Journal of Organizational & Educational Leadership

Volume 6 | Issue 1 Article 3

October 2020

The Case for Mandatory Literacy Training for Elementary Education Principals

Catherine McGeehan
Kutztown University, cathymcgeehan1@gmail.com

Meganlyn Norris
Kutztown University, mnorris@kutztown.edu

Introduction

According to the (2019) results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for reading in grade 4, approximately 66% of the students who participated in the examination are reading below the proficient level (Nation's Report Card, 2019). When compared to the 2017 NAEP results when 64% of the students scored below the proficient level, the 2019 scores indicated a 2% increase in the number of students reading below the proficiency level (Nation's Report Card, 2019). Sadly, this data demonstrates that the majority of fourth grade students nationwide continue to read below the proficient level, and the scores are continuing to decrease rather than increase. Even more concerning is the finding that Hernandez (2011) found after conducting a longitudinal study of nearly 4,000 students indicating that students who did not read proficiently by third grade were four times more likely to drop out of high school. Therefore, increasing the reading proficiency rate among 4th graders within the United States is of the utmost significance.

The International Literacy Association (ILA) responded to the stagnant 2017 scores with a research brief which stated that in order to improve student achievement schools must be "…guided by their commitment to what students graduating from the school should know and be able to do as reader[s]" (2018a, p. 6). To fulfill this mission, ILA addressed three key challenges: (a) school infrastructure reorganization, (b) teacher buy-in, and (c) a coherent curriculum across grade levels and subject areas. ILA recommended that school districts utilize a systemic approach to improve student achievement by forming school teams that work collaboratively to build a shared understanding of reading research, curriculum, and assessment. While school teams should include several members such as general education teachers, special education teachers, and resource teachers, ILA acknowledged that the building principal was a key member to the success

of the team for improving school performance.

Theoretical Framework

The principal plays a vital role in impacting student learning. Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004; as cited in Fullan, 2014) stated that "the principal is second only to the teacher in terms of impact on student learning" (p. 5). This impact on student achievement in reading was clearly demonstrated in a dissertation conducted by Goldwyn (2008) who found that principals with more content knowledge about reading instruction were correlated with schools that showed more gains in student achievement scores in literacy. Goldwyn (2008) suggested that "educational leaders' domain knowledge may be a useful concept to include in professional development and principal preparation programs to ensure that all students make sufficient growth in reading throughout the school year" (p. xxi). The metacognition framework provides a valid reason for the results described in this dissertation. In his explanation of cognitive monitoring, Flavell (1979) stated that "the monitoring of a wide variety of cognitive enterprises occurs through the actions of and interactions among four classes of phenomena: (a) metacognitive knowledge, (b) metacognitive experiences, (c) goals (or tasks), and (d) actions (or strategies)" (p. 906). The theory further indicates that individuals can only monitor what they know (Flavell, 1979). Thus, the role of the principal to observe and provide effective feedback to improve their teachers' literacy practices is clearly connected to the reading content and pedagogy possessed. Without a strong knowledge base of best practices in literacy instruction, a principal may have little to offer teachers and may not have the tools needed to support the development of literacy practices among their faculty.

Purpose of the Study

The focus of this study was to examine how well Educational Leadership programs prepare

principals to serve as literacy leaders. Principals who are knowledgeable in the area of literacy leadership are better prepared to support teachers in improving literacy instruction that will lead to instructional gains for their students compared to those who are ill prepared (Taylor, 2004). We also know that new teachers are more likely to implement effective literacy practices that lead to increases in student achievement when they work for a principal that is able to talk about those practices and demonstrate them (Kindell, Crowe & Elsass, 2018). Therefore, it is essential that principal preparation programs examine the required courses within their programs and ensure there is opportunity for candidates to develop the literacy knowledge necessary to effectively support teachers in refining their literacy practices (Fink & Resnick, 2001). While principals may seek alternative learning opportunities to develop literacy content knowledge, it would be appropriate for preparation programs to provide at least initial coursework that focuses on a topic which is one of the main instructional focal points of a principals' career.

Literature Review

Benefits of Effective School Leadership

The role of a school leader is complex and multifaceted involving managerial duties and resource allocation (Jenkins, 2009). Yet, the primary role of the school leader is "…to promote the learning and success for *all* students" (Lunenburg, 2010, p. 1). In a 2017 report commissioned by the Learning Policy Institute, Sutcher, Podolsky and Espinoza noted a strong positive correlation between instructional leadership and student achievement. This positive correlation is clear when an instructional leader demonstrates use of the following contexts: constructive feedback for teachers, instructional and curriculum monitoring, assessment and analysis of student learning, and establishment of professional learning communities (Seashore Louis, et al., 2010; Waters, et al., 2003). Furthermore, the 2004 report commissioned by the Wallace Foundation, written by

Leithwood et al., found that "successful leadership can play a highly significant – and frequently underestimated – role in improving student learning" (p. 5).

