

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 139

EA 030 416

AUTHOR Wells, Zella; Rinehart, James S.; Scollay, Susan J.
TITLE Kentucky's Induction-Model Intern Assistant Principals:
Players or Designated Hitters in High-Stakes Accountability?
PUB DATE 1999-10-00
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
University Council for Educational Administration
(Minneapolis, MN, October 29-31, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Assistant Principals; *Competency Based Education;
*Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education;
*Professional Training; *School Administration; Sex
Differences; *Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky; University Council for Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study that sought to achieve three things: (1) to determine the nature of Kentucky's 1997-98 principal interns and assistant principal interns and to compare the work performed by these two types of interns; (2) to ascertain if work differences existed among assistant principal interns according to gender or school level; and (3) to investigate possible changes, including effects of reform initiatives such as high-stakes accountability on the role of 1997-1998 first-year principal and assistant principal interns. All 154 principal interns and assistant principal interns in K-12 public schools were surveyed using a descriptive questionnaire, 134 of whom responded. Findings from this study underscore the continued contradiction between the espoused value of the assistant principalship as an ideal training ground for the principalship and the actual duties performed in 1997-1998 by assistant principal interns in Kentucky. Based on the survey responses, the demographic characteristics of principal and assistant principal interns are more similar than different, with the exception of gender differences. However, the self-reported administrative duties of principal interns were significantly different from those reported by assistant principal interns. Appendixes contain Principal and Assistant Principal Interns' Administrative Duty Rankings. (Contains 43 references.) (DFR)

**KENTUCKY'S INDUCTION-MODEL INTERN ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS:
Players or Designated Hitters in High-Stakes Accountability?**

Zella Wells, Ed.D.
Johnson County Schools
Paintsville, Kentucky 41240
zwells@johnson.k12.ky.us

James S. Rinehart, Ph.D.
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
jsrine01@pop.uky.edu

Susan J. Scollay, Ph.D.
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
scollay@pop.uky.edu

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
University Council for Educational Administration
Minneapolis, Minnesota
October 29-31, 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ★ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

Z. Wells

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA030416



OVERVIEW

This paper is based on findings derived from dissertation research conducted in Kentucky during the 1998 fall semester to achieve the following purposes:

1. From comprehensive job duty (administrative tasks) inventories, comparisons were made between the duty rankings of principal and assistant principal interns to determine if their work differed and if so, the nature and extent of the difference.
2. Similar comparisons were made to ascertain if work differences existed among assistant principal interns according to gender or to school level – elementary, middle, or high.
3. Finally, to investigate the possible effects of Kentucky's education reform initiatives, including high stakes accountability, on the roles of 1997-98 first-year principals and assistant principals, comparisons of Kentucky's 1997-98 secondary assistant principal interns' duty rankings were made to those of three similar studies conducted over the past 30 years, including two National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) national studies (Austin and Brown, 1970; Kalla, 1983; Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, and McCleary, 1988).

Research questions were answered by using a mail survey research methodology. To facilitate the comparability and applicability of this study's findings to previously-acquired information, the raw data gathered from intern surveys were converted into rankings of administrator duties by replicating the procedure followed in the 1965 and 1987 NASSP national surveys of assistant principals (Austin and Brown, 1970; Pellicer et

al., 1988). After completion of the rankings, Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used, as appropriate, to assess whether significant differences occurred between or among various subgroups of the population and to answer specific research questions.

Findings from this study inform the continued and seemingly deepening contradiction between the espoused value of the assistant principalship as an ideal training ground for the principalship and the actual duties performed in 1997-98 by assistant principal interns in Kentucky (Kindsvatter and Tosi, 1971; Laughery, 1959; Kelly, 1987). The disparities found between principal and assistant principals' work raises significant policy and practice issues related to Kentucky's administrative internship program. Work differences suggest that assistant principal interns have more limited opportunities (assigned job duties) than do principal interns to demonstrate proficiency on all six of Kentucky's newly-adopted Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, the criterion for successful completion of the internship program (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, 1996).

BACKGROUND/SIGNIFICANCE

Arguably, Kentucky is one of the country's leading states in the implementation of comprehensive and systemic education reform initiatives, including high stakes school and district accountability (Kannapel, Aagaard, and Coe, 1997; Southern Regional Education Board, 1998; White, 1998). As such, the ability to determine and to compare the work of intern principals and assistant principals who are actively engaged in implementing reform initiatives deepens current understanding of both roles. In contrast to most other states'

pre-service internships, Kentucky principals and assistant principals are required to complete a one-year internship during their first year of employment as building-level administrators. Interns are provided with the opportunity for learning under the supervision of a three-person committee of experienced educators (a principal mentor, a university representative, and the school district's superintendent or designee). The intern must demonstrate mastery of state-approved standards of performance for successful completion of the internship and full licensure (Kentucky Department of Education, 1997a).

