A COMPARISON OF URBAN, SUBURBAN, AND RURAL PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP SKILLS BY CAMPUS STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL

SUSAN ERWIN
PAM WINN
JOHN ERWIN
Tarleton State University

Because of the importance of developing highly skilled school leaders, statewide assessments of 784 Texas public school administrators were compared in a causal-comparison study to determine how leadership skills varied by type of campus (urban, suburban and rural) and by campus student achievement ratings. Data were collected from a 2006-2008 Texas state-approved principal performance assessment, Principal Assessment of Student Success (PASS). Principal leadership skills identified in PASS were compared within campus student achievement categories as measured by Texas (No Child Left Behind) public school accountability ratings, and data were disaggregated by campus type (urban, suburban, rural). Important findings indicate that leadership skills of urban, suburban, and rural principals at campuses with the state's highest student academic achievement ratings differ from skills of principals at schools with lower student academic achievement ratings. Study findings indicate that principals from all campus achievement levels demonstrate functional domain (managerial) skills; however, as principals increasingly demonstrate programming domain (systemic) skills, campus student achievement increases. This finding suggests the need for professional development aimed at nurturing systemic practices among campus leaders. In addition, clear communication, both individually (i.e. Oral Expression) and within groups (i.e. Staff Development) appears to differentiate leaders at more highly rated campuses, indicating a need to develop these skills to a greater extent.

Keywords: school leadership, academic achievement, urban schools, suburban schools, rural schools

Twenty five years of education research confirms that quality school leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing student achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Lesotte, 1992, 1991; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Winn, Erwin, Gentry, & Cauble, 2009a, 2009b). As school administrator responsibilities continue to increase worldwide, development of effective school leadership is requisite (Olson, 2008). Consequently, targeting specific leadership skills related to student achievement might, ultimately, improve student academic performance in urban, suburban, and rural schools.

SPECIAL CHALLENGES FOR URBAN, SUBURBAN, AND RURAL PRINCIPALS

Literature related to the urban principalship focuses on four challenges (Winn, et al., 2009b): low SES/high minority population (Laird, DeBell, Kienzl, & Chapman, 2007; Nevarez & Wood, 2007; Talbert-Johnson, 2006); inexperienced teachers (Cortney & Coble, 2005; Humphrey, Koppich, & Hough 2005); and increasing numbers of dropouts and loss of students (and related revenue) to charter schools (Jewell, 2004; Lewis, 2004; May, 2007).

Recent suburban demographic shifts have produced growing numbers of minority students moving into predominantly White, well-funded, middle class suburban schools (Bancroft, 2009; Hill, 2009). Suburban principals face challenges associated with predominantly White faculties who lack awareness of minority cultural differences, resulting in deficit views regarding minority students' learning and behavior differences (2005Chaney & De Gennaro, 2005; Howard, 2007; Mabokela & Madsen,). These challenges have been exacerbated by rapid growth of English language learner populations in many suburban districts (Field, 2008; Howard, 2007).

In contrast, literature related to the rural principalship focuses on three challenges (Winn, et al., 2009a): retention of effective principals (Arnold, Gaddy, & Dean, 2004; Partlow & Ridenor 2008; Provasnik, Kewalramani, Coleman, Gilbertson, Herring, & Xie, 2007); difficult community relations (Cruzeiro & Morgan, 2006; Jimerson, 2005; Mitchem, Kossar, & Ludlow 2006); and pressure to meet standards with limited resources (Arnold et al., 2004; Warren & Peel, 2005). Thus, although urban, suburban, and rural school leaders face different obstacles, there is a pronounced need for effective, skilled leaders in each type of school.

PURPOSE

In spite of overwhelming evidence (Winn, et al., 2009a, 2009b) that principals have an essential role in creating effective schools (Leithwood, et.al., 2004; Lesotte, 1992, 1991; Marzano, et al., 2005), comparisons of leadership skills in terms of student academic achievement and type of school population (urban, suburban, or rural) have not been conducted. Because of the urgency of developing highly skilled school leaders, this study compared the leadership skills of practicing urban, suburban, and rural administrators to determine to what degree their skills differed by campus student achievement.

