Journal of Research on Leadership Education
Volume 2, Issue 3 (December, 2007)

DEVELOPING SCHOOL LEADERS: PRACTITIONER GROWTH DURING AN ADVANCED LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR PRINCIPALS AND ADMINISTRATOR-TRAINED TEACHERS

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno
University of Kentucky

The intent of principal preparation "is to produce leaders" (Milstein, 1992, p. 10) that have the requisite knowledge, dispositions, and skills to lead contemporary schools competently and effectively (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000; Kelley & Peterson, 2000). New performance expectations for principals in the United States, delineated in administrator standards established by the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO, 1996) and individual states, have modified the long-standing perception of a principal as a school manager to a perspective of learner-centered leaders who focus on high levels of learning for all students (Fullan, 2003; Murphy, 2002, 2005; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Subsequently, many university-based preparation programs have redesigned their delivery formats, aligned their curricula to new professional standards, and updated their performance assessments for graduate students (Jackson & Kelley, 2002; Murphy & Forsyth, 1999). Nonetheless, new and veteran principals alike face administrative realities today for which they are often not fully prepared.

Almost concurrently with changed expectations for the principalship, school districts in the United States report difficulty in attracting and retaining well-prepared principals (Educational Research Service, National Association of Elementary School Principals, & National Association of Secondary School Principals 2000; McAdams, 1998). Reasons for shrinking candidate pools are interrelated, confounding, and costly (Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Muth & Browne-Ferrigno, 2004; Usdan, 2002), but often linked to contextual challenges. Potential candidates are simply not willing to apply for, or assume,

principalships in schools with high staff turnover, limited resources, and low student achievement (Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, & Chung, 2003; Lashway, 2003; Roza, Cello, Harvey, & Wishon, 2003). Hard-to-staff schools are often located in geographically isolated or economically distressed districts with "concentrations of poor and minority students, low per-pupil expenditures, and low principal salaries" (Roza & Swartz, 2003, p. 2). Such contextual conditions are unappealing to many qualified candidates, particularly for individuals with school-age children or spouses with professional careers. Recruiting and retaining principals is thus quite challenging for the schools "most in need of outstanding leadership" (Roza et al., p. 55).

The issue is compounded in rural areas with less than 2,500 residents. Because approximately 7.2 million of American's 45.1 million children and youth live in these small communities, 1 out of every 6P-12 students attends a school where learning opportunities different from those in urban or suburban schools (Arnold, 2004). For example, students attending rural schools seldom take fieldtrips to museums, theatrical performances, or historical sites because travels distances are too great and costs too prohibitive. Small rural schools cannot be supported through partnerships with community organizations or local businesses because none are located in their vicinities. Unlike urban and suburban settings where social services are delivered by governmental agencies, rural schools are often the support providers for students and families in need of such assistance. Hence, addressing principal-candidate shortages in hard-to-staff rural schools requires unique strategies and determined efforts by districts desperately needing new administrative talent (Howley & Pendarvis, 2002; Miller, 2004).

This article describes an advanced leadership development program designed to prepare principals who are able and willing to serve in high-need rural schools and includes participants' reflections on their professional growth. Commentary presented in this article emerged from an exploratory case study conducted throughout program implementation. Although designed specifically for a high-need rural district in eastern Kentucky, the

program was 1 of 6 initiatives selected by WestEd to be featured in *Innovations in Education: Innovative Pathways to School Leadership* (U. S. Department of Education [USDE], 2005). Thus, the program presented here has potential for replication in other settings[a].

Frameworks: Literature-Based Program Design

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) *Standards for School Leaders* (CCSSO, 1996) were adopted in 1998 as Kentucky's framework for the preparation, practice, and evaluation of principals (Browne-Ferrigno & Fusarelli, 2005). Because the rural district had developed an administrator evaluation aligned with the *Standards*, the program needed a new, yet closely related framework. The curriculum was thus based on the *Standard's* four recurring themes identified by researchers at the Educational Testing Service: "a vision of success, a focus on teaching and learning, an engagement of all stakeholders, a demonstration of ethical practice" (Hessel and Holloway, 2002, p. 21).