Additionally, the comparisons of Kentucky's secondary assistant principal interns' duties and responsibilities to previous NASSP national samples and to a pre-education reform Kentucky sample offered insight into the effect of reform initiatives on job practices and expectations (Austin and Brown, 1970, Kalla, 1983, Pellicer et al., 1988). This information should be particularly useful to administrator preparation programs as they evaluate and revise course offerings relative to current and anticipated job skills appropriate for aspiring school leaders.

Findings from this study also have significance beyond immediate practice in Kentucky. Some researchers have observed (Austin and Brown, 1970; Clemons, 1989) and at least one theorist has claimed (Mizelle, 1995) that due to implementation of education reform initiatives as well as to other influences, the assistant principal's role is evolving beyond the traditional responsibilities of student discipline and attendance. Data from this research offer limited support to those claims. Similarly, the extent (or lack) of the school-level or gender-related differences found in the work of Kentucky assistant

principal interns added a different and previously undocumented dimension to the knowledge base in those areas.

Internships have long been a recognized and commonly-accepted means of organizational socialization. Several theorists link the benefits of the internship with adult learning theory that emphasizes active learner involvement, reflective thinking, and experiential learning (Kolb, 1984; LaCost and Pounder, 1987). From a broader perspective, sociologists view the internship within the context of socialization theory (Schmeider, McGrevin, and Townley, 1994). Specifically, the principal and assistant principal internships would be considered a type of organizational socialization which is a “process by which one is taught and learns the ‘ropes’ of a particular organizational role” (Van Maanan and Schein, 1979, p. 211).

Consistently throughout the literature, the assistant principalship is perceived to be a transitory, entry-level position that serves as a training ground for the principalship or higher administrative position (Austin and Brown, 1970; Golanda, 1991; Gorton and Kattman, 1987; Kelly, 1987; Kindsvatter and Tosi, 1971; Laughery, 1959; Marshall 1992; Marshall and Greenfield, 1985). However, the literature documents that many view the assistant principalship as lacking clear conceptualization or definition in relationship to schools’ organizational structures (Gillespie, 1961; Reed and Himmler, 1985; Smith, 1987). Mostly the position has entailed supervision of students (discipline and attendance), oversight of extra-curricular events, and other non-instructional duties. Consequently, because of limited opportunities for assistant principals to develop as instructional leaders, others have questioned the adequacy of the position as an effective preparation for the principalship and higher administrative positions (Brown and Rentschler, 1973; Coppedge, 1968; Kelly, 1987; Marshall, 1992).

METHODOLOGY

Population

All 1997-98 principal and assistant principal interns employed in Kentucky's K-12 public schools serving traditional student populations ($N = 154$) were surveyed. Interns working in church schools, alternative, technical, and vocational schools, preschools, day treatment centers, and small schools with only head teachers were excluded from the study because of their unique educational and operational settings. There were 134 survey respondents (87%).

Table 1

Respondents Classified by Job Title, Gender, and School Level* ($n = 134$)

School Level	Principals		Assistant Principals	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u>
Elementary	11	26	6	6
Middle	1	2	14	5
High	3	1	25	15
K-12	2	0	1	2
K-8	6	5	0	1
Other (7-12)	0	2	0	0
Total	23	36	46	29

* Source: Intern survey responses.

Instrumentation

Replicating the format of two previous NASSP national surveys of principals and assistant principals, the instrument utilized in this study was a descriptive questionnaire

consisting of two parts – a demographic section containing 21 questions and a job duty analysis consisting of 80 administrative duties. Sixty-five of the 80 items replicated the job analysis portion of the 1987 NASSP survey and 15 items were added to more completely reflect the principalship in Kentucky by a focus group comprised of incumbent and former principals. Survey participants responded to the job duty analysis and demographic questions by selecting one of several fixed-response options or by filling in blanks (Austin and Brown, 1970; Pellicer et al., 1988).