Attributes of Effective Principals

According to Fullan (2014), the most effective principals are avid learners who develop collaborative school cultures in which the principal not only participates in learning with teachers but also focuses on implementing high-quality instructional approaches that would increase student achievement. Additional studies of effective instructional leaders indicated that these principals work directly with teachers to strengthen and provide feedback on their practice; offer meaningful professional learning opportunities to improve instruction; foster a safe space for teachers to critique, learn from, and collaborate with each other; analyze multiple forms of student data with the aim of improving instruction; and set high expectations for teachers and students (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009; Supovitz, et al., 2010). Sutcher and Espinoza (2017) found that teachers led be effective principals were also more apt to prioritize critical thinking skills. This point was further emphasized by Principal Dewey Hensley who stated that, "Todays best principals, know what good and effective instruction looks like, so they can provide feedback to guide teachers" (Mendels, 2012, p. 54). Likewise, Seashore Louis et al. (2010) stressed the importance of feedback being provided to teachers by administrators that was specific and relevant to improving their instruction in order to meet the needs of their learners. These studies along with the implications of the metacognitive framework demonstrate the potential need for principals to gain knowledge in effective literacy instruction as this knowledge will enable principals to provide effective feedback to teachers. This feedback is likely to improve instruction and student achievement.

Furthermore, the theoretical framework is supported considering the actions of the ILA

through the 2017 Standards for Literacy Professionals (2018b). For the first time ever, the organization highlighted competencies aligned with their standards for principals who want to deepen their knowledge of literacy research and best practices in literacy instruction. These competencies emphasized instructional leadership for literacy according to the six key areas of literacy standards for literacy professionals: foundational knowledge, curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, diversity and equity, learners and the literacy environment and professional learning and leadership. While they are not meant to replace standards developed by organizations geared toward the development of educational leaders, these competencies are meant to enhance those standards by providing additional guidance for literacy instruction. This effort supports the metacognitive awareness theory in which the organization is clearly stating that a body of knowledge is necessary for principals to be able to provide teachers with the knowledge they need to implement effective literacy practices.

Evidence of Metacognition and Its Impact on Leadership

Evidence of the impact of metacognition on leadership has begun to emerge researching the impact of literacy content knowledge of principals. According to Stein and D'Amico (2000) the role of the principal requires an intricate balance of managerial and content area knowledge that needs to be adjusted and modified depending upon various circumstances. . However, the study's findings indicated that the when principals developed literacy content knowledge the literacy scores increased due to the growth in literacy instruction. Consequently, Stein and D'Amico (2000) stated, "We propose that the study of administrators' cognitive understanding of subject matter and the relationship between such understanding and the leadership administrators provide for school improvement is a missing paradigm in research on educational administration" (p. 43).

Methodology

The emphasis on principals to serve as instructional leaders is highly recommended (Fullan, 2014; Lunenburg, 2010). The metacognitive theoretical framework emphasized that an individual cannot provide instruction for content they are lacking. Without metacognition in literacy, principals may be unable to give constructive feedback regarding effective instructional practices. In addition, NAEP's goal of promoting higher level thinking among readers emphasizes the need for teachers across the nation to utilize instructional practices aimed at increasing student achievement. Having a knowledge base of that view of reading as critical thinking and endorsing it, becomes a powerful goal in promoting effective guidance and direction in their feedback and selection of appropriate instructional materials and professional development for teachers.

And so, this caused the researchers to wonder how well-prepared might principals be to serve as instructional leaders of literacy and to provide teachers with the kind of feedback they need to become more effective teachers of literacy. In order to provide feedback, principals would need to acquire the knowledge to make suggestions and provide insight. As a result, the researchers sought to examine how much literacy content knowledge is required in Master of Education (M.Ed.) in Educational Leadership programs. To answer this question, the following content analysis study was conducted.

Procedures

Using the metacognition theoretical model as the guiding framework, the researchers of this study engaged in a content analysis study. Hoffman, Wilson, Martinez, and Sailers (2011) defined content analysis as "…the method of making inferences from texts and making sense of these interpretations in a context surrounding the text" (p. 30). The methodology also consisted of a content analysis process developed by Durkin (1981) and described by Hoffman et al. (2011).