METHOD

Data Source: Leadership Skill Assessment

Records collected in 2006-2008 from a Texas state-approved professional development performance assessment, Principal Assessment of Student Success (PASS), provided the data for this study (see Appendix A). Using substantiation provided by principals (campus improvement plan, state accountability data, Adequate Yearly Progress, phone interviews, teacher performance data, and student performance data), PASS assessor teams (two assessors per principal recruited from among Texas veteran campus and central office administrators and university educational leadership departments) rated principal leadership skills. Identified by Thompson (1993) and adopted by the National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA), skills within three domains (functional, programming, and interpersonal) provided the context from which to assess principal leadership (see Appendix B).

Data Source: Campus Student Achievement by Campus Type

Finally, to identify the relationship between leadership skills and campus student achievement, assessor-identified NPBEA skills were compared within campus student achievement categories as measured by Texas (No Child Left Behind) public school accountability ratings (See Appendix C) from low to high: Academically Acceptable (AA), Recognized (R) or Exemplary (E). Campus achievement was then disaggregated by campus type (urban, suburban, rural) as identified from principal records in PASS.

Participants

PASS data accessed from Texas principal evaluations conducted state-wide from 2006 through 2008 yielded records of 784 elementary, middle, and high school principals from 248 urban, 277 suburban, and 259 rural schools (see Appendix D). Unequal representation of schools at each instructional level (elementary, middle, and high school) within each state accountability level (AA, R, E) may have affected interpretation of study findings; however, the dispersion of these data reflects the pattern of accountability ratings in Texas.

Data Analysis

Frequency counts and percentages were used to compare assessor rankings of NPBEA skills for principals at each state accountability level (AA, R, E) disaggregated by campus type (See Appendix E and Table 1). Chi-square cross tabulation tables determined dependence/independence by school accountability ratings and principals' NPBEA skill rating frequency counts. All Chi-square comparisons of leadership skills by campus achievement yielded p values that were not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) and, thus, were not reported. Finally, findings were sub-divided by

NPBEA skill domains (functional, programming, and interpersonal) to provide context for identifying trends in school leadership by accountability rating and campus type (see Appendix E and Table 1).

RESULTS

Comparison of NPBEA Skills by Campus Type and Campus Accountability Rating

Assessor ratings of the top five skills by campus accountability ratings produced 672 ratings for 244 urban principals (see Appendix C), 711 ratings for 277 suburban principals (see Appendix D), and 714 ratings for 259 rural principals (see Appendix E). The five most frequently rated skills by campus type (urban, suburban, or rural) and state accountability group (AA, R, E) are listed in Table 1. Of the 14 NCBEA skills assessed, five did not appear (*Problem Analysis, Curriculum Design, Measurement and Evaluation,* and *Resource Allocation*) among those most frequently observed.

Although the skills rating were different in order, principals of all campus types and state accountability groups demonstrated high ratings in skills of *Leadership* and *Sensitivity*. *Information Collection* was rated highly for all but urban R campus principals, and *Organizational Oversight* was common to all but urban E campus principals. *Student Guidance and Development* was rated highly at urban AA, R, E and rural E campuses, while *Judgment* was noted among urban R, suburban AA, rural R, and rural E leaders. Skills appearing in only two groups included *Instructional Management* (suburban E and rural AA) and *Oral Expression* (urban E and suburban R). A unique skill exhibited by only one campus group was *Staff Development* (rural E).

Assessors consistently highly rated AA campus leaders on three functional domain skills (*Leadership, Sensitivity, Information Collection*, and *Organizational Oversight*) and one interpersonal domain skill (*Sensitivity*) regardless of campus type (urban, suburban, rural). Only *Student Guidance and Development* (urban), *Judgment* (suburban), and *Instructional Management* (rural) differed among AA campus leaders. Notably, these skills all fall within the programming domain. Six of the 14 NPBEA skills were exhibited most frequently among AA campus leaders.

At R rated campuses, urban, suburban, and rural principals were rated the same in two functional domain skills (*Leadership* and *Organizational Oversight*) and one interpersonal domain skill (*Sensitivity*). *Information Collection*, a functional domain skill, was rated highly for all except urban campus principals, and *Judgment*, a programming domain skill, was common to all except suburban campus principals. Unique skills exhibited by only one R campus type were *Oral Expression* (suburban), an interpersonal domain skill, and *Student Guidance and Development* (urban), a programming domain skill. Seven of the 14 NPBEA skills were exhibited most frequently among R campus leaders.