Data Collection Procedures

Intern names, districts, and school assignments were obtained from the Kentucky Department of Education's Division of Testing and Internship, and school addresses were taken from the 1997-98 Kentucky Schools Directory (Kentucky Department of Education, 1997b). Survey packets were mailed to 154 beginning principals and assistant principals participating in the 1997-98 Kentucky Principal Internship Program (KPIP). Packets contained a cover letter, a two-part questionnaire (demographics and job analysis), a stamped and addressed return envelope, and a participation incentive (a one-dollar bill).

The initial mailing produced 104 returned surveys and two follow-up letters yielded 30 additional returns. Postcards returned by 16 non-respondents failed to reveal any systematic patterns or reasons for non-participation. A total of 134 surveys (87%) were used in the data analysis.

Data Analysis

The responses from the demographic section of the survey provided descriptive data about the interns. Results for most demographic questions were displayed in frequency

tables and were summarized in narrative form. Means and standard deviations were calculated for interval-level responses such as age, years of classroom experience, KPIP program evaluation rating, and school enrollment. Information from the demographic section and salient data from the job analysis portion were used to profile Kentucky principal and assistant principal interns and to delineate their duties and responsibilities.

The job analysis section of the survey contained 80 administrative duties for which respondents indicated the degree of their responsibility on each. The response option format was a 4-point Likert-type scale assigned the following numerical codes: (a) 0 – Not Applicable, (b) 1 – Slight Responsibility; (3) 2 – Shared Responsibility; (4) 3 – Full Responsibility.

The same coding and classification system utilized in the 1965 and 1987 NASSP studies was replicated in operationally defining what was meant by principal and assistant principal intern “work,” i.e., their administrative “duties” or “responsibilities,” (Austin and Brown, 1970; Pellicer et al., 1988). Responses on the 80 items that were marked “not applicable” or “slight responsibility” were grouped together and were not considered to be the “work” of the respondents. These items were not used in identifying the duties of principal and assistant principal interns. Administrative duties for which more than 50% of respondents marked either “shared” or “full” responsibility were re-coded into a single category and ranked in descending order based on the percentage of respondents who had indicated either option (“shared” or “full”). Thus, the items that met the 50% responsibility criterion, referred to as the “50% criterion rule”, were defined to be the “work” or the administrative duties of principal and assistant principal interns.

Subsequently these items were used to answer the first overall research question: What is the nature of the work of Kentucky principal and assistant principal interns and does their work differ?

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS[®] Base 7.5 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software, and a significance level of $\alpha = .05$ was set for all tests of significant difference. On tasks that satisfied the NASSP's 50% criterion rule, either a Mann-Whitney-U test or a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to analyze the rankings of specified groups for significant differences.

FINDINGS

Demographics

Little variation was found between the demographic characteristics (Table 2) of the Kentucky principal interns and those of assistant principal interns.

Table 2

1997-98 Principal and Assistant Principal Intern Demographics

Typical Principal Intern	Typical Assistant Principal Intern
Caucasian	Caucasian
Female	Male
Working at a SBDM elementary school	Working at a SBDM middle or high school
39 years of age	38 years of age
Married	Married
Working at rural or small town school	Working at rural or small town school
Formerly a teacher	Formerly a teacher
11 years classroom experience .	13 years classroom experience
Master's degree + 30 hours	Master's degree + 30 hours
Principal or superintendent aspirations	Principal or superintendent aspirations
Rated the internship program highly	Rated the internship program highly

The most noteworthy demographic difference between the two groups of interns was that the majority of Kentucky's principal interns were females (60%), most of whom who worked in elementary schools. In contrast, the majority of assistant principal interns were males (63%), who predominantly worked in middle or secondary schools. There were few minority principal ($n = 1$) or assistant principal ($n = 4$) interns. During the 1997-98 academic year, the number of assistant principal interns ($n = 89$) exceeded the number of principal interns ($n = 65$).

Intern Work

A comparison of the rankings of duties (Appendix A and Appendix B) revealed that the work of principal and assistant principal interns to be significantly different, $z = -6.86$, $p = .00$. This difference was evidenced at all school levels – elementary, middle, and high. Of the ten highest-ranked administrative duties (Table 3), only three were common to both principal and assistant principal interns. These included: school policies (implementation); student discipline; and student and staff safety.

An inspection of the top twenty duties for both principal and assistant principal interns (Appendix A and Appendix B) suggested that both roles had changed somewhat since earlier job analyses (Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1988). For both principal and assistant principal interns, eight of their 20 highest-ranked duties were tasks not even listed on earlier job inventory instruments. The eight new duties and their respective ranks are presented in Table 4.

