the extent to which they are mutually shared" (1989, p. 13). Echoing the views of Peters and Austin (1985) and others, Rosenholtz notes that agreed-upon goals enhance the ability of a school to plan and to act rationally, to make moment-to-moment decisions that move the school in a consistent direction, and to justify and evaluate the behavior of organizational members. Such desirable consequences depend on the nature or content of the goals selected by a school.

- *Productive schools are guided by a clear set of goals, which are consistent with their images of the educated person (See Chapter 2).*

Establishing trivial or misguided school goals contributes little to a school's capacity, no matter how many such goals are achieved. This is also the case for goals which, although not trivial, are not clearly connected to, or cannot be justified by their direct contribution to student learning.

Finally, with respect to content, school goals which simply reiterate what the school is already doing serve little purpose. To be of value in improving a school's contribution to student learning, goals should identify a discrepancy between some desired outcome and what is currently being accomplished. Such statements of goals approximate definitions of problems (Baird, 1983; Fredericksen, 1984) for the staff to solve and, as a consequence, are clear calls for action.

- *Productive schools are guided by a set of clear goals widely shared and strongly supported by the school staff, the students and the school community.*

The contribution of goals to a school's capacity depends on more than their *content*. It also depends on the extent to which such goals are widely shared across members of the school faculty and deeply held by individual members. Widely shared goals contribute to a strong school culture and provide a common focus for the efforts of all those with a stake in the school (Little, 1982; Bossert, 1988; Purkey & Smith, 1985).

The most important, yet the most poorly understood, requirement for school goals is that they be deeply held and personally meaningful to individual members of the school staff. Unless this requirement is met, having school goals will not matter, since they will have minimal influence, at best, on the day-to-day behavior of individual members. The social cognitive explanation provided for the motivation of human behavior (Bandura, 1986) in Chapter 3 explains why this requirement is so crucial. The foundations of human motivation are personally held goals, needs and aspirations. When people sense a discrepancy between their current circumstances and a goal, need or aspiration, they are energized to act. And that energy to act increases to the extent that the goal is clearly understood, challenging but not out of reach, and the initial steps to be taken are known.

This explanation of human motivation means that processes for establishing school goals cannot be judged successful on the basis of their content or the extent to which agreement is achieved among stakeholders. These outcomes of goal setting, while obviously important, may have few substantive consequences unless such goals also become internalized-- personally held--by individual staff members of the school. When school goals and individual staff members' goals are the same, the likelihood of their achievement is extraordinarily high.

Typical processes for establishing school goals do not necessarily provide opportunities for the development of goals with the power to energize and guide individual action. Such

behavior-shaping school goals are the result of thoughtful, unhurried discussion among colleagues, personal reflection on professional beliefs, and opportunities to articulate such beliefs and receive honest but supportive responses from others. As Heald-Taylor (1991) found, goal-setting processes emphasizing extensive participation by all staff members from beginning to end produced higher levels of agreement, consensus and personal commitment by staff members than processes ostensibly more "streamlined" and "efficient."

Implications for principals. Based on these understandings about school goals and processes for setting them, it is necessary for principals to undertake the following:

- 4.1.1 The principal involves school staff members, students and the school community in establishing and periodically reviewing school goals which are consistent with the school's and state's images of the educated person.
- 4.1.2 The principal ensures that school goals are clear, readily understood and widely shared by members of the school staff, students and the school community.
- 4.1.3 The principal uses both formal and informal means to periodically check on the understanding of and the support for school goals by school staff members, students and the school community.
- 4.1.4 The principal facilitates the development and articulation of a compelling vision based on school goals and shared values.

School Culture: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. Culture may be defined as: "... a system of ordinary, taken-for-granted meanings and symbols with both explicit and implicit content that is, deliberately and nondeliberately, learned and shared among members of naturally bounded social groups" (Erickson, 1987, p. 12). A school's culture consists of meanings shared by those inhabiting the school. Schools may include a number of subcultures as well; for example, one or several student subculture(s) and one or more teacher subculture(s). Teacher cultures are the focus of this section.

Attention to culture as part of school reform is driven by evidence that traditional school cultures, based on norms of autonomy and isolation, create a work context in which realizing the central aspirations of school reform--improving student learning--is highly unlikely. Such norms begin to develop early in a teacher's career, perhaps during teacher training (Su, 1990). Isolated cultures have been described by Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1986) in terms of norms of interaction with students, teachers, administrators and parents. Norms of authority and discipline, along with a competing need for close personal bonds, characterize teachers' interactions with students. Typical norms act to isolate teachers from professional advice

from peers which would improve their contribution to student learning. Teachers, it has been said, have peers but no colleagues.

School administrators are valued by teachers when they act as buffers from outside pressures and maintain school discipline, but not if they “interfere” in daily routines or instructional decisions. Parents are valued as support for the teacher's plans and practices but are not expected to “interfere” in those plans. As a whole, these traditional norms create a highly autonomous professional culture, one that is clearly adaptive under some conditions, such as: traditional expectations for student outcomes in some types of schools; administrators unable to provide instructional leadership; little public interest in accountability and modest expectations for the contribution of schools to society with few external pressures for change; prevailing images of teaching as craft (or art) based on limited technical know-how; and traditional contributions by the family to the development of students.

Since most of these conditions no longer prevail in many schools, it is not surprising to find evidence of a different teaching culture emerging (e.g., Little, 1982, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989; Nias et al, 1982; Schneider & Hochschild, 1988). This culture is student centered and based on norms of interaction with students that are supportive and positive; while discipline is maintained it is obviously intended to serve the interests of learning rather than an end in its own right. Teachers have a shared, technical culture built on norms of collegiality, collaborative planning and continuous improvement. Staff and the student body are cohesive and have a strong sense of community. There is reciprocity between and among staff and students. Administrators are expected to offer instructional leadership and parents are considered partners in the education of students wherever possible. Such a culture appears to be adaptive to increasingly prevalent conditions associated with calls for reform such as: new and more complex expectations for student outcomes, administrators who are able to provide instructional leadership; high expectations by the public for its schools and many associated, external pressures for change; a rapidly expanding body of technical know-how concerning instruction; and changing family environments. This culture is central to the “second wave” of school reform in the United States (e.g., Bacharach, 1988). Gideonse (1988) characterizes it as a “revolutionary transformation” in the teaching profession. Based on evidence of this type, schools should possess robust cultures characterized by:

- a widely shared set of defensible, student-centered norms, beliefs, values and assumptions about professional practices;
- collaboration among faculty to maintain and improve school programs;
- commitment to continuing inquiry, dialogue and improvement of instruction;

- the valuing of diverse opinions and perspectives among staff members; and
- a willingness to view problems as opportunities for continued learning.

Implications. School principals, like leaders of many other types of organizations, have been admonished to pay attention to and act to influence the cultures of their organizations (Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Bolman & Deal, 1987; Peters & Austin, 1982). Knowledge about how to influence organizational culture, however, is largely based on case studies and testimonials. Indeed, there is parallel, pessimistic literature that challenges the premise that leaders can have much effect on their organizations' cultures.

Two studies of how principals, in particular, can influence school cultures (Deal & Peterson, 1990; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990) suggest that:

- 4.2.1 The principal skillfully uses multiple strategies to influence the strength, form and content of the school's culture so that it is more supportive of practices contributing to student learning. Such strategies are likely to include:
 - using a variety of organizational mechanisms (e.g., hiring new staff members) to reinforce the culture;
 - communicating the form and content of the culture to others on most occasions where this is possible;
 - using symbols and rituals to reinforce cultural norms, values, beliefs and assumptions;
 - fostering staff and professional development; and
 - sharing power and responsibility with others in the school.
- 4.2.2 The principal assists staff members to gain an appreciation for the potential of a collaborative professional culture for enhancing the school's contribution to student learning.
- 4.2.3 The principal assists staff members in finding opportunities for collaboration.
- 4.2.4 The principal assists staff members in acquiring skills of collaboration.
- 4.2.5 The principal reinforces, among staff members, values which support:
 - continuing inquiry, dialogue and improvement of instruction;
 - constructive diversity of opinion and perspective; and
 - the viewing of problems as opportunities for continued learning.

6.

Structural and Organizational Characteristics of Productive Schools

Introduction

This chapter continues the task, begun in Chapter 5, of identifying assumptions about productive schools and what these assumptions signify for effective school leadership. Five components of the school are addressed in this chapter. They include: policies and procedures; organization and resources; teaching faculty; programs and instruction; and school-community relations.

Policies and Procedures: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. "Policies" are typically understood to be guides to discretionary action; they may be the product of explicit deliberation, as in the case of a school districts' formal policies, or they may be implicit guides to action much like the norms and beliefs making up an organization's culture. Traditionally the formal policies guiding practice at the local school level have come from school boards, state legislatures and the federal government. Principals have primarily interpreted rather than made such policies. Increasingly, however, authority is being delegated to school-based personnel to develop a wide range of formal policies and procedures pertaining to student welfare and instruction (Duke & Canady, 1991; Murphy, 1991). Areas covered by school-based policies include scheduling and the allocation of time; grouping and the assignment of students; homework; discipline; staff and professional development; and student assessment. Given the critical importance of well-trained, competent staff members and a continuing commitment to providing all students with opportunities to succeed, it is assumed that productive schools have policies and procedures that:

- enhance the likelihood of all students achieving school and district goals without putting any particular group of students at a disadvantage.
- support the professional growth of teachers; and
- link staff selection, evaluation, development and school improvement.

Implications for principals. These assumptions have direct implications for principals. For example, principals must be prepared to take on certain executive functions which in the past have been reserved for superintendents.

They must see that various "stakeholders"-- including teachers, parents and students-- have opportunities to participate in the development of school-based policies and procedures. They must monitor these policies and procedures to ensure that they are implemented

properly and that they are accomplishing their intended purposes. In cases where policies and procedures are not having desired effects, principals must see that the necessary adjustments are made. Through all of these actions, principals should recognize the possibility that schools can possess too many policies. Having more policies than are needed or can be enforced consistently serves only to frustrate staff members and invite accusations of unfair treatment by students and parents.

The principal's role in the area of policies and procedures should stress two specific functions:

4.3.1 The principal develops and implements, with staff members and other groups, as appropriate, policies and procedures which enhance the likelihood that all students will achieve school and district goals without putting any particular group of students at a disadvantage. Policies and procedures are likely to address such matters as homework, assignments, monitoring of student progress, and provision of extra resources to students with special needs.

Schools sometimes are accused of delivering services in ways that perpetuate existing class and status divisions (Oakes, 1985; Skrtic, 1991). As public agencies in a democratic society, schools are expected to provide students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, with opportunities to improve their circumstances. Principals must monitor school policies and procedures carefully to ensure that they are implemented properly and that they do not selectively discriminate against particular groups of students. Duke & Canady (1991) provide evidence that certain policies pertaining to homework and grading may place at-risk students at a greater disadvantage than other students. Oakes (1985) and Slavin, Karweit and Madden (1989) make a similar argument concerning student grouping policies. Principals should not assume that policies designed to promote learning necessarily achieve their intended outcomes in equitable ways for all students.

4.3.2 The principal, in collaboration with staff members, develops and implements a coherent, integrated set of policies for staff selection, evaluation, development and school improvement that are designed to promote student achievement.

A school is no better than the quality of its professional staff. Provisions are needed to ensure that every school has access to the best available teachers.

The principal is in the best position to coordinate staff recruitment and selection (Duke, 1987). Given the constantly changing nature of teaching and schools, however, careful selection alone cannot ensure that a staff will remain effective over time. For this reason, principals need to encourage and provide resources and opportunities for teachers to continue to develop as professionals, a matter already discussed at some length in Chapter 4.

Mechanisms to assist in this process include supervision, evaluation, goalsetting, multi-year professional growth plans, staff development and professional development (Duke, 1990; McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Policies should be in place at the school and district levels to support growth-oriented teacher evaluation and to encourage principals to spend a substantial portion of their time engaged in activities which contribute to the ongoing professional growth of all staff members. Research has shown that principals play a critical role in securing the resources (McLaughlin, 1990; McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988) and in creating the norms and school culture (Little, 1984), needed for teacher growth.

Organization and Resources: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. The educational needs of a complex and diverse society require a substantial commitment of resources, both human and financial. Since resources are limited, organization is necessary to ensure that resources are used in a prudent and effective manner. Calls for school-based management, shared decision-making and restructuring reflect a growing realization that the level of organization most likely to produce the greatest educational benefits for the least cost is at the building level.