Leaders from E rated campuses shared two functional domain skills (*Leadership* and *Information Collection*) and one interpersonal domain skill (*Sensitivity*). *Organizational Oversight*, a functional domain skill, was rated highly for all except urban campus principals, and *Student Guidance and Development*, a programming domain skill, was common to all except suburban campus principals. Unique skills exhibited by only one E campus type were *Oral Expression* (urban), an interpersonal domain skill, Instructional Management (suburban), a programming domain skill, and *Staff Development* and *Judgment* (rural), both programming domain skills. Nine of the 14 NPBEA skills were exhibited most frequently among E campus leaders.

SIGNIFICANT CONCLUSIONS

Comparisons of Overall Principal Skills

Of the 14 NPBEA skills assessed, only nine were consistently identified among the top skills of sampled Texas principals. Regardless of school type (urban, suburban, and rural) or campus achievement rating (AA, R, E), sampled principals were rated highest in the same four of the 14 NPBEA skills assessed (*Leadership, Sensitivity, Information Collection*, and *Organizational Oversight*). This indicates the importance of these skills in school leadership. However, the absence of *Problem Analysis, Curriculum Design, Measurement and Evaluation,* and *Resource Allocation* also has strong implications. Four of the nine are programming domain skills requiring systemic campus leadership and holistic

perspective, enabling principals to develop frameworks, design anticipated outcomes, implement supervision, set goals, and utilize inferential thinking. Due to the complexity of these concerns, it is possible assessors found these skills more difficult to quantify.

TABLE 1

Comparison of top five Urban, Suburban, and Rural Principal NPBEA Skills by Texas Campus Accountability Rating

Top 5 Ratings (5= Highest)	5	4	3	2	1
Urban (AA) Campuses	Leadership (FD)	Sensitivity (ID)	Information Collection (FD)	Organization Oversight (FD)	Stud/Guid (PD)
Suburban (AA) Campuses	Leadership (FD)	Information Collection (FD)	Sensitivity (ID)	Judgment (PD)	Organization Oversight (FD)
Rural (AA) Campuses	Leadership (FD)	Sensitivity (ID)	Information Collection (FD)	Organization Oversight (FD)	Instructional Management (PD)
Urban (R) Campuses	Leadership (FD)	Sensitivity (ID)	Stud/Guid (PD)	Organization Oversight (FD)	Judgment (FD)
Suburban (R) Campuses	Leadership (FD)	Information Collection (FD)	Organization Oversight (FD)	Sensitivity (ID)	Oral Expression (ID)
Rural (R) Campuses	Leadership (FD)	Information Collection (FD)	Sensitivity (ID)	Organization Oversight (FD)	Judgment (FD)
Urban (E) Campuses	Sensitivity (ID)	*Info/collect (FD) *Stud/Guid/ (PD) *Oral/Express (ID)	*Info/collect (FD) *Stud/Guid (PD) *Oral/Express (ID)	*Info/collect (FD) *Stud/Guid (PD) *Oral/Express (ID)	Leadership (FD)
Suburban (E) Campuses	Instructional Management (PD)	Leadership (FD)	Information Collection (FD)	Sensitivity (ID)	Organization Oversight (FD)
Rural (E) Campuses	Stud/Guid (PD)	Organization Oversight (FD)	*Staff Devel (PD) * Judgment (FD)	*Staff Devel (PD) * Judgment (FD)	*Leadership (FD) *Information Collection (FD) *Sensitivity (ID)

Note: *same frequency counts; (AA) = Academically Acceptable, (R) = Recognized, (E)= Exemplary; FD = functional, PD = Programming, ID = Interpersonal Domains

Comparisons of Principal Skills within Student Achievement Groups

Leaders at campuses with highest student achievement exhibited a greater number of skills (e.g., AA - six, R - seven, and E – nine), indicating a possible relationship between campus student achievement and number of leadership skills exhibited by the campus principal. Principals at AA and R campuses exhibited three common functional skills (*Leadership, Information Collection,* and *Organizational Oversight*) and one common interpersonal skill (*Sensitivity*). By contrast, E campus principals exhibited two functional domain skills (*Organizational Oversight* and *Judgment*), both of which require the use of perspective rather than managerial skill, and three programming domain skills (*Student Guidance and Development, Instructional Management*, and *Staff Development*) which require utilizing resources, prioritizing, and drawing informed conclusions to make quality decisions. These findings support Anagnostopoulus and Rutlege's (2007) contention that student achievement increases when leadership is collaborative rather than managerial.