Table 3

Principal and Assistant Principal Interns' "Top Ten" Administrative Duties

Principal Duties ^b (Percentages ^a)	Assistant Principal Duties ^b (Percentages ^a)
1. Building use – school-related (100%)	1. Student discipline (96%)
2. School policies (implementation) (100%)	2. <i>Parent interaction/communication</i> (96.0%)
3. Student discipline (100%)	3. <i>Student & staff safety</i> (94.7%)
4. <i>Student & staff safety</i> (100%)	4. <i>Compliance with policies, laws, & regulations</i> (93.3%)
5. <i>Communication of school vision & mission</i> (100%)	5. School policies (implementation) (85.3%)
6. School budgets (100%)	6. Assemblies (84.0%)
7. Staff inservice (professional development) (100%)	7. Student attendance (82.7%)
8. Instructional methods (100%)	8. Special arrangements at start & close of school (82.7%)
9. <i>Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan</i> (100%)	9. <i>Chair committees for special students (504s, ARCs)</i> (81.3%)
10. Evaluation of teachers (98.3%)	10. <i>Development of school policies & procedures</i> (81.3%)

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for duty.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Table 4

Administrative Duties Added by Kentucky Focus Group

Principal Intern Duties	Rank	Assistant Principal Duties	Rank
Student & staff safety	4	Parent interaction or communication	1
Communication of school vision & mission	5	Student & staff safety	2
Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan	9	Compliance with local polices, state laws, & regulations	4
Attendance at district- or state-level meetings	13	Chair committees for special needs students (504s, ARCs)	9
Analysis of state assessment and accountability data	14	Development of school polices & procedures	10
Parent interaction or communication	16	Attendance at district- and state-level meetings	14
Development of school policies and procedures	19	Communication of school vision & mission	17.5
Curriculum revision & alignment with core concepts	20	Legal rights for students	20

Aside from the high rankings for “student & staff safety,” the influence of various education reform initiatives on the work of the Kentucky interns, particularly principals, seemed apparent. Tasks such as “communication of school vision & mission,” “curriculum revision & alignment with core concepts,” and “analysis of state assessment and accountability data,” all hallmarks of high stakes assessment and accountability, apparently have been institutionalized and routinely performed by Kentucky building-level administrators. What is interesting to note, however, are differences in the types of duties performed by both groups of interns. Principal interns claimed responsibility for a number of educational- or leadership-type tasks and duties, such as communication of school vision, instructional methods, etc. On the other hand, assistant principals’ work appeared to lie predominantly in the domain of organizational management, claiming responsibility for duties such as assemblies, teacher “duty” rosters, emergency arrangements, etc. Seemingly, assistant principal interns were given responsibility for duties of the same genre as the perennial assistant principals’ duties of student discipline and student attendance (Auclair, 1991; Austin, 1972; Gorton, 1987; Greenfield, 1985; Greenfield, Marshall, and Reed, 1986; Iannaccone, 1985; Kelly, 1987; Panyako and Rorie, 1987; Reed and Himmler, 1985; Smith, 1987). Thus, assistant principal interns, while clearly a part of the administrative team, appeared to assume more of the role of an “organizational manager,” rather than that of an “instructional leader.” This finding was somewhat supported by anecdotal accounts of university representatives serving on intern supervisory committees who reported that assistant principal interns often had more limited opportunities (assigned job duties) than did their principal intern counterparts to

demonstrate proficiency on all of Kentucky's administrator standards, the criterion for successful completion of the internship program.

In addition to significant work differences between principal and assistant principal interns, the degree or magnitude of assistant principal involvement (as indicated by the percentage claiming full or shared responsibility for each task) was less than principal interns on nearly all administrative duties (Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C). While perhaps the higher percentages of duty responsibility reported for principal interns could be explained because principals, by virtue of the position, proclaim ultimate responsibility for all administrative tasks, another interpretation would be that assistant principals were indeed seen only as "role players," and asked to assume responsibility for specific, designated duties. Findings from this study suggest that the Kentucky assistant principalship, while generally recognized as a necessary and essential position, continues to exhibit job duty limitations that challenge the notion that the position is an ideal training ground for the principalship (Austin and Brown, 1970; Golanda, 1991; Gorton and Kattman, 1987; Kelly, 1987; Kindsvatter and Tosi, 1971; Laughery, 1959; Marshall, 1992; Marshall and Greenfield, 1985).