It is assumed that the organization of a productive school will be designed to accomplish the following:

- facilitate the learning of students and the work of staff members;
- ensure that teaching and learning take place in a safe and orderly environment;
- use available resources in ways that enhance the achievement of school goals;
- promote "organizational learning" (characterized by ease of access to new ideas and frequent opportunities for staff members to share and discuss new ideas);
- maximize time for learning; and
- provide special interventions in the context of the regular classroom for students who do not experience success with conventional instruction.

An additional assumption is that the preceding functions may not best be undertaken within the traditional organizational structures of schools. Current research and reform literature, in fact, stress the need for schools to substantially change the ways in which they are organized (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Goodlad, 1984; Sizer, 1992; Wehlage et al, 1989). Organizational (second-order) changes are likely to entail new ways to allocate time, new configurations of goals and new processes for making decisions.

Implications for principals. The implications of changes in school organization for principals promise to be far-reaching. No longer will it be sufficient for principals to manage personnel, physical plant and budget. They must assume leadership over schools that are

organized as learning communities. Such schools will require principals who can undertake the following activities:

- 4.4.1 The principal initiates with staff members periodic reviews of school policies and organization, with the intention of constantly improving student learning, staff productivity, and relations between school and community.
- 4.4.2 The principal facilitates and oversees a constant flow of information on new practices and evaluations of existing practices and provides opportunities for staff members to analyze and discuss the information.
- 4.4.3 The principal critically examines with staff members, on a regular basis, the models and assumptions used to assess their own and the school's effectiveness.

Organizations--schools included-- no longer can afford to rely on past successes to ensure continuing support (Senge, 1990). To remain viable in a world of changing priorities, politics, resources, personnel and clients, schools must institutionalize processes by which mission, goals, policies and organizational structure are continuously assessed. Those closest to organizational problems must feel safe enough to share their concerns so that appropriate corrective actions can be taken. Information on the effectiveness of school programs and new ways to address school goals must be made available to school personnel on a regular basis. Principals are in a strategic position to facilitate the sharing of information and analyses of organizational problems (Duke, 1987; Heck, 1992). They also help to foster an organizational climate in which staff, students and community feel comfortable discussing matters which relate to their own and the school's effectiveness. Without regular and honest sharing regarding progress toward achievement of school goals, no school can hope to meet the needs of all its students (Mortimore et al, 1988; Wilson & Corcoran, 1988).

- 4.4.4 The principal determines, with staff members, patterns of resource allocation most likely to accomplish school goals with greatest efficiency.

The allocation of educational resources increasingly takes place at the school level. These resources include time, personnel, space, curricular materials and technology. Because resources are limited and school goals are extensive, principals must see that resources are allocated in ways that maximize the likelihood of achieving school goals. To do so, they may be required to determine how staff members and students spend their time, who has access to what curricular materials and technology, and which programs and offerings are underutilized. Equality of opportunity, a central tenet of public education, is to a great extent, a function of how resources are allocated to individual students on a day-to-day basis. As in other areas of school leadership, the ability of principals to maintain an equitable and effective system of resource allocation depends on the cooperation of school personnel.

Teaching Faculty: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. A school is only as effective as its teaching faculty. In recent years considerable attention has been focused on improving the preparation of teachers and their working conditions. A productive school requires cadres of highly competent and experienced professionals who are capable of exercising leadership and participating in school decision making, as well as providing effective instruction.

The preceding section stressed the value of providing staff members with opportunities to become aware of areas of the school that are in need of improvement. Awareness is only part of the prescription, however. Staff members also must possess the skills, knowledge and commitment to undertake school improvement. It is assumed, in this regard, that staff members will need to:

- take responsibility for identifying areas of need for individual and collective improvement;
- undertake programs of continuous professional growth; and
- collaborate with other teachers in efforts to raise the level of professional performance.

Implications for principals. These assumptions suggest that two important dimensions of the principal's job are staff and professional development.

Staff development pertains to activities designed to promote faculty growth in a common direction. Professional development encompasses opportunities for staff members to grow in unique ways based on their talents, specialties and aspirations. Leadership in the following areas is necessary for effective faculty development:

4.5.1 The principal expects and encourages each staff member to assume responsibility for one's personal development as a professional and to undertake activities related to personal, continuing professional development.

4.5.2 The principal involves staff members in planning and implementing activities designed to promote collective growth for the purpose of achieving school and district goals.

The key role of the principal in promoting the development of staff members has been noted by various observers (Little, 1984; McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Principals foster norms and expectations that support growth. They secure resources and set aside time for growth activities. In some cases, principals may serve as staff developers, training teachers and others to use new methods and materials. At other times principals function more as facilitators, making sure that resource people are contacted, assisting staff members in developing individual professional growth plans and monitoring how staff

members are progressing on their plans. Where principals do not openly value and model professional growth, staff members are less likely to engage in activities that lead to improved teaching.

Programs and Instruction: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. The primary purpose of every school is to provide instruction and programs commensurate with its goals. Instruction occurs in a variety of ways, including tutorials, small groups, large groups and self-instruction formats. School programs include those that constitute regular courses of study and supplementary programs designed to enhance the regular curriculum and provide remedial or special assistance. Research has failed to demonstrate that one type of instruction or program is universally best, but studies indicate that certain types of instruction and programs are better than others.

Given what is currently known about effective instruction and the needs of contemporary students, it is assumed that productive schools provide programs and instruction that are:

- based on current understandings of human learning and motivation;
- characterized by high expectations for all students;
- designed to accommodate different rates and styles of learning;
- designed to expose students to multiple perspectives (i.e., cultural, racial, gender, etc.);
- offered in a multidisciplinary manner; and
- based on multiple forms of ongoing student assessment, all of which meet acceptable standards of validity and reliability.

Implications for principals. Implementing and supervising programs and instruction with the preceding characteristics require principals to function as instructional leaders (Duke, 1987; Heck, 1992). While the specific dimensions of instructional leadership are likely to vary somewhat, depending on grade level and school demographics, the following function is of central importance under any circumstances:

4.6.1 The principal ensures that school structures and practices promote curriculum articulation and integration within and across grades or levels.

Many calls for reform have criticized the tendency of schools to divide knowledge into discrete segments (Sizer, 1992). For knowledge to be of greatest use to students, as explained in Chapter 3, it should be taught in ways that stress its interrelationships and applications. Careful articulation of the curriculum ensures that key learning outcomes receive proper emphasis without unnecessary duplication of effort. Principals are in a good position to encourage teachers to engage in curriculum articulation and integration. While no principal

can be expected to possess subject matter expertise in all areas of the curriculum, one can create the expectation that curriculum offerings will be coordinated, provide opportunities for teachers to work together within and across grade levels and departments, and monitor to see that learning outcomes are appropriate and integrated.

4.6.2 The principal develops with staff members a variety of methods for conveying high expectations for students.

While it is true that students learn at different rates and in different ways, all students benefit from being expected to perform at the boundaries of their abilities in ways that promote growth (Good & Brophy, 1992). The principal can encourage high expectations in various ways, ranging from monitoring the curriculum to see that it contains challenging content to working with teachers to develop individual learning plans for all students. When observing direct instruction, the principal also can focus on questioning strategies and feedback to ensure that all students are exposed to rigorous inquiry.

4.6.3 The principal acts to maximize instructional time and encourages staff members to make effective use of non-classroom time.

Time is the primary resource available to educators. Research indicates that learning is a function of time (Good & Brophy, 1992). A key responsibility of the principal is to see that time is used as productively as possible. This may mean reducing interruptions to classroom instruction, including pullout programs, extracurricular activities and public address system announcements (Bossert, 1988). During observations of classroom instruction, the principal can assist teachers in increasing student "on-task" behavior by noting what teachers do just before and immediately after loss of attention. Learning time can extend beyond the regular class period through tutorials, carefully planned homework and homework assistance centers.

Experimentation with new ways to schedule elementary and secondary schools has increased dramatically (Canady & Rettig, 1995; Sizer, 1992). Block scheduling, for example, offers principals a tool for expanding the amount of instructional time available for particular subjects, reducing time lost in transitions between classes, and lowering the total number of students with whom teachers interact during a semester. As a consequence, teachers have more opportunities to sustain complex learning activities and fewer sets of papers to correct. Students are able to concentrate on fewer courses or subjects and make up missed assignments more easily.

4.6.4 The principal provides support to staff members in the design and use of multiple forms of assessment.

- 4.6.5 The principal facilitates the use of assessment data for instructional and program improvement.
- 4.6.6 The principal monitors student progress and, both in collaboration with and independent of staff members, facilitates the adjustment of instruction for students who do not experience success both in the regular classroom or through organizational restructuring.

To determine whether or not school goals are being accomplished, the principal must have access to data on student achievement. These data, however, are no better than the quality of the methods used to assess and measure student achievement. To ensure high quality information, the principal needs to assist staff members in developing and using multiple forms of assessment (Arter, Stiggins, Duke & Sagor, 1993; Mortimore et al, 1988). Of particular value are assessments of student performance, including applications of knowledge to problem solving and exhibitions requiring the integration of knowledge from different fields (Sizer, 1992).

Once data on student achievement are collected, they must be reviewed to determine areas where instruction may need to be strengthened. Opportunities to analyze and interpret data need to be provided for teachers. The principal or designee also must attend to issues of curriculum alignment– the relationship between what students are taught and expected learning (Duke, 1987). Regular monitoring of student progress may reveal the systematic neglect by teachers of key areas of the curriculum. When assessment data indicate that certain students are experiencing difficulties, the principal should provide support necessary to assist staff members in making adjustments in their instruction (Heck, 1992). The ultimate value of assessment data must be measured in terms of its contribution to the improvement of teaching and learning.

School-Community Relations: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. Schools do not exist in a vacuum. They operate in a complex set of contexts which include a nation, a state, a school system and a local community. In particular, the local community plays a key role in the success of a school (Comer, 1980; Epstein, 1987). Conditions associated with constructive school-community relations include:

- ongoing dialogue about appropriate school goals;
- shared values and beliefs about teaching and learning;
- sensitivity to community heterogeneity, including ethnic, racial, religious, cultural, generational and economic makeup; and

- shared responsibility for fostering productive learning environments outside as well as within schools.

Implications for principals. These conditions, unfortunately, do not characterize all schools. In some schools, for example, parents are not routinely consulted regarding school goals and priorities. The community feels uncertain about what these schools are trying to accomplish. To develop productive school-community relations, the principal must undertake several functions:

4.7.1 The principal facilitates a continuous dialogue among the staff and community concerning school goals, assumptions about learning, and the nature of effective instruction.

Community members, particularly parents, should support the actions taken by school staff members. In order to do so, community members need opportunities to discuss with school personnel matters pertinent to teaching and learning. Such discussion can foster the kind of common understanding of school goals and instructional objectives that is essential for cooperation between schools and communities.

4.7.2 The principal encourages active parental involvement in the life of the school.

Most parents are deeply concerned about their children's school experience. They can play crucial roles in fostering the values necessary for effective learning to take place, among them, providing understanding when their children do not experience success and supervising the completion of school assignments. In addition, schools benefit when parents become directly involved in school activities (Comer, 1980; Epstein, 1987; Mortimore et al, 1988). Such involvement may include serving as a teacher's assistant or volunteer tutor, helping to raise funds or serving on a school committee. By creating opportunities for parental involvement, the principal helps shorten the distance between school and home and generates additional "human resources" for use in achieving school goals.

4.7.3 The principal assists staff members in acquiring community resources for use in school programs.

Applications of the learning that takes place in school are not limited to those which take place in the school. The community can provide settings in which students apply school-based knowledge as well as other knowledge. Museums, libraries, institutions of higher education, commercial enterprises, theaters and parks are but some of the more obvious resources. Besides contributing learning sites and opportunities for "on-the-job" training, communities serve as sources of expertise. Instructors in highly specialized fields, mentors and advisors for school planning activities are three roles which can be filled by community members. Given the wealth of learning resources in every community and the

limited nature of school-based resources, it is vital that principals possess an awareness of community-based resources and the skills to acquire them.