Comparisons of Principal Skills within Campus Types (Urban, Suburban, Rural)

Unique top rated skills among urban principals by campus student achievement were *Student Guidance and Development* (AA), *Judgment* (R), and *Oral Expression* (E). These differences may reflect inherent challenges at each accountability level. AA principals, faced with greater numbers of low performing students, may focus more intently on critical student learning needs (*Student Guidance and Development*, programming domain) to avoid sanctions associated with low test scores (Anagnostopoulos & Rutledge, 2007). R campus principals may focus less on sanctions and, instead, rely upon Judgment for collaborative decision making to prioritize significant campus issues affecting overall student performance. Interpersonal domain skills like *Oral Expression* improve effectiveness of functional and programming skills; thus E principals, who are less threatened by poor student performance, may require skills with more precision to improve already successful programs. Large, complex student populations (Laird et al., 2007; Nevarez & Wood, 2007) and inexperienced teachers (Cortney & Coble, 2005; Humphrey et al., 2005; Tillman, 2003) may require the most successful urban leaders to develop greater communication skills, thus differentiating campus achievement.

Suburban principals shared four skills; however, the fifth skill varied by campus rating. AA campus leaders exhibited *Judgment*, while R leaders demonstrated *Oral Expression*, and E campus leaders practiced *Instructional Management*. Again, challenges faced by campuses may account for differences. Perhaps suburban principals at AA campuses exhibited *Judgment* (functional domain) to address myriad challenges associated with student demographics changes (Field, 2008; Howard, 2007; Mabokela & Madsen, 2005). Likewise, altering instruction to meet diverse learning needs may explain why suburban principals at E schools were rated highest in *Instructional Management*. Furthermore, campus success might favor leaders with communication expertise, differentiating AA to R campus leaders.

Top rated skills of rural principals differed by *Instructional Management* (AA), *Judgment* (R and E), and *Staff Development* and *Student Guidance and Development* (E). It appears that E campus principals were more willing to risk capitalizing on their unique leadership strengths, whereas their AA and R campus counterparts approached leadership with greater conformity to traditional models. Furthermore, rural principals who demonstrated programming domain skills (i.e. *Staff Development* and *Student Guidance and Development*) provided systemic, collaborative leadership that may result in improved achievement in comparison to counterparts at lower performing campuses who demonstrated functional domain (managerial skills) supported by interpersonal skills (Baxter, 2008; Daresh, 2007). Rural E campus principals were the only group to exhibit *Staff Development* among the top five skills. Due to limited resources associated with rural campuses (Arnold et al., 2004; Warren & Peel, 2005), effective faculty training may differentiate rural campus student achievement levels.

Comparisons of Principal Skills among All Campus/ Achievement types

Differentiated by only two skills per campus type (urban, rural, suburban), leaders at AA rated schools were more likely to exhibit similar skills than their counterparts at R or E rated campuses. Among leaders from R rated campuses, suburban/rural leaders were most alike, differing by only two skills; whereas, urban/rural leaders differed by three

skills, while urban/suburban leaders differed by four skills. The greatest differences in leadership skills were exhibited among E campus leaders. Three skills differentiated E leaders in urban/suburban and urban/rural comparisons, while four skills differentiated E leaders in suburban/rural comparisons. Overall, AA campus leaders were most similar regardless of campus type, supporting studies indicating when schools face sanctions, principals utilize management versus systemic leadership strategies (Anagnostopoulos & Rutledge, 2007).

The largest differences among leadership groups were found between suburban/rural E campus leaders. These differences may result from differences in suburban/rural financial resources (Hill, 2009; Warren & Peel, 2005) and suburban demographic changes more comparable to urban, rather than rural, schools (Howard, 2007; Nevarez & Wood, 2007).