The work differences (job duties) between principal and assistant principal interns were found at all school levels – elementary middle, and high, i.e., the two jobs were fundamentally different. However in a somewhat unexpected finding, principal interns' work did not differ significantly across the three school levels. Elementary principal interns performed basically the same duties as did their middle and high school counterparts. This finding offered at least limited support for Kentucky's newly-adopted

K-12 principals' certification. Previous principal certifications had been tri-level (elementary, middle, and high). Even more surprising, survey results also showed that assistant principal interns performed generally the same administrative duties regardless of the school level to which assigned. Similarly, male and female assistant principal interns' work did not differ significantly except at the elementary school level where female assistant principals were found to have responsibility for an average of 17 more administrative duties than did their male counterparts.

Finally, in limited comparisons of Kentucky's 1997-98 assistant principal interns' duty rankings to those from three earlier studies, no significant differences in rankings were found (Austin and Brown, 1970; Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1988). Because statistical comparisons were restricted to those tasks identified as principal or assistant principal "work" common to all three studies, previously unranked or the duties that now appeared in the 1997-98 rankings and which indicated possible changes in the assistant principal's role were not considered in the analyses. However, when hypothetical data were used for the previously unranked duties in a simulated comparison, results suggested that assistant principals' work indeed may have changed over the past 30 years. Similarly, when lists of the "top ten" highest-ranked duties from the 1983, 1988, and 1998 studies were inspected, only four duties remained common to all three studies: student discipline, school policies, student attendance, and special arrangements at start/close of school (Austin and Brown, 1970; Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1988).

CONCLUSIONS

Three overall conclusions were drawn from the study's findings. First, the demographics of principal and assistant principal interns were generally similar, but assistant principal interns did not engage in the same work as principal interns nor were duties assumed with the same degrees of responsibility. Second, the work of assistant principal interns was similar across all school levels – elementary, middle, and high – as was true for principal interns. Male and female assistant principal interns' work did not differ significantly except at the elementary school level. Finally, in limited comparisons to earlier studies, no statistically-significant changes in assistant principal's work were found, although possible changes in the assistant principal role were indicated when hypothetical values were used for missing (previously unranked) data. Results from the simulated comparison suggest that the assistant principal's role may have changed. Further evidence of role change was observed in a listing of the 1997-98 assistant principals' ten highest-ranked duties that contained five tasks that were not identified as the "work" of those surveyed in the 1988 NASSP study or in the 1983 Kentucky study.

Appendix A

Principal Interns' Administrative Duty Rankings

Administrative Duties ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
Building use – school-related	1	100.0
School policies (implementation)	2	100.0
Student discipline	3	100.0
<i>Student & staff safety</i>	4	100.0
<i>Communication of school vision & mission</i>	5	100.0
School budgets	6	100.0
Staff inservice (professional development)	7	100.0
Instructional methods	8	100.0
<i>Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan</i>	9	100.0
Evaluation of teachers	10	98.3
Faculty meetings	11	98.3
Teacher personnel records	12	98.3
<i>Attendance at district- or state-level meetings</i>	13	98.3
<i>Analysis of state assessment and accountability data</i>	14	98.3
<i>Parent interaction or communication</i>	16	98.3
Curriculum development	16	98.3
Teacher selection	16	98.3
Student attendance	18	98.3
<i>Development of school policies & procedures</i>	19	98.3

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the task.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duties ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
<i>Curriculum revision & alignment with core concepts</i>	20	98.3
Teacher incentives & motivation	21	98.3
Administrative representative at community functions	22	96.6
Teacher “duty” rosters	23	96.6
<i>Compliance with local policies, state laws, & regulations</i>	24	96.6
School master schedule	25	96.6
Emergency arrangements	26	96.6
School financial accounts	27	96.6
Student testing program	28	96.6
Special arrangements at start & close of school	29	94.9
<i>Legal rights for staff</i>	30	94.9
Assemblies	31	94.9
<i>SBDM council & committees</i>	32.5	93.2
<i>Legal rights for students</i>	32.5	93.2
Communication of school achievement information	34	93.2
Building use – nonschool-related	35	91.5
Orientation for new teachers	36	91.5
School daily bulletins (announcements)	37	91.5
Substitute teachers	38	91.5
Parent Teacher Association/Organization	39	89.8
Non-instructional equipment & supplies	40	88.1