"Acquiring community resources" may well have an additional meaning in many future schools. These schools are likely to become centers for social, psychological, health and community, as well as educational services. While it would be unrealistic to expect existing school staffs to be responsible for such services, they will need to coordinate their efforts with other caregivers. It seems likely that school leaders will have to assume a significant role in promoting such coordination.

7.

Keys to School Order and Stability

Introduction

Unstable organizational conditions rarely spawn effective innovation (Kanter, 1988). The continuous improvement of teaching and learning, therefore, requires adequate levels of organizational order and stability. This chapter outlines five managerial functions central to the provision of order and stability in schools. They include communication and coordination; management of time; budget and resource management; school governance; and student discipline.

The managerial functions in this chapter sometimes overlap with the leadership functions mentioned in Chapters 5 and 6. When similar functions are noted in the preceding chapters, however, it is because they are focused directly on teaching and learning. Functions in Chapter 7 contribute to teaching and learning by contributing to an orderly and smoothly running school. We agree with Mitchell, Ortiz and Mitchell (1987, p. 219) when they argue that role flexibility is critical for an effective principal. "Principals must know," they contend, "how and when to act the part of 'manager,' 'leader,' 'administrator' or 'supervisor' in working with teachers." It is just as serious to under-manage as to under-lead a school.

Communication and Coordination: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. Communication is the exchange of understanding. Without understanding among the staff members of a school, it is impossible to accomplish even the most basic tasks, not to mention something as ambitious as a school mission. Understanding, of course, does not ensure agreement or acceptance, but it constitutes the basis for productive interaction. In the absence of understanding, distrust and confusion can surface, undermining school culture and reducing the likelihood of cooperation.

Closely related to communication is coordination, which Duke (1987, p. 295) defines as the "processes and procedures designed to reduce the need for organizational control by facilitating communications and fostering internal integration." Coordination ensures that people and units do not work at cross-purposes, undermining rather than enhancing each other's likelihood of success.

Where coordination is absent or poorly provided, organizational stability can be difficult to maintain. The sense of common purpose that welds human efforts has little opportunity to take hold.

Bolman and Deal (1991, pp. 57-58) distinguish between two types of coordination. Vertical coordination is represented by supervision, policies, rules, planning and other mechanisms that tend to originate from the top and filter down. Lateral coordination is less formal and takes place through meetings, task forces, standing committees, special coordinating roles and "matrix structures." Bolman and Deal (1991, p. 57) note that vertical coordination is more likely to be significant "when the environment is relatively stable, the task is predictable and well understood, and uniformity is a critical need." Lateral coordination, on the other hand, is necessary when complex tasks must be accomplished in environments characterized by high uncertainty and rapid change (p. 58). These conditions seem to describe many contemporary schools. It is no surprise, therefore, that much of the literature on school reform has stressed the importance of lateral, as opposed to vertical, coordination (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Sizer, 1992).

Implications for principals. Communication and coordination relate to every phase of school operations and every function for which principals are responsible. Many examples of communication and coordination related to teaching and learning already have been presented. Still, there is merit in addressing certain key functions separately. The literature reviewed for this monograph place particular emphasis on the following communication and coordination functions: keeping members of the school and community informed (Goldring & Rallis, 1993), listening and responding to concerns and ideas (McPherson & Crowson, 1994; Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1993b), providing feedback and recognition (Rosenblum, Louis & Rossmiller, 1994; Jenkins, 1992), facilitating teamwork (Lieberman, Falk & Alexander, in press; Matranga, Homer, Hill & Peltier, 1993) and troubleshooting and mediating conflict (Rossmiller, 1992; Burello & Reitzug, 1993).

Contemporary life is complex. Everyone connected with schools, from teachers and parents to students, is pulled in many directions. Such circumstances are likely to contribute to uncertainty and confusion. Time to clarify directions, double-check expectations and listen carefully to proposals is always at a premium.

Effective principals never assume that people know what the important issues are or what they are supposed to do. They create and maintain various channels of communication, instructional objectives, operating procedures, rules and other elements of a smooth-running school. Such channels may include school-home newsletters, open houses, parent-teacher and student-teacher conferences, faculty meetings, and various types of informal contacts (Niece, 1993; Kirby & Bogotch, 1993; Hallinger & Hausman, 1994).

Keeping people informed is only part of the principal's obligation when it comes to communication. It is equally important to listen to what others have to say. The opportunity

to be heard is a basic element of a democratic society, one that is not limited to adults. In addition, listening to others is the primary way principals learn how well the school is doing. Once again, no single channel of communication is sufficient. In order to stay in touch with the feelings and concerns of members of the school community, principals must encourage various types of interaction. The literature on effective management stresses, for example, the value of an "open-door" policy, where people drop by to let the principal know what's on their minds (Leithwood, Dart, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1993b; Kleine-Kracht, 1993). An "open door" is unlikely to promote productive sharing, however, if principals appear too busy, threatened, aloof or preoccupied. A great many or most studies dealing with managerial functions note the critical importance of interpersonal skills (e.g., Pierson & Bredeson, 1993; Haughey & MacElwain, 1992; Blase, 1993).

Some parents and students feel uncomfortable expressing their concerns to authority figures. Principals, therefore, may need to adopt informal strategies to encourage communication. Such strategies may include home conferences and meetings in the community. Breaking down the boundaries that block effective communication between principals and those they serve may be one of the greatest challenges facing today's school leaders, particularly given the increasing diversity and the growth of non-English-speaking members of the school community.

5.1.1 The principal utilizes a variety of communication channels to keep school employees, students and parents informed about the school's mission, goals, expectations, instructional objectives, operating procedures, rules and other matters of importance.

5.1.2 The principal encourages school employees, students and parents to express their feelings and concerns through a variety of communication channels.

Another crucial dimension of communication is feedback, a common element of successful systems (Rosenblum, Louis, & Rossmiller, 1994). Without feedback, members of organizations are left to guess whether or not goals and expectations are being met. Senge (1990, pp. 79-80) observes that feedback can be divided into two general types: *reinforcing feedback* that serves as the engine of growth and change, and *balancing feedback*, which functions to stabilize. Further, Senge explains how both are necessary in organizations.

The literature on effective schools provides various examples of the importance of principal-based feedback. Performance feedback to teachers is a vital source of guidance regarding the extent to which teaching and learning goals are being achieved (Haughey & MacElwain, 1992; Snyder & Ebmeier, 1993). Recognition is a special form of feedback which serves as a source of reward and motivation as well as an indication of appropriate performance. Effective principals find ways to recognize the achievements of teachers, students and other members of the school

community (Marshall, Steele & Rogers, 1993). In providing feedback, accuracy, credibility and timeliness are extremely important (Duke & Stiggins, 1986). Principals must become skilled observers in order to detect and share important aspects of performance. Ongoing training is essential.

5.1.3 The principal provides accurate, credible and timely feedback on performance as well as frequent recognition of achievement.

In the past, the focus of managerial communication often was command-and-control. Such management is ill-suited to the needs of the contemporary school (Handy, 1990; Sizer, 1992). Effective principals now recognize that a major purpose of communication is coordination, which, in turn, gives rise to a spirit of cooperation and collective accountability (Gerstner, 1994; Sizer, 1992). Greater coordination and shared responsibility make it possible for principals to play more supportive and less supervisory roles. One way in which principals provide support is by encouraging the formation of teams. Teams ameliorate the traditional isolation of teachers and foster shared decision making (Glickman, Allen & Lunsford, 1994). Teams may operate at the department and grade level or coalesce around issues of student identification and placement, interdisciplinary instruction, and school improvement.

Coordination requires not only building linkages within the school, but between the school and other groups. The most important of these groups is the family (school-community relations were addressed in the preceding chapter). Other important groups include the district administration and other youth-serving agencies in the community. Schools must work cooperatively with district officials if they are to secure necessary resources and support. Coordination necessitates frequent communication to clarify needs, policies and new initiatives. In recent years, schools have been encouraged to work more closely with local agencies serving young people (Schorr, 1989). Such agencies range from social service agencies to courts and probation services. Too often these organizations work at cross-purposes, thereby jeopardizing opportunities for at-risk youth.

5.1.4 The principal fosters coordination by encouraging and supporting teams and building links between the school and other organizations.

No school is perfect. Despite the best efforts to foster effective communication and coordination, problems arise from time to time. Lightfoot (1983) contends that the good school is not one that is problem-free, but one that anticipates problems and openly deals with ways to reduce the impact of problems. Toward this end, effective principals must function on occasion as troubleshooters and conflict mediators.

Duke (1987, p. 295) defines troubleshooting as the "processes and procedures designed to anticipate and minimize the impact of problems that threaten an organization's capacity to achieve its goals." To obtain the information necessary to troubleshoot, principals need to maintain open and honest relations with members of the school community. Those closest to problems are the ones most likely to detect their emergence. When people are uneasy, distrustful or intimidated, they are unlikely to risk sharing information about problems. Such conditions reduce the likelihood of effective troubleshooting. The key to monitoring potential problems is to establish a nonthreatening relationship and to foster the expectation that problems are normal parts of all organizations.

While it is desirable to detect small problems before they become serious, some problems cannot be prevented. They must be managed, however, to reduce their capacity for disruption. Part of problem management entails conflict mediation. Principals may be called on to mediate conflicts among teachers and teams, between teachers and students, teachers and parents, and teachers and district staff members (Rosenblum, Louis & Rossmiller, 1994; Rossmiller, 1992). Conflict mediation provides principals with opportunities to promote a problem-solving orientation and to model problem-solving strategies. The more adept at problem solving that members of the school become, the less likely that they will expect the principal to resolve all problems.

5.1.5 The principal promotes problem management through troubleshooting and conflict mediation.

The Management of Time: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. The basic resource with which educators work is time. Given the nature of teaching and learning, time is always at a premium. In fact, it is safe to conclude that there is never enough time to do everything that could be done to promote effective instruction. Under such circumstances, no school can afford to waste time. Research on effective teaching indicates that certain activities are more likely to promote learning than other activities (Good & Brophy, 1986). Effectiveness is less a matter of doing everything that could be accomplished than of making certain that the most important activities are done first. The key to the effective management of time, then, is a well-informed sense of priorities which permits decisions to be made about how best to allocate scarce time and energy.

Every school has a schedule which indicates how time is to be organized and used. Some schedules are more complex than others. The school schedule, along with the specific schedules for individual teachers, constitutes an indication of instructional priorities. It is reasonable to maintain that what educators regard as most important are those activities for which they allocate the most time. The management of time begins with the determination of the school schedule and the schedules of teachers.

Scheduling the school day and year is not without controversy. Opinions vary as to the merits of particular types of schedules, pullout programs, length of classes and frequency of breaks (Duke & Canady, 1991, pp. 28-45). The absence of agreement on such matters does not mean, however, that all preferences are equally valid. It is safe to assume that students are less likely to learn what they spend little time studying (Walberg, 1986). Similarly, aspects of school organization that receive relatively little time and attention are unlikely to function as smoothly as those that do.

Implications for principals. In situations where professional staff members have more to do than available time permits, leadership is needed to help establish and monitor priorities. Chapter 6 pointed out that the chief focus of teachers' time should be teaching and the chief focus of students' time should be learning.

Few dispute this statement, yet it is sometimes easy to lose track of how time is spent amidst the competing demands and unexpected developments of daily life in schools and classrooms. The principal often is in the best position to assess how teachers and students are spending time and assist in reducing unproductive uses of time.

While teaching and learning must be the primary focus of activity, they alone are insufficient to ensure the orderly and effective operation of a complex organization like a school. Besides minimizing classroom interruptions and creating schedules that maximize the likelihood that students receive the instruction they need, the principal must see that

sufficient time is available for planning and coordination activities, professional and staff development, and school governance.

The preceding section stressed the importance of schoolwide, school-community and district-school communication and coordination. These activities require time. While technological advances such as e-mail and teleconferencing hold promise for reducing some of the logistical hurdles impeding coordination efforts, time is required for direct contact between people. The value of team-based and schoolwide planning has been noted by various advocates of school reform (Gerstner, 1994; Sizer, 1992). Principals who expect teachers to coordinate curriculum offerings, instructional interventions and interdisciplinary teaching cannot rely on chance encounters to accomplish these undertakings. Opportunities during the regular school day must be scheduled so that teachers can plan together. Such opportunities also serve to reduce teacher isolation and prevent misunderstanding (Courter & Ward, 1983; Prestine, 1993).