The process included the following six steps: (1) initial coding of all materials by one researcher, (2) a second coding conducted by another researcher, (3) a discussion amongst the two researchers to resolve all disagreements, (4) the second coder reexamined for any elements that may have been missed, (5) the first coder repeated step one again, (6) the researchers analyzed the results and report by frequency and then by category (Hoffman et al., 2011, 34-35).

Selection of Programs to Review

Using the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)'s Nationally Recognized Program Search (http://caepnet.org/provider-search?state=&program=ELCC&tab=program#progresultssampling), the researchers selected 100 curriculum grids from universities and colleges across the country that were listed as, "Recognized Programs" by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), on the CAEP website (see Appendix C). The CAEP recognition process ensured that the institutional programs identified had received national accreditation for providing exemplary programs.

When selecting programs from the ELCC website, the researchers choose programs that provided candidates with a master's degree in educational administration, a master's degree in building level administration, or a master's degrees in administration and education. The decision to use M. Ed. programs versus certification only programs was made due to the course requirements provided more coursework and elective options than certification only programs. After identifying the institutions that have nationally recognized programs in administration, the researchers reviewed each program on their respective university's website and located their course grid or list of courses identified within their program of study.

Coding Process

Using a deductive coding method, the titles of every course for each of the 100 programs selected were reviewed. The terms or phrases used in the coding process included; literacy, reading, writing, content area reading instruction, literacy across the content areas, literacy instruction, reading instruction, supervision of literacy, reading development and instruction. The documents were coded four times. First, the researchers independently searched for terms that were relevant or connected to literacy. A few days later each researcher reviewed the documents again and searched for literacy related terms within the course titles.

Upon completion of the first individual review, each researcher analyzed their results and provided frequency counts for each of the 100 curriculum grids or lists. The researchers compared their frequency tables and discussed any discrepancies. They then reviewed any institutions where one identified a potential literacy related course and the other did not. During this phase, it was noted that one of the researchers used titles from the electives used in some of the programs and the other did not. The researchers agreed that electives were not required courses and would not ensure that all candidates from those programs had taken those courses. During the second phase of coding, all electives were eliminated from potential review. The researchers examined only required courses for each institution. Upon conclusion of the second individual coding phase, the researchers met and compared results. The results were identical. This process provided inter-rater reliability for the coding process. The frequency list was confirmed, and the researchers noted the institutions that offered a course with some sort of literacy reference in the title (see Table 1).

Table 1

Courses with a Literacy Reference

Name of Institution	**Title of Literacy Related Course**	**Literacy Term(s) Identified**
Monmouth University	EDL-593 Administration and Supervision of literacy Practices 3.0 and Professional Development for School Leaders	Literacy
Chicago University	ELCF 5245 – Supervision and Assessment of Literacy and Numeracy Initiative Across the Grades and Content Areas	Literacy
Hood College	EDUC 502 - Technology for Literacy, Leadership, and Learning	Technology for Literacy
Andrews University	SPED 645- Reading and Writing Assessment & Intervention	Reading and Writing

In the second coding phase, the researchers searched the course descriptions for the four courses that had a literacy related title and searched for additional evidence that literacy instruction was in fact a content area taught in the course. Access to the course descriptions was accomplished by reviewing each of the four university's websites, pulling the course descriptions for the courses that contained a literacy related title. Those course descriptions were then coded for literacy related terms and phrases. As done in phase one, each course description was coded four times. After

reviewing each course description individually, the researchers compared their frequency counts and compared results. If there were any discrepancies, the course descriptions were reviewed and discussions ensued until a unanimous decision was made. Following the discussions, each researcher reviewed the descriptions a few weeks later. Upon completion of the second individual coding phase, the researchers met and confirmed their results for phase two. Similarly, to phase one, this process provided inter-rater reliability (see Table 2).

Table 2

Course Descriptions with Literacy Related Terms in the Descriptions

Name of Institution	**Course Title**	**Course Description**	**Literacy Related Terms Identified in the Descriptions**
Monmouth University	EDL-593 Administration and Supervision of literacy Practices 3.0 and Professional Development for School Leaders	Focuses on the principles, methods, and materials applicable to the administration, organization, and supervision of literacy programs as well as the coaching of staff and colleagues. Students are involved in observation, supervision, and a long-term staff development program in schools.	Supervision of literacy programs as well as the coaching of staff and colleagues
Chicago University	ELCF 5245 – Supervision and Assessment of Literacy and Numeracy Initiative Across the Grades and Content Areas	Valuates literacy and numeracy skills and the supervision of the implementation of literacy and numeracy skills aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) across the grades and across content areas. Emphasis on how to assess and evaluate student progress in reading and mathematics and how to modify teaching approaches to meet the needs of the students. Acquisition of supervisory and leadership skills in the	Valuates literacy Supervision of the implementation of literacy Emphasis on how to assess and evaluate student progress in reading Supervisory and leadership skills in the assessment and evaluation of K-12 literacy