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the task.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duties ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
Special education (IEP implementation)	41	86.4
Innovations, experiments, & research	42	84.7
School public relations program	43	84.7
<i>Fund raising for school or student activities</i>	44	84.7
<i>Chair committees for special needs students (504s, ARCs)</i>	45	83.1
Custodial services	46	81.4
Clerical services	47	81.4
Instructional media & materials	48	81.4
<i>Extended School Services (ESS)</i>	49	81.4
Computer services	50	79.7
School-wide examinations	51	78.0
School calendars	52	78.0
Instructional software	53	76.3
Textbook selection	54	76.3
Cafeteria services	55	74.6
Transportation services	56	72.9
Student teachers	57	72.9
Coordination of community resources for instruction	58	72.9
Liaison with community agencies	59	71.2
Orientation program for new students	60	71.2
Student photographs	61	69.5
School dances	62	67.8
Athletic program	63	67.8

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the task.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duties ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
School club program	64	66.1
Relationships with educational/employer representatives	65	61.0
Graduation activities	66	59.3
Guidance program	67	55.9
Articulation with feeder schools	68	54.2
School newspaper	69	54.2
School participation in community fund drives	70	52.5
School traffic or safety squad	71	52.5
50% Criterion ^c		
Student store	72	37.3
Instruction for homebound students	73	35.6
Student council	74	32.2
Medical, dental, & health services	75	30.5
Financial aid for students	76	28.8
School assistance to students in transition	77	23.7
Work-study program	78	22.0
School alumni association	79	18.6
Adult education program	80	15.3

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the task.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

^c NASSP’s operationally defined “cut off” point for identifying the “work” of principals and assistant principals.

Appendix B

Assistant Principal Interns' Administrative Duty Rankings

Administrative Duty ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
Student discipline	1	96.0
<i>Parent interaction or communication</i>	2	96.0
<i>Student & staff safety</i>	3	94.7
<i>Compliance with local policies, state laws, & regulations</i>	4	93.3
School policies (implementation)	5	85.3
Assemblies	6	84.0
Student attendance	7	82.7
Special arrangements at start & close of school	8	82.7
<i>Chair committees for special needs students (504s, ARCs)</i>	9	81.3
<i>Development of school policies & procedures</i>	10	81.3
Administrative rep. at community functions	11	78.7
Evaluation of teachers	12	78.7
Teacher “duty” rosters	13	77.3
<i>Attendance at district- and state-level meetings</i>	14	76.0
Faculty meetings	15	74.7
Special education (IEP implementation)	16	72.0
Emergency arrangements	17.5	72.0
<i>Communication of school vision & mission</i>	17.5	72.0
Building use – school-related	19	70.7
<i>Legal rights for students</i>	20	68.0
<i>Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan</i>	21	66.7

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the duty.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duty ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
Transportation services	22	66.7
Staff inservice (professional development)	23	64.0
Orientation for new teachers	24	64.0
Athletic program	25	64.0
School dances	26	64.0
<i>Analysis of state assessment & accountability data</i>	27	62.7
Teacher personnel records	28	61.3
School daily bulletins (announcements)	29	60.0
<i>SBDM council & committees</i>	30	60.0
<i>Curriculum revision/alignment with core concepts</i>	31	58.7
Teacher incentives, motivation	32	58.7
Student testing program	33.5	57.3
Custodial services	33.5	57.3
Teacher selection	35	57.3
Substitute teachers	36	56.0
Instructional methods	37	54.7
School club program	38	54.7
School traffic or safety squad	39	54.7
Curriculum development	40	53.3
<i>Legal rights for staff</i>	41	53.3
Clerical services	42	50.7

50% Criterion^c

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the duty.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

^c NASSP’s operationally defined “cut off” point for identifying the “work” of principals and assistant principals.