5.2.1 The principal arranges opportunities for staff members to plan together on a regular basis.

A school is only as good as its staff, which, in turn, can only be as good as the professional knowledge it has an opportunity to acquire. Professional knowledge, including curriculum content and research on teaching practices, changes continuously, making it necessary for teachers to regularly engage in professional and staff development. Workshops at the end of a long school day and evening classes at a university may not always be the best vehicles to update teachers' knowledge base. An important aspect of time management involves scheduling professional and staff development activities when teachers are most likely to benefit.

5.2.2 The principal arranges opportunities for staff members to participate in professional and staff development activities.

In recent years there has been a growing interest in shared decision making and school-based management. Many calls for school restructuring begin with a recommendation to expand teacher involvement in school governance (Marshall & Tucker, 1992; Sizer, 1992). Advocates argue that teachers are more likely to implement decisions in which they have participated. In addition, as the professionals closest to teaching and learning, teachers possess insights and information crucial to effective decision making.

Shared decision making, if only superficial, can do more harm than good. Understandably, teachers do not appreciate being asked to participate in meetings and on committees simply for the purpose of placation. Their time is too valuable to be wasted. Principals who involve teachers in school governance must make certain that teacher input is

taken seriously. Involvement without influence undermines morale and prevents a feeling of ownership in matters of schoolwide importance.

As in the preceding cases, teacher participation in school governance is contingent, to some degree, on the availability of opportunities during the regular school day for faculty meetings. Principals must learn how to use scarce meeting time wisely. Instead of squandering time sharing information that can be distributed by memo or e-mail, principals should manage agendas so that adequate time can be spent deliberating on important issues.

5.2.3 The principal arranges opportunities for staff members to participate in school governance.

Effective time management encompasses personal use of time as well as opportunities for staff members to plan, learn and make decisions. How principals spend time has been identified as a key indicator of an effective school (Duke, 1987). Schools are more likely to be orderly and well-run when principals are highly visible. Principals who spend a large portion of their time in classrooms and working with teachers reveal through their actions that teaching and learning are central activities in the successful operation of schools.

5.2.4 The principal maintains a high level of visibility throughout the school, and particularly in classrooms.

How principals spend their time conveys a powerful symbolic message about what is important in a school. It is more difficult to persuade teachers to concentrate their time and energy on the core issues of teaching and learning when the principal's time is absorbed in relatively unimportant activities. The capacity of a principal to reinforce key benefits and values through the allocation of personal time should not be underestimated.

Budget and Resource Management: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. Time may be the basic resource with which educators work, but time, along with instructional materials and various support services, generally must be budgeted and purchased. No school has the luxury of unlimited resources. While educational reformers delight in criticizing school administrators for concentrating on such mundane matters as budgets, bus schedules and building maintenance, the fact is that teaching and learning depend on resources, student transportation, and safe and comfortable environments.

Most decisions regarding school resources and services traditionally have been made at the district level. While some school systems continue to deal with these matters in a highly centralized manner, others have moved to decentralized decision making, or what has come to be known as school-based management. The guiding assumption behind this trend is that those in the best position to decide how to allocate resources are typically the people closest to the delivery of instruction--namely teachers and school leaders. Caldwell and Spinks (1992, p. 15) elaborate on the development of this view:

"A centralised, bureaucratic form of management is appropriate where the tasks to be performed are relatively uniform in nature and stable over time, with few exceptional cases among the range of tasks. These were the conditions which prevailed over much of a century or more in large government school systems. The greater the commitment to and understanding of the range of individual learning needs and approaches to learning and teaching...the less appropriate the centralised, bureaucratic form. These are the conditions which prevail in the 1990s."

The extent to which resource-related decisions are decentralized ultimately depends on a variety of factors, including district size, economic conditions and local politics. It is difficult to imagine a time, however, when principals would play no role in budgeting and resource management. At the very least, they are expected to identify resource needs and monitor the allocation of resources.

Implications for principals. The first step in the process of building a budget entails the identification of needs, a task that requires a complex array of inquiries and speculations. Teachers and departments must be asked to anticipate enrollments and necessary staffing and instructional materials. New programs must be accommodated. In the likely event that all needs cannot be satisfied, priorities must be established. Effective school leaders are able to undertake budget-building and the designation of priorities without provoking alarm or undermining morale.

5.3.1 The principal establishes and regularly implements a process for identifying school resource needs and determining the priority of those needs.

Budgets typically are developed at the school level well before principals know what resources will be available to the district in the coming year. When the actual figures are known, they may not coincide with the identified needs of particular schools. In these circumstances, the principal may need to assume the role of advocate, arguing in the community and before district officials for the needs of the school. If the necessary resources cannot be obtained through advocacy, the principal may have to consider alternative ways to generate resources. Grants, community fund raising and appeals for volunteers are some of the ways that creative school leaders attract supplementary resources to support the mission of their school.

5.3.2 The principal functions as an advocate for school resource needs in the community and with district officials.

Once resources are acquired, the principal must make certain that they are allocated as budgeted and used efficiently. The public expects its funds to be expended conscientiously. As the chief financial officer at the school level, the principal is accountable for all expenditures. An accurate, up-to-date bookkeeping system must be maintained so that expenditures can be audited. Questionable management of school finances can result in the public's loss of faith in school leaders, no matter how committed they are to teaching and learning.

5.3.3 The principal maintains accurate, up-to-date records of school income and expenses.

5.3.4 The principal monitors school resources to make certain they are used as efficiently as possible.

School Governance: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. While public schools operate within a complicated array of federal, state and district policies and regulations, they are accorded considerable discretion in a variety of areas, including the allocation of resources, the organization of instruction, student placement, discipline, staff development and extracurricular activities. Decisions are made regarding these and other matters in a number of ways, including top-down directives, advisory bodies and shared decision making. Much of the contemporary reform and restructuring literature stresses the importance of broad-based involvement in school governance. Empowerment is the word frequently used by reformers to describe efforts to increase a sense of ownership and accountability among stakeholders, including teachers, parents and often students.

It is assumed that decisions are more likely to be implemented successfully when those affected by them play a role in the decision-making process. Osborne and Gaebler (1993, pp. 252-253) go further and claim that decentralization 1) increases the flexibility so necessary for organizations in adapting to changing conditions and 2) leads to greater productivity and higher morale.

As those who have experimented with decentralization know, increased participation in decision making does not just happen. People are busy. They also may be suspicious. If the intention of school governance is to provide opportunities for meaningful participation by stakeholders, school leaders must recognize that such initiatives necessitate considerable managerial expertise.

Implications for principals. The first step in managing school governance is to see that mechanisms are in place to facilitate broad-based participation. These mechanisms may include standing and ad hoc committees, advisory groups and management teams. The intention is not to burden people with unnecessary meetings, but to obtain information which increases the likelihood that sound decisions can be made.

5.4.1 The principal provides opportunities for stakeholders to participate in school decision making.

Seeing that sound decisions are made is necessary but not sufficient for effective school governance. Once made, decisions must be implemented. There is considerable evidence to indicate that many decisions are never implemented because organization leaders lack the know-how and political acumen to do so (Pfeffer, 1992). Principals must follow through on decisions to ensure that those responsible for implementing them understand what needs to be done. Monitoring the implementation process may require frequent feedback, encouragement and, on occasion, direct supervision (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988; Prestine, 1993).

5.4.2 The principal follows through on decisions to ensure that they are implemented in a timely and appropriate manner.

Most schools are far too complex to be run effectively by one person. Principals must cultivate leadership among their staff members by delegating authority and helping individuals acquire leadership skills. Shared decision making is of little value when participants lack the knowledge to work productively in groups and teams. Principals must proactively assist teachers who are accustomed to working in isolation to gain the skills and understandings required for collaboration and team work. Principals must function as mentors, identifying staff members with leadership potential and assisting them in assuming new responsibilities (Leithwood, 1992).

5.4.3 The principal helps staff members acquire leadership skills and delegates authority so that these skills can be used for the benefit of the school.

While the trend in school governance clearly involves increased participation in decision making and greater delegation of authority, it must be noted that principals are still held accountable for virtually everything that occurs in their schools (Smylie et al., 1994). Most school districts have yet to devise a system of collective accountability to support the move to shared decision making and stakeholder empowerment. As a consequence, principals need to understand their legal responsibilities and the expectations of their supervisors.

Student Discipline: Assumptions and Implications for Principals

Assumptions. It is likely that student discipline is one of the least popular aspects of school management for most teachers and school administrators, yet they acknowledge that teaching and learning cannot take place amid disorder and disruption. All organizations require some measure of control to ensure that people remain focused on central purposes. With children and young adults, some of whom would prefer to be elsewhere, the task of maintaining order is truly challenging.

Control becomes more of a concern as organizational size increases. It is much easier to employ informal means for achieving appropriate behavior when teachers and administrators know students by name and interact with them on a regular basis. Establishing relationships is generally preferable to enforcing rules when it comes to promoting good discipline. As school size grows, personal contact alone may be insufficient to establish discipline. For this reason, many school systems have considered reducing the size of larger schools.

Implications for principals. For productive teaching and learning to occur, students and staff members need to know that they, and their personal property, will be safe and respected. Consequently, principals must see that rules and procedures are established that encourage appropriate behavior (Duke, 1990; Wilson & Corcoran, 1988). Since rules and procedures are of little value if people do not know them or if they are applied inconsistently and unfairly, principals also must monitor staff efforts to ensure that students understand behavioral expectations and that rules are enforced consistently and fairly. When students perceive that rules are sensible and that disciplinary measures are carried out consistently with firmness and fairness, they are more likely to conduct themselves appropriately, thereby reducing lost instructional time and enhancing perceptions of order and stability.

5.5.1 The principal establishes, implements and monitors disciplinary processes which promote order, respect and safety for those who work in and attend school.

5.5.2 The principal sees that clear expectations for student conduct are developed and shared on a regular basis.

While many discipline problems can be eliminated or, at least, contained by the systematic and consistent enforcement of rules, it is unlikely that inappropriate behavior can be completely eliminated. When problems arise that cannot be handled by teachers and other staff members, principals are expected to serve as disciplinarians. Specific functions may include fact-finding, determining guilt, contacting parents and sometimes law enforcement officials, and meting out punishment.

5.5.3 The principal acts as the school's chief disciplinarian in cases that cannot be handled by other staff members.

Student misconduct sometimes reveals aspects of the school that are dysfunctional. In their capacity as troubleshooters, principals should periodically assess the nature and scope of behavior problems to determine whether changes are needed (Duke, 1987). For example, frequent referrals for disciplinary action from particular teachers may be an indication of inadequate classroom management skills. Chronic student absenteeism could be a sign of domestic or emotional concerns. Principals are often in the best position to monitor student behavior in order to identify possible targets for intervention.

5.5.4 The principal assesses student behavior problems on a regular basis to determine possible targets for instructional improvement and student intervention.

The functions covered in this chapter represent, for the most part, traditional managerial concerns. While they are not as directly focused on teaching and learning as the functions in Chapters 5 and 6, these managerial functions are essential to the stability and order of schools. A climate of continuous improvement of teaching and learning depends on such stability and order. It would be a serious mistake to confuse these necessary organizational conditions with resistance to change and status quo thinking. The effective school leader recognizes that stability and change are compatible and interdependent.

8.

Postscript- Emerging Developments in School Management

Before concluding this analysis of school leadership functions, it may be beneficial to take a brief look at the future. Most of the discussion to this point has been based on scholarship dealing with contemporary schools. It is, of course, much safer to specify what school leaders must do today to be effective than to speculate on what they may be required to do tomorrow. Still, failure to anticipate emerging needs and their consequences for school leaders would be a mistake.

Ample evidence exists that the context in which schools operate is undergoing extensive change. Values are shifting along with living patterns. Consumers of school services demand more choices. The lines separating public and private organizations are blurring. Pressure is mounting for greater interagency cooperation to deal with the needs of at-risk youth. Notions of organization are changing, causing many to rethink the design and structure of schools and school systems. All of these changes are likely to affect the nature of school management.

A variety of references were reviewed in order to better understand the evolving managerial functions of the principal, including the books on educational reform cited at the end of this section.

In addition, a number of books from the business reform literature that dealt with the need for organizational change and new types of management were examined and are also included at the end of this section.