RECOMMENDATIONS

As noted, quality school leadership is second only to classroom instruction in influencing student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004). Study findings indicate that principals from all campus achievement levels demonstrate functional domain (managerial) skills; however, as principals increasingly demonstrate programming domain (systemic) skills, campus student achievement increases. This finding suggests the need for professional development aimed at nurturing systemic practices among campus leaders. In addition, clear communication, both individually (i.e. Oral Expression) and within groups (i.e. Staff Development) appears to differentiate leaders at more highly rated campuses, indicating a need to develop these skills to a greater extent.

Future study examining principal attributes (i.e. gender, pre-administrative educational experience, leadership experience) that influence principals' skills might further clarify differences among leaders from schools with different student achievement levels. Furthermore, differentiation of principals' skills by campus level of instruction (i.e. elementary or secondary) might identify skills unique to student instructional level.

REFERENCES

Anagnostopoulos, D., & Rutledge, S. (2007, May). Making sense of school sanctioning policies in urban high schools. *Teachers College Record, 109*(5), 1261-1302.

Arnold, M., Gaddy, B., & Dean, C. (2004). *A look at the condition of rural education research: Setting a direction for future research.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Bancroft, K. (2009, January 1). To have and to have not: The socioeconomics of Charter Schools. *Education and Urban Society, 41*(2), 248-279.

Baxter, V. (2008). A communitarian framework for planning educational leadership preparation programs. *Educational Planning, 17*(1), 18-26.

Chaney, J., & DeGennaro, A. (2005, November 1). Where everybody knows your name. *Principal Leadership, 6*(3), 22-26.

Cortney, R., & Coble, C. (2005, March). Targeting teacher recruitment and retention policies for at-risk schools. Policy Issues. Number 20. *Learning Point Associates / North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL).* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED489524)

Cruzeiro, P., & Morgan, R. (2006, Spring). The rural principal's role with consideration for special education. *Education, 126*(3), 569-579.

Daresh, J. (2007, Fall). Mentoring for beginning principals: Revisiting the past or preparing for the future? *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 20*(4), 28-34.

Field, R. (2008, November 1). Keeping pace in suburbia and rural America. *School Administrator, 65*(10), 24-26.

Hill, K. (2009, January 1). A historical analysis of desegregation and racism in a racially polarized region: Implications for the historical construct, a diversity problem, and transforming teacher education toward culturally relevant pedagogy. *Urban Education, 44*(1), 106-139.

Howard, G. (2007, March 1). As diversity grows, so must we. *Educational Leadership, 64*(6), 16-22.

Humphrey, D., Koppich, J., & Hough, H. (2005, March). Sharing the wealth: National board certified teachers and the students who need them most. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(18), 1-50.

Jewell, A. (2007, September). Ten years and still failing: An analysis of Ohio. *Focus Education*. Retrieved from http://www.sheffield.k12.oh.us/Focus%20Education%20Special%20Report%209-12-07.pdf

Jimerson, L. (2005, August), Placism in NCLB – How rural children are left behind. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 38*(3), 211-219.

Laird, J., DeBell, M., Kienzl, G., & Chapman, C. (2007). *Dropout Rates in the United States: 2005 (NCES 2007-059)*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved fromhttp://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004) *How leadership influences student learning. A commissioned report*. NY: Wallace Foundation.

Lesotte, L. (1991) *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.

Lessote, L. (1992). "Principal" insights from effective schools. *Education Digest, 58*(3), 14-17.

Lewis, A. (2004, march). Failing NCLB. *The Education Digest, 69*(7), 65-67.

Mabokela, R., & Madsen, J. (2005, July 1). Color-blind and color-conscious leadership: A case study of desegregated suburban schools in the USA. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 8*(3), 187-206.

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005) *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA, and Aurora, CO: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

May, J. (2007, Fall). The market-driven age of education: Challenges of urban school leadership. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 20*(4), 28-34.

Mitchem, K., Kossar, K., & Ludlow, B. (2006, Summer). Finite resources, increasing demands: Rural children left behind? Educators speak out on issues facing rural special education. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 25*(3), 13-23.

Nevarez, C., & Wood, J. (2007, December). Developing urban school leaders: Building on solutions 15 years after the Los Angeles riots. *Educational Studies, 42*(3), 266-280.

Olson, L. (2008, April). Lack of school leadership seen as a global problem. *Education Week, 27*(33), 8.

Partlow, M., & Ridenour, C. (2008, Spring). Frequency of principal turnover in Ohio's elementary schools. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 21*(2), 15-23.