		assessment and evaluation of K-12 literacy and numeracy across curriculum.	
Hood College	EDUC 502 - Technology for Literacy, Leadership, and Learning	This course examines what educational leaders need to know about technology to enhance the school program, both administratively and instructionally.	Nothing
Andrews University	SPED 645- Reading and Writing Assessment & Intervention	This is an advanced course for diagnosis and remediation or prevention of reading and writing disabilities. Students will be trained on how to administer and interpret different reading and writing assessments that are used with K-12 students and to determine the correct evidence-based intervention through the analysis of data.	This is an advanced course for diagnosis and remediation or prevention of reading and writing disabilities. Students will be trained on how to administer and interpret different reading and writing assessments.

The coding process that was completed for the titles and course descriptions indicated that very few programs provided courses that contained literacy related terms in the title or course descriptions. As a result, the researchers decided to add a third coding process. This time the researchers would code the course descriptions of any course that had the term "curriculum" in the title. Again, the researchers pulled additional course descriptions for any course that contained the term "curriculum" from each university's website and searched the course descriptions for verification of literacy instruction. Each researcher reviewed the documents one time and then met with each other to address any discrepancies. The course descriptions were then coded a second time by each of the researchers a few weeks later. Upon completion of the second review, the researchers met and provided frequency counts for each of the curriculum courses that included a

literacy related term or phrase in the course description. A frequency count for each of the courses that included a literacy related term in the course descriptions was provided.

Findings

The findings of the coding analysis indicate that only four of the one hundred programs reviewed, required a single course with literacy in the title. The universities that required a course that had literacy in the title included: Monmouth University, Chicago University, Hood College, and Andrews University.

The four institutions that referenced the term "literacy" in either their course titles and/or course descriptions were reviewed again by the researchers. This additional review allowed researchers to determine that only three institutions actually addressed literacy instruction in their course descriptions. The course from Hood University's entitled, "Educational Technology for Literacy Leadership and Learning," used the term "Literacy" in the title. However, when reviewing the course description, the researchers did not find any mention of literacy instruction. The course description stated, "Examines what Educational Leaders (reading specialists, administrators, and teachers) need to know in order to enhance the school program through the use of technology. Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) practices, adaptive, administrative, and instructive use of technology." Therefore, the term "literacy" was used in their title, but there was no emphasis on literacy instruction within the actual course description (see Table 2).

The three programs that did offer a course with the term "literacy" in the title and a description that emphasized literacy instruction were Monmouth University, Chicago State University, and Andrews University. At Monmouth University the course entitled, "EDL-593: Administration and Supervision of Literacy Practices and Professional Development for School

Leaders" has a course description that reads, "Focuses on the principles, methods, and materials applicable to the administration, organization, and supervision of literacy programs as well as the coaching of staff and colleagues. Students are involved in observation, supervision, and a long-term staff development program in schools."

The course Chicago State University requires is entitled, "ELCF 5245, Supervision and Assessment of Literacy and Numeracy Initiatives Across Grades and Content Areas/Fields." The course description reads, "Evaluates literacy and numeracy skills and the supervision of the implementation of literacy and numeracy skills aligned with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) across the grades and across content areas. Emphasis on how to assess and evaluate student progress in reading and mathematics and how to modify teaching approaches to meet the needs of the students. Acquisition of supervisory and leadership skills in the assessment and evaluation of K-12 literacy and numeracy across curriculum."

Finally, the course Andrews University requires, "SPED 645- Reading and Writing Assessment & Intervention" included a course description that read, "This is an advanced course for diagnosis and remediation or prevention of reading and writing disabilities. Students will be trained on how to administer and interpret different reading and writing assessments that are used with K-12 students and to determine the correct evidence-based intervention through the analysis of data."