Administrative Duty ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
Building use – nonschool-related	43	49.3
School-wide examinations	44	49.3
Cafeteria services	45	49.3
Graduation activities	46	48.0
Non-instructional equipment & supplies	47	46.7
Orientation program for new students	48	46.7
Liaison with community youth-serving agencies	49	46.7
Instructional media & materials	50	45.3
School calendars	51	44.0
School master schedule	52	42.7
Computer services	53	42.7
<i>Extended School Services (ESS)</i>	54	41.3
Innovations, experiments, & research	55	41.3
Articulation with feeder schools	56	41.3
Parent Teacher Association/Organization	57	40.0
Textbook selection	58	38.7
School public relations program	59	38.7
Student teachers	60	38.7
Communication of school achievement information	61	37.3
School budgets	62	37.3
Relationships with educational/employment reps.	63	36.0
<i>Fund raising for school/student activities</i>	64	36.0
Student photographs	65	29.3

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the duty.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duty ^b	Rank	Percentage ^a
School financial accounts	66	28.0
Instructional software	67	24.0
School participation in community fund raising	68	24.0
Student council	69	21.3
Instruction for homebound students	70	20.0
Coordination of community resources for instruction	71	18.7
Guidance program	72	17.3
School assistance to students in transition	73	17.3
School newspaper	74	16.0
Medical, dental, & health services	75	12.0
Student store	76	9.3
Financial aid for students	77	6.7
Work-study program	78	6.7
Adult education program	79	6.7
School alumni association	80	2.7

^a Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for the duty.

^b In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

^c NASSP’s operationally defined “cut off” point for identifying the “work” of principals and assistant principals.

Appendix C

Administrative Duties Identified by At Least 90% of 1997-98 Interns

Principal Duties ^a (Percentages ^b)	Assistant Principal Duties ^a (Percentages ^b)
1. Building use – school-related (100%)	1. Student discipline (96%)
2. School policies (implementation) (100%)	2. <i>Parent interaction/communication</i> (96.0%)
3. Student discipline (100%)	3. <i>Student & staff safety</i> (94.7%)
4. <i>Student & staff safety</i> (100%)	4. <i>Compliance with policies, laws, & regulations</i> (93.3%)
5. <i>Communication of school vision & mission</i> (100%)	
6. Staff inservice (professional development) (100%)	
7. School budgets (100%)	
8. Instructional methods (100%)	
9. <i>Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan</i> (100%)	
10. Evaluation of teachers (98.3%)	
11. Faculty meetings (98.3%)	
12. Teacher personnel records (98.3%)	
13. <i>Attendance at district- or state-level meetings</i> (98.3%)	
14. <i>Analysis of state assessment and accountability data</i> (98.3%)	
15. <i>Parent interaction or communication</i> (98.3%)	

^a In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

^b Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for duties.

Assistant Principal Duties^a (Percentages^b)

Principal Duties^a (Percentages^b)

16. Curriculum development (98.3%)
17. Teacher selection (98.3%)
18. Student attendance (98.3%)
19. *Development of school policies & procedures (98.3%)*
20. *Curriculum revision & alignment with core concepts (98.3%)*
21. Teacher incentives & motivation (96.6%)
22. Administrative representative at community functions (96.6%)
23. Teacher "duty" rosters (96.6%)
24. *Compliance with local policies, state laws, & regulations (96.6%)*
25. School master schedule (96.6%)
26. Emergency arrangements (96.6%)
27. School financial accounts (96.6%)
28. Student testing program (96.6%)
29. Special arrangements at start & close of school (94.9%)
30. *Legal rights for staff (94.9%)*
31. Assemblies (94.9%)
32. *SBDM council & committees (93.2%)*

^a In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

^b Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for duties.

Principal Duties ^a (Percentages ^b)	Assistant Principal Duties ^a (Percentages ^b)
33. <i>Legal rights for students</i> (93.2%)	
34. Communication of school achievement information (93.2%)	
35. Building use – nonschool-related (91.5%)	
36. Orientation for new teachers (91.5%)	
37. School daily bulletins (announcements) (91.5%)	
38. Substitute teachers (91.5%)	

^a In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.

In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

^b Percent of respondents indicating “shared” or “full” responsibility for duties.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

- Auclair, J. A. (1991). The position of the middle school assistant principal as training for the instructional leadership role of the principal. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52-04A, 1188.
- Austin, D. B. (1972). The assistant principal – What does he do? Theory Into Practice, 11 (1), 68-72.
- Austin, D. B., & Brown, H. L. (1970). Report of the assistant principal. Washington, DC: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Brown, G. J., & Rentschler, J. E. (1973). Why don't assistant principals get the principalship? NASSP Bulletin, 57(375), 36-47.
- Clemons, M. J. (1989). The assistant principal's responsibility in school-based systems. NASSP Bulletin, 73(516), 33-36.
- Coppedge, F. L. (1968). The "new" image of the assistant principal. Clearing House, 42(5), 28-287.
- Gillespie, T. M. (1961). Assistant principal: Status, duties, and responsibilities. NASSP Bulletin, 43(251), 59.
- Golanda, E. L. (1991). Preparing tomorrow's educational leaders: An inquiry regarding the wisdom of utilizing the position of assistant principal as an internship or apprenticeship to prepare future principals. Journal of School Leadership, 1(3), 266-281.
- Gorton, D. (1987). Improving the assistant principalship: The principal's contribution, NASSP Bulletin, 71 (501), 1-4.
- Gorton, D., & Kattman, B. (1985). The assistant principalship: An underused asset. Principal, 65(2), 6, 39-40.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985). Developing and instructional role for the assistant principal. Education and Urban Society, 18 (1), 7-27.
- Greenfield, W. D., Marshall, C., & Reed, D. B. (1986). Experience in the vice principalship: Preparation for leading schools. The Journal of Educational Administration, 24 (1), 107-121.