While each of the references we consulted differed somewhat in perspective, underlying assumptions and recommendations, considerable agreement was found concerning the direction in which tomorrow's organization must head and the nature of its management. Five aspects of "the new management" emerged as particularly important: the management of mission, competition, accountability, empowerment and organizational culture. A discussion of each of these aspects of the new management follows.

Management of Mission

When mission was mentioned in the past, images of visionary leaders scanning the horizon for new worlds to conquer were invoked. Leadership was closely associated with forging a sense of direction that could inspire the confidence of followers. Today, however, the literature recognizes the key roles of customers and followers in setting direction. Missions no longer are produced by one person, but result from extensive collaboration. Students of leadership now recognize that the creation of a mission is only one step in an

extensive process. Once developed, a mission must be translated into reality. It is this process that we refer to as the management of mission.

To understand what is entailed in managing a school's mission, it is necessary to understand the nature of the mission. Reformers note that mission must be tied directly to outcomes (Gerstner, 1994; Marshall & Tucker, 1992; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). No longer is it acceptable to define the mission of a school in terms of guaranteeing certain inputs of assuring compliance with policies, rules and regulations. The outcomes around which mission should be molded must deal directly with student performance. Mention also is made of customer satisfaction as a crucial outcome (Gerstner, 1994). Opinions vary regarding who are the public schools' customers, but agreement is widespread that politicians and bureaucrats no longer should be seen as the primary groups that educators must try to please.

A number of reformers call for outcomes to be "benchmarked," meaning that levels of desired performance should be set in accordance with the highest standards of current achievement (Boyett & Conn, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Marshall & Tucker, 1992). In many cases, the benchmarks for American students will be derived from the performance of foreign students.

Once an outcome-based mission has been developed, it must be communicated to students, patrons and employees. A mission is of little practical view if the principal alone understands it. Articulating the mission of the school to all stakeholders, therefore, is the first dimension of mission management. This task may require translating the mission into specific performance objectives or expectations (Gerstner, 1994; Marshall & Tucker, 1992).

Collecting data concerning the extent to which the school's mission is being achieved is another aspect of mission management, as well as the management of accountability. The use of outcome data to evaluate, improve and reward the performance of teachers and other school employees will be addressed in the upcoming section on accountability. For present purposes, the primary value of outcome data is to inform school improvement efforts. Principals are expected to review data in order to 1) identify discrepancies between actual performance and intended mission and 2) determine why the mission is not being achieved. Outcome data also are used to revise school mission and set new performance targets. The process of monitoring mission and outcomes is best viewed as continuous rather than episodic.

Ensuring that specific school-based strategies for achieving school mission are developed is another dimension of mission management. Senge (1990) regards such activity as a design function, entailing the integration of vision, values and purpose. Gerstner (1994) considers

the development of mission-based strategies to require building a network of people willing to undertake the strategy. Principals who lack a strong background in learning theory and teaching research are unlikely to be able to contribute to the development of strategies associated with the achievement of student outcomes (Leaders for American's Schools, 1988).

Management of Competition

Most reformers acknowledge that school mission will increasingly be influenced by market conditions (Boyett & Conn, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Marshall & Tucker, 1992; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). No longer will public schools have the luxury of operating under monopolistic conditions. As a consequence, principals will need to understand how markets function and how to enable their schools to be competitive. The image of the entrepreneur has been used by several writers to capture this new aspect of school management (Gerstner, 1994; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993).

The first obligation of the entrepreneur is to know the customer (Gerstner, 1994; Handy, 1990; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). Customer satisfaction becomes an important basis for determining accountability (Gerstner, 1994). Principals need to act as if parents have a choice of schools (Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). Increasingly, of course, parents do have a choice. Even when alternatives are unavailable, though, managing schools as if customers could go elsewhere forces educators to anticipate student needs and carefully monitor their progress.

Seeing that programs are available to meet the needs of students is the second important aspect of managing competition (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993; Sizer, 1992). One criticism of contemporary schools is that many programs focus on remediating failure. If educators know their students' needs and develop programs to match these needs, programs are more likely to prevent learning problems rather than correct the results of failure.

Carefully designed programs are of little value, of course, if students are assigned to programs carelessly. Principals must be responsible, therefore, for seeing that students are properly assigned. The expectation is not that principals will personally assign all students, but that they will monitor the process of assignment and correct misassignments quickly.

In some instances, student needs may be better served by individuals or agencies outside the school. Consequently, an aspect of entrepreneurial management entails "outsourcing" or subcontracting for services (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Handy, 1990; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993; Sizer, 1992). Principals must be able to draft specifications for desired services, promote competition among service providers for the best services at the lowest prices, arrange for contracts with service providers and manage contracts to ensure that desired services continue to be provided. Advocates of outsourcing observe that it is unrealistic to expect one

organization to do everything equally well (Handy, 1990).

Another aspect of the management of competition involves knowing the competition (Marshall & Tucker, 1992). In the past, principals have not made a point of learning about programs available at other schools, public or nonpublic. Most students had no choice of the school they attended. Today choice is becoming available to more students. Alternatives exist within public school systems as well as outside of them. Principals no longer can take their clientele for granted. If other schools' enrollments are growing, it is essential for principals to understand why.

No discussion of entrepreneurial management can occur without reference to resources. Schools that fail to attract students no longer can count on the resources necessary to continue. Principals must be able to market their schools to ensure enrollments remain high (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). In addition, they must serve as advocates for resources in the community (Gerstner, 1994; Leaders for America's Schools, 1988). Schools are not only competing with each other for students; they are competing with other sectors of the economy for resources. Principals share an obligation to keep the community informed about the financial needs of their schools and the importance of adequate funding.

Management of Accountability

Principals have long been held accountable for their performance, but conceptions of adequate performance have changed dramatically in recent years. Accountability in the past tended to be based on compliance with rules, regulations and policies. Since principals were expected to comply with these guidelines, their evaluation of teachers and other staff members also focused on compliance. Little effort was made to link performance appraisal directly to student outcomes.

The meaning of accountability is rapidly changing. States and school systems increasingly are waiving rules, regulations and policies in favor of outcomes. This shift in focus from compliance to outcomes is transforming the management of accountability. Traditional supervision and evaluation activities are being replaced by greater reliance on coordination, support and incentives. Old-style command-and-control management is ill-suited to the needs of tomorrow's school (Handy, 1990; Sizer, 1992).

Coordination entails a variety of managerial functions, ranging from reminding staff members of school mission and intended outcomes to creating opportunities for teachers to plan together. The ultimate objective of coordination is to foster a spirit of collective accountability, where all staff members share responsibility for achieving school goals (Boyett

& Conn, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Handy, 1990; Sizer, 1992). As collective accountability builds, the principal ceases to be regarded as the individual responsible for everything.

Greater coordination and shared responsibility make it possible for principals to play more supportive roles. Instead of focusing on whether or not teachers exhibit relatively routine behaviors, for example, principals can encourage teachers to grow professionally by examining their students' performance, reflecting on their instructional practice and sharing information with colleagues. In some cases, principals themselves function as teachers, demonstrating how to identify assumptions, test models of professional practice and reason through problems (Senge, 1990).

Another aspect of the management of accountability involves the use of incentives to facilitate achievement of school mission (Gerstner, 1994; Handy, 1990; Osborne & Gaebler, 1993). Principals will increasingly be expected to reward staff members based on performance. In order to do so in a fair and equitable manner, principals must constantly monitor progress toward desired outcomes, a process that could entail reviewing test results, interim progress reports, report cards, portfolios of student work and other evidence of student achievement.

Management of Empowerment

If one word characterizes the reform literature, it is "empowerment". Traditional managerial practice has been associated with denying a voice in decision making to those who carry out and are affected by organizational decisions. Such practice has been linked to poor performance and low morale (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Drucker, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Handy, 1990; Marshall & Tucker, 1992). Principals increasingly are expected to provide opportunities for teachers, staff members, students, parents and community members to participate in school decision making.

Shared decision making is increasing, in part, because the central administrations of school districts are recognizing the importance of developing greater authority within individual schools. This trend toward decentralization, which started in private industry and has come to be referred to as site-based management in school systems, opens up opportunities for local involvement in decisions concerning such matters as resource allocation, curriculum and personnel matters (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Handy, 1990; Sizer, 1992). The guiding assumption holds that individuals and groups are more likely to be accountable for the consequences of decisions in which they have directly participated.

Another development that has facilitated the spread of shared decision making is the blurring of lines separating teachers and administrators (Sizer, 1992). Many teachers in the past viewed opportunities for involvement in decision making with suspicion, since they felt ultimate influence resided solely with the administration. As chances for teachers to exercise leadership have expanded, so has their ability to influence. Principals, recognizing that they cannot personally manage all aspects of today's complex public school, are learning to delegate authority and form leadership teams (Boyett & Conn, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Handy, 1990; Sizer, 1992). The role of principal is becoming that of a leader of leaders. The principals who are likely to be most effective in the future will be those most skilled at helping others learn to lead.

The key elements of the management of empowerment, therefore, include delegating authority, team building, teaching others to exercise leadership and coordinating opportunities for shared decision making. These functions all require time, invariably a scarce commodity in any school. Principals must manage the school calendar in ways that protect time for shared decision making. Empowerment means little if staff schedules prevent them from participating in governance activities.

Management of Organizational Culture

In recent years, students of organizations have recognized that organizations develop distinctive cultures, encompassing different norms, aspirations, conceptions of success, rituals and unofficial roles. Effective organizations possess cultures that often vary dramatically from the cultures of ineffective organizations. Organizational cultures represent contexts within which the work of organizations is shaped, carried out and given meaning. Administrators play key roles in sustaining, as well as creating, organizational culture.

Educational and business reform literature places great importance on the management of cultures that promote cooperation, accountability and high performance. Key aspects of culture management include the development and reinforcement of shared values, the integration of culture and mission, and the promotion of continuous improvement.

Shared values form the heart of an organizational culture (Handy, 1990). Among the values which receive particular attention in the reform literature are teamwork (Boyett & Conn, 1992; Gerstner, 1994; Handy, 1990; Sizer, 1992), trust (Boyett & Conn, 1992), truth (Senge 1990) and service (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992). Some values are noticeable by their absence. The cultures of effective organizations show no great reverence for the status quo (Senge, 1990) or compliance with rules and regulations (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992). Principals must ensure that agreement is reached regarding key values guiding professional

practice and that members of the school community are regularly reminded of these values. Exemplars of particular values should be recognized for their contributions to school culture, and efforts to understand why deviations from key values occur need to be undertaken.

The culture of a school is of little value in the long run unless it serves the school's mission. Mission ultimately gives meaning to the work of students and teachers. It conveys a sense that individuals are engaged in something greater than themselves (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). Principals need to monitor culture to see that shared values, norms and aspirations support school mission and goals (Gerstner, 1994; Marshall & Tucker, 1992). Rituals and ceremonies that celebrate progress toward goals are important elements of school culture.

Managing school culture also entails promoting an expectation of continuous improvement. It is tempting, particularly for schools that have achieved a measure of success, to view change with suspicion. While change does not always benefit schools, lack of change rarely guarantees success. Principals who keep staff members focused on improvement provide opportunities for inquiry regarding performance (Senge, 1990) and for group learning (*Leaders for America's School*, 1988). These activities have been associated with professional cultures (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Marshall & Tucker, 1992; Sizer, 1992).

References on Educational Reform

- Caldwell, B.J. & Spinks, J.M. (1992). *Leading the Self-Managing School*. London: Falmer.
- Gerstner, L.V. (1994). *Reinventing Education*. New York: Dutton.
- Leaders for America's Schools: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration* (1988).
- Marshall, R. & Tucker, M. (1992). *Thinking for a Living: Education and the Wealth of Nations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government*. New York: Plume.
- Sizer, T.R. (1992). *Horace's School*. Boston: Houghton.

References on Business Reform

- Boyett, J.H. & Conn, H.P. (1992). *Workplace 2000: The Revolution Reshaping American Business*. New York: Plume.
- Bluestone, B. & Bluestone, I. (1992). *Negotiating the Future*. New York: Basic Books.
- Drucker, P. R. (1992). *Managing for the Future*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Handy, C. (1990). *The Age of Unreason*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Leinberger, P. & Tucker, B. (1991). *The New Individualists*. (New York: Harper Collins).
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday Currency.