Based on the course descriptions, the researchers concluded that all three of these course descriptions indicated a focus on literacy instruction and assessment at some level. The course descriptions allowed the researchers to infer that literacy assessment, intervention, or methods focused on literacy were emphasized in each of these courses. Next, the researchers reviewed course descriptions with the word "curriculum" in the title. Three universities mentioned literacy

instruction within the identified curriculum course descriptions. For example, McKendree University's course entitled "Educational Curriculum Theory and Design" had a course description that read, **"**This course will examine the historical, social and political aspects of curriculum design and instruction. Dominant and alternative ways of thinking about curriculum and its evaluation will be presented. Included are: differentiated instruction, curriculum mapping, using Rubrics, exploring theory, and developing a curriculum design, as well as other current curricular issues and initiatives. The course focuses on literacy and numeracy, English Language Learner (ELL), early childhood, technology, the exceptional child, gifted, assessment and the needs of the school/district in improving student learning." St. Francis University and Western Illinois University had course descriptions that also alluded to literacy instruction in a similar way. However, all three of these descriptions failed to provide any details regarding which aspects of literacy are covered in those courses.

In summary, of the 100 Educational Leadership programs reviewed, only seven required a course that emphasized literacy as a topic within their required course titles or course descriptions. Within those seven programs, six actually mentioned literacy in their course descriptions and only three provided a course description that focused on literacy as a specific content topic. The other three embedded it within additional content topics such as mathematics and English Language Learners.

It should also be noted that the researchers did find some of the universities allowed for literacy courses to be taken as one of several electives. For example, The Bank Street College offered two literacy courses as one of their many elective options, as did Bowie University. Duquesne University offered the option to "add on" a "Supervisor of Reading" certificate to their M. Ed. in Administration program.

Seashore Louis et al. (2010) indicated that if one is to serve as an effective leader of instruction, they need the content knowledge that will allow them to provide actionable feedback. Flavell (1979) stated that an individual must know content in order to monitor thinking. Without the opportunity to take courses that focus on literacy instruction in their administrative programs, administrators may enter the field lacking the information they need to support teachers in improving their literacy practices.

Discussion

The metacognitive framework as stated by Flavell (1979) posits, "You may not understand some person or thing you hear, see, or read about if you do not attend closely—and also, sometimes, even if you do attend closely. Moreover, you can fail to understand something or someone in two different ways: (a) by not achieving any coherent representation at all, or (b) by understanding incorrectly, that is, misunderstanding" (p. 907). Therefore, it is possible that principals who lack literacy content knowledge may not recognize best literacy practices when they see them, nor will they be able to facilitate conversations that enable their teachers to improve their practices so that student learning can be impacted positively. Few studies that examine the relationship between evidence of metacognition and its impact on leadership exists. Further studies that examine this relationship are necessary to truly examine the impact metacognition will have on principal leadership.

This study sought to examine the number of literacy courses required of M.Ed. in Educational Leadership programs for principals according to course titles and course descriptions provided in the catalogs of various higher education institutions as identified through a CAEP search. Based on the course titles and courses description reviewed in this study, the opportunity to develop this content knowledge is lacking. While elementary education and early childhood

preservice programs require at least one, if not several courses in literacy, not all principals have a background in early childhood or elementary education. Many principals come from secondary backgrounds such as, but not limited to, family and consumer science, math, science, physical education, and music. Most secondary education programs focus heavily on the specific content and also fail to require an emphasis on literacy instruction. Based on the metacognition theoretical framework, this means that many principals may lack the content knowledge they need to provide teachers with effective feedback regarding literacy instruction. Therefore, it is possible that they may not be able to support teachers in improving practices that will lead to gains in student achievement.

Some institutions, however, do offer an elective in literacy. The researchers recommend that these programs consider making these required courses rather than optional electives. This would ensure that principals enter the field with the literacy knowledge they need to support their teachers and students.

Potential Scenario

Based on the lack of literacy courses required in nationally accredited educational administration programs, it is likely that many principals are not prepared to serve in the role of instructional leader for literacy. To prove this point, the following scenario based on the curriculum grid for a current undergraduate education program and a principal certification program is provided for you to ponder. Susan, a female undergraduate teacher candidate specializing in Physical and Health Education from a state university, successfully completes the 124-credit undergraduate Physical and Heath Education. This program required only a single course in literacy. However, Susan is deemed an effective teacher of Physical and Health Education and begins her career as a Physical Education teacher at a local middle school. After successfully

teaching Physical Education for five years, Susan decides to return to school to earn her K-12 Principal Certification at another state university. Similar to most principal certification programs, this program does not require candidates to take a course in literacy. Upon completion of 24 post baccalaureate credits and five years teaching in her documented area of certification (Physical and Health Education), Susan becomes a certified principal and an eligible candidate for a principal position. If hired as an elementary school principal, Susan may have received some instruction in literacy through professional development opportunities or self-selected readings, but she would be serving as a principal with only a single documented course in literacy in her sophomore year of her undergraduate program.