The Principals Excellence Program (PEP) was designed on the premise that the "making of a principal" (Lane, 1984) is an intricate process of personal and professional transformation that often requires considerable time and support by others (Browne-Ferrigno, 2001, 2003; Crow & Glascock, 1995; Goldring & Rallis, 1993). The goals of PEP were to improve instructional leadership among practicing principals and to expand the pool of principal candidates, and the strategy was to provide advanced leadership development for principals and teachers holding valid administrator certification. Because scant literature about professional development for practicing principals existed when the program was designed (National Staff Development Council, 2000), research-based recommendations for improving preservice principal preparation and adult learning theories were used. Socialization into the community of administrative practice (Aiken, 2002; Begley & Campbell-Evans, 1992; Crow & Glascock, 1995; Greenfield, 1975; Hamilton, Ross, Steinbach, & Leithwood, 1996) became the framework for the program. Four theories of

action—situated learning, leadership mentoring, community building, succession planning—guided the design and implementation of learning activities, performance assessments, and program evaluation. Instructional and assessment strategies, based on the four theories of action, included comprehensive action research, group-development activities, individual and group reflection, inquiry learning, and participant presentations to authentic audiences. Examples of literature that guided program development in 2002 follows.

Situated Learning

Situated learning was the primary theory of action used by program designers. Sometimes called supervised clinical practice or social practice (Wenger, 1998), situated learning is a well-accepted component of professional preparation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Stein, 1998). It places emerging professionals in authentic situations where they can apply theories, procedures, and skills learned in classroom settings (Glasman & Glasman, 1997; Murphy, 1993). Learning in context of authentic practice can increase role clarification and technical expertise and simultaneously develop important skills and behaviors (Capasso & Daresh, 2001; Cordeiro & Smith-Sloan, 1995; White & Crow, 1993).

Supervised clinical practice stimulates essential changes in aspiring principals' educational orientations, perspectives, concepts, language, and behaviors (Browne-Ferrigno, 2001, 2003; Milstein & Krueger, 1997). Because most preservice preparation programs are delivered after regular school hours to accommodate students employed full-time as teachers, graduates often do not have opportunities for extensive field-based administrative practice. In order to address this challenge, program participants were assigned to schools where they engaged in purposeful work with support from leadership mentors.

Leadership Mentoring

Because leadership mentoring fosters reciprocal learning and develops collegial relationships, it became the second theory of action guiding program design and

implementation. When aspiring or novice practitioners are able to work with veteran practitioners in authentic settings, they observe leadership in action and develop an understanding about professional expectations in the professional community (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2001a, 2004a, 2006; Heck, 1995; Parkay & Hall, 1992). Leadership mentoring has the potential to enhance role-identity transformation for aspiring and novice principals, provide concurrent professional development for veteran principals serving as mentors, and expand leadership capacity throughout an organization (Crow & Matthews, 1998; Milstein, Bobroff, & Restine, 1991; Mullen & Lick, 1999).

Community Building

Today principals are expected to engage in collaborative leadership with stakeholder groups (CCSSO, 1996; Hessel & Holloway, 2002). Because the closed-cohort model of program delivery forms stable learning groups that do not change membership, cohort members can potentially gain practice as collaborative leaders (Basom & Yerkes, 2001; Norris & Barnett, 1994). A community created by the closed-cohort structure and maintained through purposeful group-development activities is perceived to strengthen curriculum integration and team teaching (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2001b, 2003, 2004b; Teitel, 1995; Yerkes, Basom, Norris, & Barnett, 1995). Other benefits of learning in cohorts include development of reflective abilities, professional behaviors, and interpersonal relationships (Hill, 1995; Horn, 2001; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Coffin, 1995).

With careful attention to ongoing group development, cohorts have potential to build trust relationships, create safe learning environments, expand collegial networks, and develop high-performing teams. Community building thus became the third theory of action for this program.

Succession Planning

Planning for future leadership needs requires concerted efforts to attract and select quality applicants to the field of administrative practice (Hart, 1993; IEL, 2000). Filling an

open principalship is a complex social process that affects school culture, interpersonal relationships among stakeholder groups, and student learning (Jones & Webber, 2001; Takahashi, 1998). Potential candidates must be identified, nominated, recruited, and developed (Petzko & Sceary, 2001; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998), a process long recommended by the field of educational administration (Milstein, 1992; Stout, 1973). Because expanding the district's candidate pool was a goal, succession planning became the fourth theory of action.