A Final Thought

As we have developed our thoughts about effective leadership for Connecticut's schools, we have faced the paradox confronted by all those engaged in preparing leaders. Should we prepare leaders for today's schools or tomorrow's? If we are pleased with the schools we have, we can be guided by the realities of current school administration. If we believe that schools must change in order to serve a rapidly changing society, then preparing leaders for today's schools will ensure school leaders' obsolescence. The problem is this--at any given time some people are pleased with the schools they have and some are not.

In composing our vision of effective leadership, we have made an honest effort to keep one eye on the horizon and one eye on the ground in front of us. It makes little sense either to focus so completely on a distant goal that we stumble over each step or to concentrate exclusively on taking one step at a time and lose sight of where we should be headed in the long run. We refuse to think of school administration in dichotomous terms, as if it were only leadership or only management, either rooted in reality or visionary. Leadership is special, precisely because it entails a marriage of seeming opposites.

References

- Arter, J.; Stiggins, R.; Duke D.L.; & Sagor, R. (1993). Promoting assessment literacy among principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77 (556), 1-8.
- Ashton, P.T., & Webb, R.B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York: Longman.
- Bacharach, S.B. (1988). Four themes of reform: An editorial essay. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 24, 484-496.
- Baird, L.L. (1983). *Review of problem solving skills*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bass, B.M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: The Free Press. (Chapter 23, pp. 407-418).
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1987). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Begley, P., & Leithwood, K. (1990). The influence of values on administrator practices. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 3(4), 337-352.
- Berger, P.L., & Luckman, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.
- Blase, J. (1993). The micropolitics of effective school-based leadership: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(2), 142-163.
- Bloom, B. (1976). *Human characteristics and school learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bluestone, B., & Bluestone, I. (1992). *Negotiating the future*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blumenfield, F. (1978). Science - yesterday, today and tomorrow. In D. Orlosky & B. Smith (Eds.). *Curriculum development: Issues and insights*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1987). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing of organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (1991). *Reframing Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 314-329.
- Bossert, S. (1988). School effects. In N. Boyan (Ed.). *Handbook of research on educational administration*. New York: Longman.
- Boyett, J.H., & Conn, H.P. (1992). *Workplace 2000: The revolution reshaping American business*. New York: Plume.

- Bransford, J. (in press). Who ya gonna call? Thoughts about teaching and problem solving. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood & J. Murphy (Eds.). *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Brookfield, S.D. (1984). Self-directed adult learning: A critical paradigm. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 35(2), 59-71.
- Brown, S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, January-February, 32-42.
- Burrello, L.C., & Reitzug, U.C. (1993). Transforming context and developing culture in schools. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 71, 669-677.
- Caldwell, B.J., & Spinks, J.M. (1992). *Leading the self-managing school*. London: Falmer.
- Calfee, R. (1981). Cognitive psychology and educational practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 9, 3-74.
- Campo, C. (1993). Collaborative school cultures: How principals make a difference. *School Organization*, 13(2), 119-127.
- Canady, R.L. & Rettig, M.D. (1995). *Block Scheduling*. Princeton: Eye on Education.
- Cheng, Y.C. (1993). Profiles in organizational culture and effective schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(2), 85-110.
- Cheng, Y.C. (in press). Principals' leadership as a critical factor of school performance: Evidence from multi-levels of primary schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*.
- Coleman, J., et al (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Coleman, P., & LaRocque, L. (1990). *Struggling to be good enough*. London: Falmer Press.
- Comer, J. (1980). *School power: implications of an intervention project*. New York: Free Press.
- Corno, L., & Snow, R.E. (1986). Adapting teachers to individual differences among learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching (3rd edition)*. New York: MacMillan.
- Courter, R.L., Ward, B.A. (1983). Staff development for school improvement. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.), *Staff development* (pp. 185-209). Chicago, IL: The National Society for the Study of Education.
- Crandall, D., Thompson, C., & Taylor, J. (1980). *The National Diffusion Network: A special report*. Andover, MD: The Network Inc.
- Crooks, T.J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of Educational Research*, 58(4), 438-482.

- Deal, T., & Peterson, K. (1990). *Principal's role in shaping school culture*. U.S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Derry, S.J., & Murphy, D.A. (1986). Designing systems that train learning ability: From theory to practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 56(1), 1-39.
- Drucker, P.R. (1992). *Managing for the future*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Duke, D. (1986). The aesthetics of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22(1), 7-28.
- Duke, D. (1987). *School leadership and instructional improvement*. New York: Random House.
- Duke, D. (1990). Developing teacher evaluation systems that promote professional growth. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 4, 131-144.
- Duke, D. (1992, April). *Concepts of administrative effectiveness and the evaluation of school administrators*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Duke, D., & Canady, R.L. (1991). *School Policy*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Duke, D. & Stiggins, R. (1986). *Teacher evaluation--five keys to growth*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Dwyer, D.C., Lee, G.V., Rowan, B., & Bossert, S.T. (1983). *Five principals in action: Perspectives on instructional management*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Earl, L., & Cousins, B. (1991). Student evaluation. In A. Hargreaves, K. Leithwood, D. Gerin-LaJoie, D. Thiessen, & B. Cousins (Eds.). *Exemplary practices in the transition years*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Eisner, E. (Ed.) (1985). *Learning and teaching the ways of knowing: Eighty-fourth yearbook of NSSE*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, J.L. (1987). Parent involvement: State education agencies should lead the way. *Community Education Journal*, 14, 4-9.
- Erickson, F. (1987). Conceptions of school culture. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23, 11-24.
- Fennell, H.A. (1992). Leadership for change: Principals and power-sharing. *The Canadian Administrator*, 31(8), 1-12.
- Fieman-Nemser, S., & Floden R.E. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: MacMillan.
- Ford, M.E. (1992). *Motivating humans: Goals, emotions and personal agency beliefs*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Fredericksen, N. (1984). Implications of cognitive theory for instruction in problem solving. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(3), 363-407.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1992) (Eds.). *Teacher development and educational change*. New York: Falmer.
- Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. (1977). Research on curriculum and instruction implementation. *Review of Educational Research, 47*(1), 335-397.
- Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Gagne, E.D. (1985). *The cognitive psychology of school learning*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Gallagher, J. (1979). Concerning natural competency examinations in education, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1*(1), 62-67.
- Gallmeier, K. (1992). *Effectiveness of principal leadership style on teacher motivation*. EDRS Document.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gerstner Jr., L. V. (1994). *Reinventing education*. New York: Dutton.
- Gideonse, H.D. (1988). Practitioner-oriented inquiry by teachers: Meaning, justification and implications for school structure. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4*, 65-76.
- Glickman, C., Allan, L., & Lunsford, B.F. (1994). Voices of principals from democratically transformed schools. In J. Murphy & K. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts* (pp. 203-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Goldring, E.B., & Rallis, S.F. (1993, April). *Principals as environmental leaders: The external ink for facilitating change*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1986). School effects. In M. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: MacMillan Publishers.
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1992). *Looking in classrooms* (5th edition). New York: Harper Collins.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Green, T. (1987). The conscience of leadership. In L. Shieve & M. Schoenheit (Eds.). *Leadership: Examining the elusive*. 1987 ASCD Yearbook.
- Greenfield, T. (1985). The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21*(4), 99-119.
- Greenfield, W.D., Licata, J.W., & Johnson, B.L. (1992). Toward measurement of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration, 30*(2), 65-76.

- Gullickson, A.R. (1984). Teacher perspectives of their instructional use of tests. *Journal of Educational Research*, 77(4), 244-248.
- Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis, K. (1990). *What makes a difference? School context, principal leadership and student achievement*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University, mimeo.
- Hallinger, P., & Hausman, C. (1994, April). *From Attila the Hun to Mary had a little lamb: Principal role ambiguity in restructured schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., & Hausman, C. (1992). Restructuring schools: Principals' perceptions of fundamental educational reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 330-349.
- Handy, C. (1990). *The age of unreason*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Harisun, M. (1991, January). *Social justice resource schools: A case study of a school effectiveness strategy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, Cardiff, Wales.
- Haughey, M., & MacElwain, L. (1992). Principals as instructional supervisors. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XXXVIII(2), 105-119.
- Heald-Taylor, G. (1991). *An investigation of the relationships among school goal-setting procedures, school goal consensus and the cohesiveness of a school's culture*. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Heck, R. H. (1992). Principals' instructional leadership and school performance: Implications for policy development. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(1), 21-43.
- Helm, C. M. (1989). *Cultural and symbolic leadership in Catholic elementary schools: An ethnographic study*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1978). *Towards a philosophy of administration*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Iran-Nejad, A. (1990). Active and dynamic self-regulation of learning processes. *Review of Educational Research*, 60(4), 573-602.
- Jencks, C. et al (1972). *Inequality*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Jenkins, H. (1992, August). *School principals - entrepreneurial professionals*. Paper presented at the Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Council for Education, Hong Kong.
- Johnson, D.N. (1992, April). *Principal vision, environmental robustness, and teacher sense of autonomy at the high school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1986). *Models of teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Kagan, J., & Kogan, N. (1970). Individual variation in cognitive processes. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.). *Carmichael's manual of child psychology: Volume 1*. New York: Wiley.
- Kanter, R. M. When a thousand flowers bloom: structural, collective and social conditions for innovation in organization. In Barry M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 10 (Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1988).
- Keller, J., & Heskett, J. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kelly, T. (1990). Effective schools: correlates and technology. *The Effective School Report*, 8(8), 1-6.
- Kelly, T. (1992). Implementing effective schools through comprehensive school improvement plans. *The Effective School Report*, 10(2), p. 3.
- King, M. I. (1989). *Extraordinary leadership in education: Transformational and transactional leadership and predictors of effectiveness, satisfaction and organizational climate in K-12 and higher education*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Kirby, P.C., & Bogotch, I. (1993, April). *Information utilization in restructuring schools: The role of the beginning principal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Kirby, P.C., King, M.I., & Paradose, L.V. (1992). Extraordinary leaders in education: Understanding transformational leadership. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 85(5), 303-311.
- Kleine-Kracht, P. (1993). Indirect instructional leadership: An administrator's choice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(2), 187-212.
- Knowles, M. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to androgogy (2nd edition)*. New York: The Adult Education Company.
- Kotter, J.P., & Heskett, J.L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kowalski, T.J., Reitzug, U.C., McDaniel, P., & Otto, D. (1992). Perceptions of desired skills for effective principals. *Journal of School Leadership*, 2, 299-309.
- Leaders for America's schools: The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration* (1988).
- Lee, V. E., Smith, J. B., & Cioci, M. (1993). Teachers and principals: Gender-related perceptions of leadership and power in secondary schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 153-180.
- Lieberman, A., Falk, B., & Alexander, L. (in press). A culture in the making: Leadership in leader-centered schools. In J. Oakes & K.H. Quartz (Eds.), *Creating new educational committees: Schools and classrooms where all children can be smart*. 94th NSSE Yearbook.

- Lieberman, A., Saxl, E., & Miles, M. (1988). Teacher leadership: Ideology and practice. In A. Lieberman (Ed.). *Building a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leinberger, P., & Tucker, B. (1991). *The New individualists*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Leinhardt, G. (1992). What research on learning tells us about teaching. *Educational Leadership*, April, 20-25.
- Leithwood, K. (1989). School system policies for effective school administration. In M. Holmes, K. Leithwood & D. Musella (Eds.). *Educational policy for effective schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward Transformational Leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 49(5). 8-10.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(3).
- Leithwood, K., & Steinbach, R. (in press). Superintendents' group problem-solving processes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.
- Leithwood, K.A., & Montgomery, D.J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 309-339.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P., & Cousins, B. (1990). The nature, causes and consequences of principals' practices: An agenda for future research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(4), 5-31.
- Leithwood, K., Cousins, B., & Lawton, S. (1989). The relationship between selected characteristics of effective secondary schools and student retention. In B. Creemers, T. Peters, & D. Reynolds (Eds.). *School effectiveness and school improvement*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Leithwood, K., Dart, B., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1991). *Building commitment for change: A focus on school leadership (Final report for year two on the research project: Implementing the primary program)*. Prepared for the British Columbia Ministry of Education.
- Leithwood, K., Dart, B., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1993a). *Fostering organizational learning: A study in British Columbia's intermediate developmental sites, 1990-1992 (Final report for year three of the research project: Implementing the Year 2000 policies)*. Prepared for the British Columbia Ministry of Education.
- Leithwood, K., Dart, B., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1993b). *Building commitment for change and fostering organizational learning: Final report for phase four of the research project: Implementing British Columbia's education policy*. Prepared for the British Columbia Ministry of Education.

- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Fernandez, A. (1994). Transformational leadership and teachers' commitment to change. In J. Murphy & K. Louis (Eds.) (1994), *Reshaping the principalship*. Newbury Park, Cal.: Corwin Press.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Silins, H.C., & Dart, B. (1993). Using the appraisal of school leaders as an instrument for school restructuring. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(2), 85-109.
- Lightfoot, S.L. (1983). *The good high school*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lindsay, P., & Norman, D. (1977). *Human information processing (2nd edition)*. New York: Academic Press.
- Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19(3), 325-340.
- Little, J. (1984). Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. *Teachers College Record*, 86(1), 84-102.
- Little, J. (1989). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of leading. *Review of Research in Education*, 5(16). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Little, J. (1992). Teacher development and educational policy. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.). *Teacher development and educational change*. New York: Falmer.
- Marks, R. (1990). Pedagogical content knowledge: From a mathematical case to a modified conception. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 3-11.
- Marshall, C. (1992). School administrators' values: A focus on atypicals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 368-386.
- Marshall, C., Steele, J.R., & Rogers, D.L. (1993, April). *Caring as a career: An alternative model for educational administration*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Marshall, R., & Tucker, M. (1992). *Thinking for a living: Education and the wealth of nations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Martin, W.J., & Willower, D.J. (1981). The managerial behavior of secondary school principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 69-90.
- Marzano, R.J. (1992). *A different kind of classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Matranga, M., Horner, M.P., Hill, G., & Peltier, G. (1993). Site-based management: A survey of Nevada principals. *The Clearinghouse*, 67(a), 60-62.
- Mawhinney, H.B. (1994, April). Three frames of leadership in opening the high school door to community collaboration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

- McCaslin, M., & Good, T.L. (1992). Compliant cognition: The misalliance of management and instructional goals in current school reform. *Educational Researcher*, 21(3), 4-17.
- McEvoy, B. (1987). Everyday acts: How principals influence development of their staff. *Educational Leadership*, 44(5), 73-77.
- McLaughlin, M. (1990, April). *District contexts for teachers and teaching*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.
- McLaughlin, M., & Pfeifer, R.S. (1988). *Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability, and effective learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McPherson, B. (1988). Superintendents and the problem of delegation. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 65(4), 113-130.
- McPherson, R.B., & Crowson, R. L. (1994). The principal as mini-superintendent under Chicago school reform. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts* (pp. 57-76). Thousand Oakes, CA: Corwin Press.
- Miles, M. (1983). Unraveling the mysteries of institutionalization. *Educational Leadership*, 41, 14-19.
- Mitchell, D.E.; Ortiz, F.I.; & Mitchell, T.K. (1987). *Work orientation and job performance*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Moorhead, R., & Nediger, W. (1989). *Behaviors of effective principals*. Presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Quebec City.
- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D., & Ecob, R. (1988). *School matters*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Murphy, J. (1991). *Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Murphy, J., and Louis, K.S. (1994). *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Newell, A., Rosenbloom, P., & Laird, J. (1990). Symbolic architectures for cognition. In M. Posner (Ed.). *Foundations of cognitive science*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Newton, E.H. (1993). The secondary headship: Perceptions, conceptions, performance and reactions of headteachers in Barbados. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 31(2), 22-42.
- Nias, J., Southwork, G., & Yeomans, R. (1982). *Understanding the primary school as an organization*. London: Cassells.
- Niece, R.D. (1993). The principal as instructional leader: Past influences and current resources. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77(553), 12-18.

- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequity*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1993) *Reinventing government*. New York: Plume.
- Osterman, K.F., Crow, G.M., & Rosen, J. (1993, April). *New principals: Problems, priorities, and preparation*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). *A passion for excellence*. New York: Random House.
- Peterson, K., Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1987). Superintendents' perceptions of the control and coordination of the technical core in effective school districts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 23(1), 79-95.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. (1992). *Managing with Power: politics and influence in organizations*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pierson, P.R., & Bredeson, P.V. (1993). Its not just a laughing matter: School principals' use of humor in interpersonal communications with teachers. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3, 522-533.
- Pitner, N. (1988). The study of administrator effects and effectiveness. In N. Boyan (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Educational Administration*. New York: Longman.
- Place, A.W., & Kowalski, T.J. (1993). Principal ratings of criteria associated with teacher selection. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 7, 291-300.
- Pollack, S., Chrispeels, J., & Watson, D. (1987, April). *A description of factors and implementation strategies used by schools in becoming effective for all students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Administration, Washington, DC.
- Prestine, N.A. (1991). Shared decision making in restructuring essential schools: The role of the principal. *Planning and Changing*, 22(3/4), 160-177.
- Prestine, N.A. (1993). Extending the essential schools metaphor: Principal as enabler. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3, 356-379.
- Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1985). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal*, 84(4), 427-452.
- Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(1), 1-35.
- Rosenblum, S., Louis, K.S., & Rossmiller, R.A. (1994). School leadership and teacher quality of work life in restructuring schools. In J. Murphy & K.S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts* (pp. 991-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' workplace*. New York: Longman.
- Rossmiller, R.A. (1992). The secondary school principal and teachers' quality of work life. *Educational Management and Administration*, 20(3), 132-146.
- Rudduck, J. (1988). The ownership of change as a basis for teachers' professional learning. In J. Calderhead (Ed.). *Teachers' professional learning*. London: Falmer Press.
- Rudduck, J., & Kelly, P. (1976). *The dissemination of curriculum development*. Windsor, Berks.: The NFER Publishing Co.
- Rutter, M., et al (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Sarason, S.B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sashkin, M., & Sashkin, M. (1990, April). *Leadership and culture-building in schools: Quantitative and qualitative understandings*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.
- Schneider, B., & Hochschild, J. (1988). *Career teachers' perceptions of the teaching culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, mimeo.
- Schorr, L. B. (1989). *Within our reach*. New York: Anchor.
- Seeley, D. (1992, April). *Visionary leaders for reforming public education*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Javonovich.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Javonovich.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1992a). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1992b). Reflections on administrative theory and practice in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 304-313.
- Shavelson, R. (1973). What is the basic teaching skill? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 24(2), 144-151.
- Shedd, J., & Bacharach, S. (1991). *Tangled hierarchies: Teachers as professionals and the management of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shepard, L., & Kreitzer, A. (1987). The Texas teacher test. *Educational Researcher*, 16(6), 22-31.
- Shoemaker, D. (1979). Concerning natural competency examinations in education, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1(3), 61-70.

- Shuell, T.J. (1990). Phases of meaningful learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 60(4), 531-547.
- Silins, H.C. (1992). Effective leadership for school reform. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 4, 317-334.
- Silins, H.C. (1994). *Analyzing leadership and its components: What makes the difference?* Adelaide: The Flinders University of South Australia.
- Sizer, T.R. (1992). *Horace's school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Skalbeck, K.L. (1991). *Profile of a transformational leader: A sacred mission*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Skrtic, T.M. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(2), 148-206.
- Slavin, R., Kareweit, N., & Madden, N. (Eds.). (1989). *Effective programs for students at risk*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, J.G. (1989). *The effect of superintendent leader behavior on principal work motivation*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services.
- Smith, W.F., & Andrews, R.L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smylie, M. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing unwillingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(1), 53-67.
- Snyder, J., & Ebmeier, J. (1993). Empirical linkages among principal behaviors and intermediate outcomes: Implications for principal evaluation. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(2), 75-107.
- Srivastva, S., Cooperrider, D., & associates (1990). *Appreciative management and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Starratt, R.J. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 27(2), 185-202.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stiggins, R., & Duke, D. (1988). *The case for commitment to teacher growth: research on teacher evaluation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Strike, K., Haller, E., & Soltis, J. (1988). *The ethics of school administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (1990). School improvement efforts: Quantitative and qualitative data from four naturally occurring experiments in Phases III and IV of the Louisiana school effectiveness study. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(2), 139-161.

- Su, X. (1990). The function of the peer group in teacher socialization. *Phi Delta Kappan*, May, 723-727.
- Tamir, P. (1988). Subject matter and related pedagogical knowledge in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4, 99-110.
- Unknown author (n.d.). *Coping with external environmental constraints: Adaptation patterns of public school administrators*.
- Van Lehn, K. (1989). Problem solving and cognitive skill acquisition. In M.I. Posner (Ed.). *Foundations of cognitive science*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Vandenburghe, R., & Stassens, K. (1991, April). *Vision as a core component in school culture*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Walberg, H. (1986). Synthesis of research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching (3rd edition)*. New York: MacMillan.
- Walters, J.M., & Gardner, H. (1986). The theory of multiple intelligences: Some issues and answers. In R. Sternberg & R. Wagner (Eds.). *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- Wehlage, G.G.; Rutter, R.A.; Smith, G.A.; Lesko, N.; & Fernandez, R.R. (1989). *Reducing the Risk*. London: Falmer.
- White, R., & Tisher, R. (1986). Research on natural sciences. In M. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. New York: MacMillan Publishers.
- Willower, D., & Kmetz, J.T. (1982, April). *The managerial behavior of elementary school principals*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Wilson, B., & Corcoran, T. (1988). *Successful secondary schools*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Yukl, G. (Ed.) (1989). *Leadership in organizations (2nd edition)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zimmerman, B.J., & Schunk, D.H. (1989). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Appendix A

Summary of Assumptions about Productive Schools

1. Assumptions About the Educated Person

1.1 *The educated person possessed those qualities, outlined in some detail in Connecticut's Common Core of Learning. These qualities include Aspects of Character, Skills and Competencies, and Understandings and Applications. Acquisition of the specific qualities included in each of those categories permit the educated person to:*

- 1.1.1 think and act independently;
- 1.1.2 respond productively to a changing world;
- 1.1.3 play a useful role in shaping a desirable future for self, family, immediate community and more distant communities;
- 1.1.4 understand, appreciate and be sensitive to the diverse nature of society and to view cultural diversity as an opportunity;
- 1.1.5 pursue further education; and
- 1.1.6 make a successful transition to the world of work.

2. Assumptions About the Learning Process

- 2.1 *Learning is a process of constructing personal meaning or "sense making."*
- 2.2 *Meaning is constructed in the process of comparing existing understandings (organized into "knowledge structures" or "schema") with perceptions of the environment - the school's curriculum, for example - and (a) finding matches with existing understanding or knowledge structures and/or (b) adapting and adding new elements to existing knowledge structures.*
- 2.3 *Meaning is also constructed as one develops connections among chunks of knowledge (or knowledge structures) that previously one had not viewed as related.*
- 2.4 *Meaning is socially negotiated. Understandings often are influenced by perceptions of the understandings of others.*
- 2.5 *The motivation to learn arises from one's internalized goals, needs and aspirations.*
- 2.6 *There is considerable variation among learners in the time required to achieve the same outcomes.*
- 2.7 *There is considerable variation among learners in the cognitive processes which they use to achieve the same outcomes.*
- 2.8 *Students often will possess aptitudes in specific areas (or domains) of human functioning and will learn in these domains more readily than in others.*

3. Assumptions About the Teacher' Beliefs and Values

- 3.1 *The teacher is committed to assisting each student to grow toward the image of the educated person (See 1, Assumptions about the Educated Person).*
- 3.2 *The teacher has a sophisticated understanding of the learning process (see 2.1 to 2.7) and its implications for instruction.*
- 3.3 *The teacher is committed to empowering students to become self-directed in their learning.*
- 3.4 *The teacher has mastered a large repertoire of instructional strategies and is able to decide when they are most appropriate to use, considering the desired outcomes of the curriculum, the needs of the learner and other appropriate criteria.*
- 3.5 *The teacher adjusts instruction to accommodate variations among learners in the time required and the processes used to achieve the same outcomes.*
- 3.6 *The teacher is well-grounded in contemporary knowledge about the content of the curriculum area for which he or she is responsible.*
- 3.7 *The teacher encourages students to examine issues from multiple intellectual perspectives.*
- 3.8 *The teacher monitors student learning using a variety of techniques and uses the results to improve instruction.*
- 3.9 *The teacher believes that:*
 - *all students can learn;*
 - *teachers have a significant contribution to make to such learning;*
 - *teachers are responsible for ensuring that students learn;*
 - *fulfilling their responsibility often will require considerable persistence;*
 - *teachers have a leadership role to play with other teachers;*
 - *growth as a teacher requires inquiry and reflection;*
 - *they ought to be models of the educated person (See 1, Assumptions about the Educated Person);*
 - *learning is a life-long responsibility;*
 - *there is power in collaboration; and*
 - *students have a significant role to play in designing their own learning experiences.*
- 3.10 *The teacher values continuous professional growth, and the dignity and diversity of students.*
- 3.11 *The teacher creates and maintains classroom environments that are conducive to teaching and learning.*
- 3.12 *The teacher acts as a highly knowledgeable member of the [classroom] community - a guide, not simply an interactive textbook.*

4. Assumptions About the Purposes and Culture of Productive Schools

4.1 *The productive school is guided by a set of clear goals. These goals are:*

- 4.1.1 consistent with the image of the educated person (See 1, Assumptions about the Educated Person); and
- 4.1.2 readily understood, widely shared and strongly supported by the school staff, the students and the school community.