While the principal described in the scenario above may have participated in some professional development focused on literacy instruction and done some independent reading regarding literacy instruction beyond her undergraduate studies, she has not received formal coursework in her M. Ed. Program to help deepen her content knowledge in literacy. Consequently, this may impact their ability to provide teachers the feedback and guidance they need to improve their practices as recommended by the research on instructional leadership (Seashore Louis et al., 2010; Waters et al., 2003). Thus, without engaging in formal coursework focused on literacy instruction, principals may enter the field with a lack of knowledge needed to make curriculum and instruction decisions that may support student achievement, may be unfamiliar with effective literacy instruction, and may lack the ability to create or identify effective professional development that will help their teachers improve literacy instruction (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).

Limitations

This study explored the course titles and descriptions of courses required in educational administrative programs and found few programs required courses that included literacy related terms in their titles or course description. However, the study did not retrieve actual syllabi from the courses required within these programs, so it is possible that literacy is taught in courses that do not contain a literacy related term in the title or description.

Most states require administrators to participate in continuing education coursework. For example, principals in Pennsylvania are required to complete 140 hours of Professional Instruction Learning (PILS) to keep their current administrative certification active. What is not known is how many states require ongoing education and if there is a requirement to complete literacy related courses as part of these required hours.

Another limitation is that the study did not aim to discover the number of credits or hours of literacy instruction that would be needed for educational leaders to support their teachers. Additional studies that examine the ideal number of courses or the depth of content administrators require to be effective literacy leaders needs to be conducted. Secondly, research studies should examine the kinds of literacy courses that best support administrators. Do they need content, or do they need to learn the content through an administrative lens? Do they need to have experience in teaching literacy or experiences supervising literacy instruction?

The National and State Departments of Education might consider requiring that administrators continue to take ongoing courses in literacy as part of their continuing education requirements. Many states offer or require opportunities for principals to take advance courses or continuing education credits in literacy, but they do not require it. Embedding ongoing requirements in literacy instruction will keep building leaders abreast of current trends in literacy

instruction and assessment. Having knowledge of these current trends will allow them to serve as effective literacy leaders as they will have better self-awareness of what good literacy instruction looks like and how to provide feedback that will improve the literacy practices currently occurring in their buildings and ultimately nationwide (Mendels, 2012).

Conclusion

According to course titles and descriptions retrieved from the higher education institutions' websites, findings suggest few educational administrative programs require courses in literacy instruction. This raises questions and concerns regarding the extent to which leadership preparation programs are preparing K-12 leaders for an essential facet of their future work such as literacy instruction. Considering these findings, the educational community might consider requiring educational leadership candidates to take courses in literacy in an effort to help them propel their teachers forward, prior to distributing principal certifications.

As evidenced in the decreasing NAEP 2019 scores, we as a nation have room for literacy improvement. Fortunately, research demonstrates that principals with knowledge of effective literacy instruction have the potential to better support improved literacy achievement among their students (Taylor, 2004). Additionally, the International Literacy Association stated in their revised standards for literacy professionals (2018b), "The principal's role as an instructional leader is critical for ensuring all students receive effective literacy instruction" (p .97). In order to ensure that success, it is imperative that principals gain knowledge about literacy so that they have the metacognitive ability to make decisions, provide feedback, and conduct effective evaluations regarding literacy instruction. Consequently, it is imperative that principal preparation programs include courses that allow principal candidates to develop that content knowledge.

References

Andrews University (2019). Special education, learning disabilities K-12 endorsement MS. Retrieved May 5, 2019 from https://bulletin.andrews.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=16&poid=12814&returnto=3372#

Chicago State University (2019). Educational administration. Retrieved March 21, 2019 from: https://www.csu.edu/catalogs/graduate/Educational_Administration.htm

Darling-Hammond, L., Meyerson, D., LaPointe, M., & Orr, M. T. (2009). Preparing principals for a changing world: Lessons from effective school leadership programs. San Francisco, CA

East Stroudsburg University (November 11, 2019). Candidates for Health Education and Physical Education double major. Retrieved January 2, 2019 from: https://www.esu.Educational/academics/departments/physical_Educationalcation/undergraduate_program/index.cfm

Fink, E. & Resnick, L. B. (2001). Developing Principals as Instructional Leaders. The Phi Delta Kapp, 82 (8), 598-606

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906–911

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goldwyn, S. (2008). Examining Educational Leaders' Knowledge Base: Investigating Educational Leaders' Domain Knowledge of Reading (Doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

Hernandez, D. (2011). *Double jeopardy: How third-grade reading skills and poverty influence high school graduation*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED518818.pdf

Hoffman, J., Wilson, M., Martinez, R., & Sailors, M. (2011). Content analysis: the past, present, and future. In Duke, N. & Mallett, M. (eds.). *Literacy Research Methodologies*. New York: Guilford Press.