Provasnik, S., KewalRamani, A, Coleman, M., Herring, W., & Xie, Q. (2007, July). *Status of Education in Rural America*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Institute of Education Sciences (IES).

Rammer, R. (2007, November, December). Call to action for superintendents: Change the way you hire principals. *Journal of Educational Research, 101*(2), 67-76.

Scribner, J., Cockrell, K. Cockrell, D., & Valentine, J. (1999). Creating professional learning communities in schools through organizational learning: An evaluation of the school improvement process. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(1), 130-160.

Talbert-Johnson, C. (2006, November). Preparing highly qualified teacher candidates for urban schools: The importance of dispositions. *Education and Urban Society, 39,* 147-161.

Tredway, L., Brill, F., & Hernandez, J. (2007, Summer). Taking off the cape: The stories of novice urban leadership. *Theory Into Practice, 46*(3), 212-221.

Thomson, S. (Ed.). (1993). *Principals for our changing schools: The knowledge and skills base.* Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Education Administration.

Warren, L., & Peel, H. (2005, January). Collaborative model for school reform through a rural school/university partnership. *Education, 126*(2), 346.

Winn, P., Erwin, S., Gentry, J., & Cauble, M. (2009a, April). *Rural principal leadership skill proficiency and student achievement*. Paper presented to the American Education Research Association (AERA), Annual Meeting. SIG: Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership. San Diego, CA.

Winn, P., Erwin, S., Gentry, J., & Cauble, M. (2009b, April). *Urban principal leadership skill proficiency and student achievement*. Paper presented to the American Education Research Association (AERA), Annual Meeting. SIG: Leadership for School Improvement. San Diego, CA.

APPENDIX A

Principal Assessment of Student Success (PASS)

Principal Assessment for Student Success (PASS) is a principal assessment that has been approved by the State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) for principal assessment within the state of Texas. According to Texas Education Code (TEC) 21.054, all principals must complete an assessment in order to maintain certification. The overarching goals of PASS include:

- To determine the level of knowledge and skills for the principalship that each principal assessed demonstrates.
- To provide quality assessment activities relevant to the role of the principalship.
- To provide purposeful and constructive feedback related to each principal's demonstration of knowledge and skills.
- To provide opportunities for each principal assessed to be reflective about his/her level of knowledge and skills, as well as to his/her plan for professional growth.

PASS is based on three sets of criteria: skills, standards, and knowledge. The skills included in the assessment comprise 14 of the 21 skills identified for the principalship by the National Board of Policy Educational Administration (see Appendix B). The standards are the seven State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) Standards which are required by the state to be included in the assessment. The knowledge is a compilation of the Ten Components of Effective Schools, the framework components of Instructional Leadership Development (ILD), and the instructional processes from the Student Success Initiative (SSI).

Each criterion is measured multiple times in PASS through a variety of authentic activities within the assessment. PASS contains a self-assessment process, a campus component, a teacher component, and a student component. All activities are based on authentic data provided by the principal being assessed and are directly connected to his/her campus.

The assessment process occurs over a 30-day period. All online activities are completed within 16 days and are then submitted for assessor review. The assessors are given 11 days to review the online responses and conduct a phone interview with the principal. Each principal's data and entry is reviewed by two assessors. One assessor is considered the primary assessor and, in addition to scoring the rubrics for each activity, provides written feedback on each activity. The assessment also includes one, face-to-face feedback session in which principals expand on their previous responses with a state-of-the -campus report and a plan of action for a teacher in need of assistance. Each primary assessor provides up to one hour of verbal feedback to each principal being assessed.

APPENDIX B

National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA): Knowledge and Skill Domains

Functional Domain Skills comprise base-level management and organizational structure to supervise daily, routine campus business (e.g. to run the buses on time, schedule classes, or maintain order). Evidence of effectiveness is typically quantifiably measurable (e.g. attendance records, disciplinary referrals).

- Leadership: Providing purpose and direction, formulating goals with staff and setting priorities based on community and district priorities and student and staff needs.
- Information Collection: Classifying and organization information for use in decision making and mentoring.
- Problem Analysis: Identifying problems, identifying possible causes, seeking additional needed information, framing possible solutions.
- Judgment: Giving priority to significant issues then reaching logical conclusions and making quality decisions.
- Organizational Oversight: Planning and scheduling own and other's work so that resources are used appropriately and monitoring priorities so that goals and deadlines are met.