4.2 *The productive school possesses a robust culture, one characterized by:*

- 4.2.1 a widely shared set of defensible, student-centered norms, beliefs, values and assumptions about professional practices;
- 4.2.2 collaboration among faculty to maintain and improve school programs;
- 4.2.3 commitment to continuing inquiry, dialogue and improvement of instruction;
- 4.2.4 the valuing of diverse opinions and perspectives among staff members; and
- 4.2.5 a willingness to view problems as opportunities for continued learning.

4.3 *The productive school follows policies and procedures that:*

- 4.3.1 enhance the likelihood of all students achieving school and district goals without putting any particular group of students at a disadvantage;
- 4.3.2 support the professional growth of teachers; and
- 4.3.3 link staff selection, evaluation, and development and school improvement.

4.4 *The productive school is organized to:*

- 4.4.1 facilitate the learning of students and the work of staff members: this may involve radically different forms of organization than are found in many schools at present;
- 4.4.2 ensure that teaching and learning take place in a safe and orderly environment;
- 4.4.3 use available resources in ways that enhance the achievement of school goals;
- 4.4.4 promote "organizational learning" (i.e., ease of access to ideas from outside the school, sharing of ideas within the school, quality time available for serious discussion of new ideas within the school);
- 4.4.5 maximize instructional time and minimize interruptions; and
- 4.4.6 provide, to the extent possible, special interventions for students in the context of the regular classroom.

- 4.5 *The productive school supports a faculty that:*
 - 4.5.1 assumes responsibility for their own professional growth; and
 - 4.5.2 includes a high proportion of members with five or more years experience and high levels of attainment in their specialties.
- 4.6 *The productive school provides instruction and programs that are:*
 - 4.6.1 developed and offered in a multidisciplinary and cross-graded manner (vertical and horizontal integration).
 - 4.6.2 based on multiple forms of ongoing student assessment and that meet acceptable levels of reliability and validity.
 - 4.6.3 characterized by high expectations for students, recognizing that students learn at different rates and in different ways;
 - 4.6.4 designed to expose students to multiple perspectives (i.e., cultural, racial, religious, gender, age);
 - 4.6.5 based on current understandings of human behavior and motivation.
- 4.7 *The productive school ensures that relations with the community are characterized by:*
 - 4.7.1 ongoing, constructive dialogue about appropriate school goals;
 - 4.7.2 shared values and beliefs about teaching and learning;
 - 4.7.3 responsiveness to the heterogeneity of its community's ethnic and economic makeup, its cultures, and its religions; and
 - 4.7.4 mutual responsibility, together with families, for fostering productive learning environments outside of school.

Appendix B

Summary of Implications for Effective Principals

1. The Educated Person

The principal ...

- 1.1 possesses an extensive understanding of the school's/state's images of the educated person and implications of these images for the school's programs and for students;*
- 1.2 provides a model, through his or her own behavior, of the school's/state's images of an educated person;*
- 1.3 encourages staff members to model the school's/state's images of an educated person in relations among themselves and with students and parents;*
- 1.4 assists staff members and students to see how specific school goals and programs contribute to the development, among students, of those qualities central to the school's/state's images of an educated person; and*
- 1.5 ensures that parents and staff members, separately and together, have sufficient opportunities to fully understand the school's/state's images of an educated person.*

2. The Learning Process

The principal ...

- 2.1 possesses an extensive understanding of, and assists staff members in developing an understanding of:*
 - 2.1.1 learning as a process of constructing meaning; and*
 - 2.1.2 the needs-based and goal-oriented nature of human motivation;*
- 2.2 communicates the school's assumptions about the learning process and the nature of human motivation with parents and the wider community, assists them in understanding and developing support for these assumptions, and encourages parents to act on such assumptions in the home;*
- 2.3 assists parents and the wider community in understanding and developing support for the school's assumptions about the learning process and the nature of human motivation; and*
- 2.4 encourages parents to interact with their children in ways that reflect the school's assumptions about the learning process and the nature of human motivation.*

3. The Teacher

The principal ...

- 3.1 *possesses or develops, as part of his or her vision, a detailed, defensible conception of the qualities needed by teachers;*
- 3.2 *assists teachers in determining the implications for their instruction of an understanding of:*
 - 3.2.1 *learning as a process of constructing meaning; and*
 - 3.2.2 *the needs-based and goal-oriented nature of human motivation;*
- 3.3 *provides regular opportunities for teachers to remain well-grounded in knowledge of the curriculum area(s) for which they are responsible;*
- 3.4 *models assumptions about the teacher in her or his staff development initiatives and relationships with teachers, students and parents; and*
- 3.5 *provides stimulation and regular opportunities for staff members to reflect on their professional beliefs, values and performance in relation to desired student learning.*

4. Assumptions About the Purposes and Culture of Productive Schools

4.1 *School goals: The principal ...*

- 4.1.1 *involves school staff members, students and the school community in establishing and periodically reviewing school goals which are consistent with the school's and state's images of the educated person;*
- 4.1.2 *ensures that school goals are clear, readily understood, widely shared and strongly supported by members of the school staff, students and the school community;*
- 4.1.3 *uses both formal and informal means to periodically check on the understanding of and the support for school goals by school staff members, students and the school community; and*
- 4.1.4 *facilitates the development and articulation of a compelling vision based school goals and shared values.*

4.2 *School culture: The principal ...*

- 4.2.1 *skillfully uses multiple strategies to influence the strength, form and content of the school's culture so that it is more supportive of practices contributing to student learning. Such strategies are likely to include:-using a variety of organizational mechanisms (e.g., hiring new staff members) to reinforce the culture;*
-communicating the form and content of the culture to others on most occasions where this is possible;
-using symbols and rituals to reinforce cultural norms, values, beliefs and assumptions;

- fostering staff members and professional development; and
- sharing power and responsibility with others in the school.
- 4.2.2 assists staff in gaining an appreciation for the potential of a collaborative professional culture for enhancing the school's contribution to student learning;
- 4.2.3 assists staff members in finding opportunities for collaboration;
- 4.2.4 assists staff members in acquiring skills of collaboration;
- 4.2.5 reinforces, among staff members, values which support:
 - continuing inquiry, dialogue and improvement of instruction;
 - constructive diversity of opinion and perspective; and
 - the viewing of problems as opportunities for continued learning.

4.3-4.4: The Structural and Organizational Characteristics of Productive Schools

- 4.3 *School policies and procedures: The principal ...*
 - 4.3.1 *develops and implements, with staff members and parents, policies and procedures which enhance the likelihood of all students achieving the school's goals without putting any particular group of students at a disadvantage. Policies and procedures are likely to address such matters as homework, assignments, monitoring of student progress, and provision of extra resources to students with special needs;*
 - 4.3.2 *in collaboration with staff members, develops and implements a coherent, integrated set of policies for staff selection, evaluation, development and school improvement that are designed to promote student achievement;*
 - 4.3.3 *collaborates with each staff member in developing and regularly reviewing a professional growth plan; and*
 - 4.3.4 *establishes a variety of opportunities, both within and outside the school, for staff members to implement their personal growth plans.*
- 4.4 *School organization and resources: The principal ...*
 - 4.4.1 *initiates with staff members periodic reviews of school policies and organization, with the intention of constantly improving student learning, staff productivity, and relations between school and community;*
 - 4.4.2 *facilitates and oversees a constant flow of information on new practices and evaluations of existing practices and provides opportunities for staff members to analyze and discuss the information;*
 - 4.4.3 *critically examines with staff members, on a regular basis, the models and assumptions used to assess their own and the school's effectiveness; and*

- 4.4.4 *determines, with staff members, patterns of resource allocation most likely to accomplish school goals with greatest efficiency.*
- 4.5 *The teaching faculty: The principal ...*
 - 4.5.1 *expects and encourages each staff member to assume responsibility for his or her development as a professional and to undertake activities related to his or her continuing professional development; and*
 - 4.5.2 *involves staff members in planning and implementing activities designed to promote collective growth for the purpose of achieving school and district goals.*
- 4.6 *Programs and instruction: The principal ...*
 - 4.6.1 *ensures that school structures and practices promote curriculum articulation and integration within and across all grades and levels;*
 - 4.6.2 *develops with staff members a variety of methods for conveying high expectations for students;*
 - 4.6.3 *acts to maximize instructional time and encourages staff members to make effective use of non-classroom time;*
 - 4.6.4 *provides support to staff members in the design and use of multiple forms of assessment;*
 - 4.6.5 *facilitates the use of assessment data for instructional and program improvement; and*
 - 4.6.6 *monitors student progress and, both in collaboration with and independent of staff members, facilitates the adjustment of instruction for students who do not experience success in the regular classroom or through organizational restructuring.*
- 4.7 *School-community relations: The principal ...*
 - 4.7.1 *facilitates a continuous dialogue among the staff and community concerning school goals, assumptions about learning and the nature of effective instruction;*
 - 4.7.2 *encourages active parental involvement in the life of the school; and*
 - 4.7.3 *assists staff members in acquiring community resources for use in school programs.*
- 5. Order and Stability**
 - 5.1 *Communication and coordination: The principal ...*
 - 5.1.1 *utilizes a variety of communication channels to keep school employees, students and parents informed about the school's mission, goals, expectations, instructional objectives, operating procedures, rules and other matters of importance;*
 - 5.1.2 *utilizes a variety of communication channels to encourage school employees, students and parents to express their feelings and concerns;*
 - 5.1.3 *provides accurate, credible and timely feedback on performance as well as frequent recognition for achievement;*

- 5.1.4 *fosters coordination by encouraging and supporting teams and building links between the school and other organizations; and*
- 5.1.5 *promotes problem management through troubleshooting and conflict mediation.*
- 5.2 *Management of time: the principal ...*
 - 5.2.1 *arranges opportunities for staff members to plan together on a regular basis;*
 - 5.2.2 *arranges opportunities for staff members to participate in professional and staff development activities;*
 - 5.2.3 *arranges opportunities for staff members to participate in school governance; and*
 - 5.2.4 *maintains a high level of visibility throughout the school, particularly in classrooms.*
- 5.3 *Budget and resource management: The principal ...*
 - 5.3.1 *establishes and regularly implements a process for identifying school resource needs and determining the priority of those needs;*
 - 5.3.2 *functions as an advocate for school resource needs in the community and with district officials;*
 - 5.3.3 *maintains accurate, up-to-date records of school income and expenses; and*
 - 5.3.4 *monitors school resources to make certain they are used as efficiently as possible.*
- 5.4 *School governance: The principal ...*
 - 5.4.1 *provides opportunities for stakeholders to participate in school decision making;*
 - 5.4.2 *follows through on decisions to ensure that they are implemented in a timely and appropriate manner; and*
 - 5.4.3 *helps staff members acquire leadership skills and delegates authority so that these skills can be used for the benefit of the school.*
- 5.5 *Student discipline: The principal ...*
 - 5.5.1 *establishes, implements and monitors disciplinary processes which promote order, respect and safety for those who work in and attend school;*
 - 5.5.2 *sees that clear expectations for student conduct are developed and shared on a regular basis;*
 - 5.5.3 *acts as the school's chief disciplinarian in cases that cannot be handled by other staff members; and*
 - 5.5.4 *assesses student behavior problems on a regular basis to determine possible targets for instructional improvement and student intervention.*