Hood College (n.d.). EDUC – Education. Retrieved January 2, 2019 from: http://hood.smartcatalogiq.com/2018-2019/Catalog/Graduate-Courses/EDUCATIONALC-Educationalcation/500/EDUCATIONALC-502

International Literacy Association (2018a). *Exploring the 2017 NAEP Reading Results: Systemic Reform Beat Simplistic Solutions*. Retrieved from literacyworldwide.org/statements

International Literacy Association. (2018b). *Standards for the preparation of literacy professionals 2017*. Newark, DE: Author.

Jenkins, B. (2009). What it takes to be an instructional leader. *Principal, 88*(3), 34-37. Retrieved from https://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/J-F_p34.pdf

Kindall, H.D., Crowe, T., & Elsass, A. (2018). The principal's influence on the novice teacher's professional development in literacy instruction. Professional Development in Education, 44 (2), 307-310.

Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Review of research: How leadership influences student learning. Toronto: University of Minnesota Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement University of Toronto Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Commissioned by The Wallace Foundation

Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). The principal as instructional leader. *National Forum of Education and Supervision Journal, 27*(4), 1-7. http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Lunenburg,%20Fred%20C.%20The%20Principal%20as%20Instructional%20Leader%20NFEASJ%20V27%20N4%202010.pdf

McKendree University (2019). Masters of Arts and Education (MAED) in Educational Leadership and Administration. Retrieved June 7, 2019 from: https://www.mckendree.edu/admission/info/graduate/maed/leadership/index.php

Mendels, P. (2012). The effective principal: Five pivotal practices that shape instructional leadership. *The Learning Professional, 33*(1), 54-58.

Millersville University (2019). MED Leadership or Teaching and Learning. Retrieved May 19, 2019 From: https://www.millersville.edu/edfoundations/m-ed-leadership.php

Monmouth University (2019). EDL-593 Administration and Supervision of Literacy Practices and Professional Development for School Leaders. Retrieved March 29, 2019 from: https://catalog.monmouth.Educational/graduate-catalog/Educationalcation/Educationalcational-counseling-leadership/principal-school-administrator-supervisor-msed/

Nation's Report Card (2019). *NAEP Reading Report Card*. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading/nation/scores/?grade=4

Nation's Report Card (2017). *NAEP Reading Report Card*. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2017/#/nation/scores?grade=4

Seashore Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation. http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/

Stein, M. K. & D'Amico, L. (April, 2000). How Multiple Subjects Matter in School Leadership. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (p.1-50), April 27, 2000, New Orleans, LA.

Supovitz, J., Sirinides, P., & May, H. (2010). How principals and peers influence teaching and learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(1), 31–56.

Sutcher, L., Podolsky, A., & Espinoza, D. (2017). *Supporting principals' learning: Key features of effective programs*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Taylor, R. T. (2004). Using Literacy leadership to Improve the Achievement of Struggling Students. Middle School Journal, 36 (1), 26-31.

University of St. Francis (n.d.). Master of Science in Education (M.S.) – Educational Leadership. Retrieved June 1, 2019 from: https://www.stfrancis.edu/educational-leadership-ms/

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), various years, 1990–2019 Mathematics and Reading Assessments. https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/mathematics/supportive_files/2019_infographic.pdf

Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. (Working paper). Aurora, CO: McREL.

Western Illinois University (2019). Educational Leadership. Retrieved June 2, 2019 from: http://www.wiu.edu/graduate_studies/programs_of_study/edl_profile.php

APPENDIX A

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS USED IN THE STUDY

Name of Institution	Total credits	Program Title
University of Central Arkansas	34	MED School Leadership, Building Administrator
Henderson State University	30	MED Educational Leadership (Ed. S) District Level
Arkansas State University	36	MSE Educational Leadership
Harding University	30	MED Educational Leadership: District Admin Advanced Specialist
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	30	EDAS District
Henderson State University	30	MSE Building Level
Arkansas Tech University	30	MED Educational Leadership
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	33	MED Building Administrator (P-12)
University of Arkansas at Monticello	33	MED Educational Leadership
Harding University	33	MED Educational Leadership
Quinnipiac University	30	MED Educational Leadership
University of North Colorado	30	MA Educational Leadership
University of South Carolina	36	MED Educational Administration
Wilmington University	33-35	MED School Leadership
Delaware State University	36	MED Educational Leadership Building Level
George Washington University	30	MED Educational Leadership & Admin
Howard University	36	MED Educational Administration and Policy Med
Trinity Washington University	30	MSA Educational Administration
Nova Southern University	36	M.S. Educational Leadership MS
Chicago State University	36	MA Educational Leadership & Principalship
McKendree University	39	MAED Educational Leadership & Administration
North Eastern Illinois University	36	MED Principal
University of St. Francis	30-33	MED Educational Leadership: Principal Prep
Concordia University	33	MED School Leadership
Western Illinois University	36	MED Principal
Southern Illinois University	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
Governors State University	36	MED Educational Leadership District Level
Loyola University	33	MED Principal