Programming Domain Skills provide systemic campus leadership requiring a holistic perspective that incorporates but surpass functional domain skills. More complex and difficult to quantify, these skills enable principals to develop frameworks, design anticipated outcomes, implement ongoing supervision, set goals, and draw inferences.

- Instructional Management: Ensuring appropriate instructional methods are used to create positive learning experiences.
- Curriculum Design: With staff, planning and implementing a framework for instruction and aligning curriculum with anticipated outcomes.
- Student Guidance and Development: Enlisting the support and cooperation of diverse professionals, citizens, community agencies, parents and students to promote the growth and development of all students.
- Staff Development: Supervising individuals and groups and providing feedback on performance and initiating self-development.
- Measurement and Evaluation: Examining the extent to which outcomes meet or exceed previously defined goals, or priorities and drawing inferences for program revisions.
- Resource Allocation: Allocating, monitoring and evaluating fiscal, human, material and time resources to reach campus goals and objectives.

Interpersonal Domain Skills employ functional and programming domain skills, but are subject to individual perception, making measurement more difficult. For example, principals may perceive themselves to be sensitive while faculty members disagree. Nevertheless, these skills improve effective implementation of both functional and programming skills.

- Sensitivity: Perceiving and responding to the needs and concerns of others.
- Oral and Nonverbal Expression: Making oral presentations that are clear and easy to understand.
- Written Expression: Expressing ideas and appropriately in writing for different audiences. (Thomson, 1993).

APPENDIX C

Texas Education Agency: School Accountability Rating

	Academically Acceptable	Recognized	Exemplary
Base indicators			
TAKS (2006-07) • All students *and each student group meeting minimum size:* • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantage.	Meets each standard: • Reading/ELA ... 65% • Writing..... 65% • Social Studies.. 65% • Mathematics .... 45% • Science ..... 40% OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 75% standard for each subject OR meets 70% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard for each subject
*SDAA II (2007)*All students (if meets minimum size criteria)	Meets 50% standard *(Met ARD Expectations)* OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 70% standard *(Met ARD Expectations)* OR meets 65% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 90% standard *(Met ARD Expectations)*
Completion Rate I (class of 2006) • All students *and each student group meeting minimum size:* • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadvantage.	Meets 75.0% standard OR meets Required Improvement	Meets 85.0% standard OR meets 80.0% floor and Required Improvement	Meets 95.0% standard
Annual Dropout Rate (2005-06) • All students *and each student group meeting minimum size:* • African American • Hispanic • White • Econ. Disadv.	Meets 1.0% standard	Meets 0.7% standard	Meets 0.2% standard
Additional Provisions			
Exceptions	Applied if district/campus would be Academically Unacceptable due to not meeting Academically Acceptable criteria.	Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of Recognized.	Exceptions cannot be used to move to a rating of Exemplary.
School Leaver Provision for 2007	A campus or district annual dropout rate, completion rate and/or underreported student measures cannot be the cause of lowered rating		

(Texas Education Agency, 2007, p. 42).

APPENDIX D

Sample

Urban Principals by Texas Accountability Ratings and School Type; Frequency count and percentage (N=248)

Urban Campus Type	AA Count %	Of Total AA %	R Count %	Of Total R %	E Count %	Of Total E %	Total Table Count	Total Table %
Elementary	68 39.3%	27.4	48 76.2%	19.4	12 100%	4.8	128	51.6
Middle School	39 22.5%	15.7	11 17.5%	4.4	0 0%	0	50	20.2
High School	66 38.2%	26.6	4 6.3%	1.6	0 0%	0	70	28.2
Total	173 100%	69.8	63 100%	25.4	12 100%	4.8	248	100

(Lowest to Highest: AA = Academically Acceptable, R = Recognized, E = Exemplary)

Suburban Principals by Texas Accountability Ratings and School Type; Frequency count and percentage (N=277)

Suburban Campus Type	AA Count %	Of Total AA %	R Count %	Of Total R %	E Count %	Of Total E %	Total Table Count	Total Table %
Elementary	43 31%	16	63 61%	23	31 94%	11	137	49.5
Middle School	39 28%	14	27 26%	10	2 6%)	1	68	24.5
High School	58 41%	21	14 13%	5	0 0%)	0	72	26.0
Total	140 100%	51	104 100%	38	33 100%	12	277	100