- Iannaccone, L. (1985). Vice-principal research: A window in the building. Education and Urban Society, 18 (1), 121-130.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). Standards for school leaders. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Kalla, M. M. (1983). A study of Kentucky assistant principals: Job responsibilities, importance, and satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College of Teachers, Vanderbilt University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44-10A, 2941.
- Kannapel, P. J., Aagaard, L., & Coe, P. (1997, March). Kentucky education reform after six years: Positive results, critical issues. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kelly, G. (1987). The assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 13-20.
- Kentucky Department of Education. (1997a). Handbook for Kentucky principal internship program. Frankfort, KY: Office of Teacher Education and Certification.
- Kentucky Department of Education. (1997b). Kentucky schools directory. Frankfort, KY: Office of Communications, Planning, and Governmental Relations.
- Kindsvatter, R., & Tosi, D. J. (1971). Assistant principal: A job in limbo. The Clearing House, April 1971, 456-464.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experiences as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- LaCost, B., & Pounder, D. (1987, October). The internship: An alternative model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Education Administration, Charlottesville, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 306)
- Laughery, W. W. (1959). Expedience or vision in the assignment of assistant principals' duties? NASSP Bulletin, 43(243), 112-114.
- Marshall, C. (1992). The assistant principal: An overview of the frustrations, rewards. NASSP Bulletin, 76(547), 88-94.
- Marshall, C., & Greenfield, W. D. (1985). The socialization of the assistant principal: Implications for school leadership. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 3-6.

- Mizelle, T. K. (1995). An examining of the role of assistant principal in high schools in Virginia that are restructuring. (Doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56-10A, 3807.
- Panyako, D., & Rorie, L. (1987). The changing role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 71 (501), 23-30.
- Pellicer, L. O., Anderson, L. W., Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., & McCleary, L. E. (1988). High school leaders and their schools. Volume I: A national profile. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Reed, D. B., & Himmler, A. H. (1985). The work of the secondary assistant principal: A field study. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 59-84.
- Schmieder, J. H., McGrevin, C. Z., & Townley, A. J. (1994). Keys to success: Critical skills for novice principals. Journal of School Leadership, 4(3), 272-293.
- Smith, J. A. (1987). Assistant principals: New demands, new realities, and new perspectives. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 9-12.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (1998). Educational benchmarks 1998. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- SPSS® Base 7.5 Applications Guide. (1997). Chicago, IL: SPSS, Incorporated.
- Van Maanan, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In Research in Organizational Behavior, (Vol. 1). (pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Publications.
- White, K. A. (1998). At the head of the class: Quality counts '98. Education Week, Vol. XVII, Number 17, 161-163.



U.S. Department of Education
 Office of Educational Research and
 Improvement (OERI)
 National Library of Education (NLE)
 Educational Resources Information
 Center (ERIC)



Reproduction Release
 (Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

in High-Stakes Accountability

Title: <i>Kentucky's Induction-model Intern Assistant Principals: Players or Designated Hitters</i>	
Author(s): <i>Zella Wells, James S. Rinehart, Susan J. Scollay</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

ZELLA WELLS, Ed.D. / Assistant Superintendent

Signature: <i>Zella Wells</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: ↑	
Organization/Address: JOHNSON COUNTY (Ky.) SCHOOLS	Telephone: 606-789-2530	Fax: 606-789-2506
	E-mail Address: <i>zwells@johnson.k12.ky.us</i>	Date: 2-2-2000

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

<p>Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:</p> <p>ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management 1787 Agate Street 5207 University of Oregon Eugene, OR, 97403-5207 attn: Acquisitions</p>
--