Northern Illinois University	36	Principal
Purdue University	30	MSE Educational Leadership Building Level
Indiana University North West	30	MED Educational Leadership
Indiana Wesleyan University	33	MED Principal Leadership Program
Indiana University SE	30	MED Building level Administration (p-12)
Oakland City University	36	MSED Building Level Administration
Bethel University	36	MED School Leadership
Indian University	33	MED Educational Leadership
Ball state University	33	MAE Educational Leadership: Building Level
Louisiana State University in Shreveport	34	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
Southeastern Louisiana University	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
Louisiana State University A&M College	39	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
University of Louisiana at Lafayette	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
University of New Orleans	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
Louisiana Tech University	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
University of Louisiana at Monroe	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
Northwestern State University of Louisiana	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
McNeese State University	36	MED Educational Leadership School Building Level
The Johns Hopkins University	39	MED School Administration and Supervision
Towson University	36	MED Human Resource Dev. Educational Leadership Track
Frostburg state University	36-42	MED Administration and Supervision
Hood College	36	MED Educational Administration
Salisbury University	33	MED Educational Leadership
Loyola University Maryland	39	MED Educational Leadership
McDaniel College	34	MED Educational Leadership
Bowie State University	41	MED Principal
Fitchburg State University	40	MED Educational Leadership
Salem State University	39	M.Ed. Educational Leadership
The University of Michigan-Flint	36	Master of Public Admin w. Ed Admin Concentration
Concordia University	32	MED Educational Leadership

Grand Valley State University	30	MED Educational Specialist
Andrews University	44	MED K-12 Educational Admin
Eastern Michigan University	32	MED Educational Leadership Specialist
Western Michigan University	36	MED Educational Leadership
Keene State College	36	MED Educational Leadership
Rider University	36	MED Educational Leadership/ Principal
Monmouth University	32	MED Principal Certification
William Paterson University	39	MED Educational Leadership
Lehman College CUNY	30	MED Educational Leadership building level
Teachers College Columbia University	33	MED Summers Principal Academy NY
University of Texas Arlington	30	MED Educational Leadership & Policy Studies Principal
State University of NY at Oswego	33	CAS School Building Leader
St. John Fisher College	32	MED Educational Leadership School District Leader
Bank Street College of Education	39	MSE Leadership for Educational Change
University of Rochester	36	MED Building Leader
East Carolina University	42	MED Educational Leadership
Kent State University	30	MED Administrator Educational leader Building Level
University of Cincinnati	36	MED Educational Leadership
Miami University	33	MED School Leadership
Bowling Green state University	33	MED Educational Leadership Building Level
University of Akron	30	MED Building Level Principalship
The Pennsylvania State University	30	MED Educational Leadership
Duquesne University	30	MED Educational Admin and Supervision District Level
East Stroudsburg University	36	MED in Educational Leadership and Principal Certification
Millersville University of PA	36	MED Leadership for Teaching and Learning
California University of PA	30	MED Administrative program for principal
Shippensburg University of PA	33	MED Educational Leadership- Building level
The PA state University	30	MED Educational Leadership - Principal
Winthrop University	36	MED Educational Leadership
Clemson University	36	MED Educational Admin and Supervision
University of South Carolina	36	MED Educational Administration
Coastal Carolina University	36	MED Educational Leadership

Lamar University	30	MED School Principal Cert
East Central University	32	MED Educational Leadership
Southern Nazarene University	36	MED Educational Leadership
Virginia State University	39	MED Educational Admin and Supervision
University of Houston	30	MSE Educational Management
Northwestern Oklahoma State University	34	MED Educational Leadership
University of Alaska Anchorage	35	MED Educational Leadership
Northern Arizona University	36	MED Educational Leadership Principal K-12
University of Alaska South Eastern	36	MED Educational Leadership
University of Connecticut	30	MED Executive Leadership Superintendent