(Lowest to Highest: AA = Academically Acceptable, R = Recognized, E = Exemplary)

APPENDIX E
NPBEA SKILLS BY TEXAS ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS

Urban Principal NPBEA Skills by Texas Accountability Ratings (N= 244 teams)

Functional Domain Skills *322/672 (47.9%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Leadership	86	28	3	117
Information Collection	51	13	4	68
Problem Analysis	15	8	2	25
Judgment	29	14	2	45
Organizational Oversight	50	16	1	67
Programming Domain Skills *197/672 (29.3%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Instructional Management	32	11	1	44
Curriculum Design	17	10	1	28
Student Guidance & Development	49	17	4	70
Staff Development	11	3	0	14
Measurement & Evaluation	19	6	2	27
Resource Allocation	11	3	0	14
Interpersonal Domain Skills *153/672 (22.8%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Sensitivity	67	26	7	97
Oral & Non-verbal Expression	29	12	4	45
Written Expression	8	2	1	11

Note. *= Total by Domain; AA=Academically Acceptable, R=Recognized, E = Exemplary.

Suburban Principal NPBEA Skills by Texas Accountability Ratings (N= 264 teams)

Functional Domain Skills *440/711 (61.9%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Leadership	70	64	11	142
Information Collection	49	37	11	97
Problem Analysis	18	16	6	40
Judgment	39	21	4	64
Organizational Oversight	33	35	9	77

Programming Domain Skills *147/711 (20.6%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Instructional Management	29	20	14	63
Curriculum Design	9	2	4	15
Student Guidance & Development	16	6	4	15
Staff Development	4	4	1	9
Measurement & Evaluation	15	7	1	23
Resource Allocation	7	4	0	11
Interpersonal Domain Skills *144/711 (20.2%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Sensitivity	42	34	10	86
Oral & Non-verbal Expression	23	22	7	52
Written Expression	3	2	1	6

Note. *= Total by Domain; AA=Academically Acceptable, R=Recognized, E = Exemplary.

Rural Principal NPBEA Skills by Texas Accountability Ratings (N= 259 teams)

Functional Domain Skills *365/714 (51%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Leadership	71	59	7	137
Information Collection	45	39	7	56
Problem Analysis	16	12	5	33
Judgment	26	28	8	62
Organizational Oversight	37	29	11	77
Programming Domain Skills *204/714 (28.5%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Instructional Management	34	20	3	57
Curriculum Design	27	2	0	29
Student Guidance & Development	27	14	15	56
Staff Development	13	6	8	27
Measurement & Evaluation	18	4	0	22
Resource Allocation	7	3	3	13
Interpersonal Domain Skills *145/714 (20.3%)	AA	R	E	TOTAL RATINGS
Sensitivity	48	36	7	91
Oral & Non-verbal Expression	20	15	2	37
Written Expression	8	6	3	17

Note. *= Total by Domain; AA=Academically Acceptable, R=Recognized, E = Exemplary.

Pamela Winn (winn@tarleton.edu) holds a doctorate in Educational Administration from the University of Texas A&M-Commerce. She has been employed with Tarleton State University since April 2002 where she serves as an Associate Professor and Director of the New Century Educational Leadership Program (NCELP). She has served in both public and higher education with experiences ranging from teaching to administration. Pamela's research interests have centered on curriculum design, instructional management, and leadership development. She has presented extensively at conferences at both the national and state levels, and has trained principal assessors across the state.

Susan Erwin (erwin@tarleton.edu), a native of Missoula, Montana, currently lives in Fort Worth and holds a B.A. in History, an M.Ed. in Special Education and a Ph.D. in Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum from the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. With 23 years K-12 public school experience and 8 years in higher education, she presently serves as Graduate Program Coordinator for the TSU Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

John Erwin (jerwin@tarleton.edu) holds a Ph.D. in Instructional Leadership and Academic Curriculum from the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. In addition to more than 20 years teaching English in public schools, he has taught college composition and literature courses. Currently John serves as a writing specialist for the TSU Department of Curriculum and Instruction in Fort Worth.