Context: Characteristics of High-Need Rural District

Pike County is located in the easternmost tip of Kentucky, bordering Virginia and West Virginia, a region of rugged terrain with steep mountains and narrow hollows. The closest metropolitan center is Lexington, 150 miles to the west. During the 1700s the region was settled by Scotch-Irish and German clans that lived independently as yeoman-farmers and did not readily welcome newcomers (Clark, 1988; Drake, 2001). Remnants of the past persist today, particularly the deeply ingrained patriarchy (Harrison & Klotter, 1997).

Because most current residents were either born in Pike County or nearby counties and have lived there most of their lives, the population is over 98 percent "white persons, not of Hispanic/Latino origin" (United States Census Bureau [Census], 2000). The population is not diverse based on race, culture, or nationality designations, although differences as found in socioeconomic status, level of education, residence location, work and life experiences. For example, less than two-thirds of the population age 25 or older have graduated from high school or earned an equivalency certificate. Less than 10 percent among that same group have earned a postsecondary degree despite local availability of several colleges and satellite campuses of a regional university. Less than 45 percent of Pike County residents 16 years or older were employed in the civilian labor force in 1999. Although the median household income was $23,930 that same year, approximately 33 percent of county households reported annual incomes under $15,000 (Census, 2000).

Pike County was classified by the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) as "distressed" for many years because its three-year unemployment and poverty rates remained at least 1.5 times the national average (Hilston, 2000). After the county's government seat and only town of appreciable size, Pikeville, was designated as a growth center by ARC, millions of dollars from federal and state sources were available for major infrastructure development (Drake, 2001). Pikeville Independent School District serves the children residing within the town limits. All children residing outside the Pikeville attend schools served by the countywide educational system known as Pike County Public Schools (PCPS).

With over 76 percent of all school-age children and youth eligible for free or reduced lunch, Kentucky ranks first among the 50 states in a priority ranking based on the "percentage of rural students who qualify for subsidized meals" (Johnson & Strange, 2005, p. 51). The PCPS average rate is 69 percent; however, many schools in isolated communities have participation rates above 90 percent. Although some community-based support is available to county schools located near the town limits, most others do not receive any external support.

The social, educational, and economic features of Pike County are common to most other counties located in the Central Appalachian region of eastern Kentucky. PCPS is unique because the superintendent and his leadership team refused to allow the high-need conditions to impact educational opportunities for children and youth in the district.

Leadership Development: Principals Excellence Program

A three-year grant from the USDE School Leadership Development Program awarded in September 2002 to the University of Kentucky (UK) and PCPS partnership made it possible to implement and evaluate PEP. Because the two partners are located 150 miles apart, external funds were needed to pay travel expenses for UK professors. The grant also paid tuition for 18 credits of coursework in educational leadership studies through UK

Graduate School, books and instructional materials, stipends to cohort members ($1000) and mentor principals ($500), and substitute expenses for participating teachers. Costs related to program evaluation and dissemination of findings (e.g., professional transcription of interview tapes, consultant fee for external evaluator, travel expenses to professional conferences and annual project director meetings in Washington, DC) were also paid by the grant. Without external funding, PEP would probably never have been implemented. Key design elements of the program are presented in the remainder of this section.

Cohorts Composed of Principals and Teachers

Program designers used a unique delivery format to support achievement of both goals: Provide simultaneous leadership development through closed cohorts composed of both practicing and teachers who had completed administrator certification requirements. This structure gave administrator-prepared teachers opportunities to work collaboratively, as equals, with principals outside their schools. Principals had the opportunity to enhance their instructional leadership skills by working closely with teacher leaders who had expertise in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Including both principals and teachers in the cohort memberships proved to be one of the most valuable elements of the program's design.

Differentiated Learning Experiences

Learning activities and performance assessments focused on preparing visionary instructional leaders who would have the necessary disposition and desire to be change agents, abilities to develop broad-based collaborations, skills to be reflective researchers and data-based decision makers, and commitment to lifelong learning. Achieving the two project goals—transformation of the principalship into a model of learner-centered leadership and expansion of the principal candidate pool—required significant time and effort dedicated solely to leadership development. Because the superintendent and school board members wanted to give credibility and value to the leadership development

activities, they released all cohort members—both teachers and principals—from their professional responsibilities one day every week throughout a calendar year (Cohort A: January-December 2003; Cohort B: January-December 2004).

Weekly activities. By instituting an alternating schedule of learning activities, cohort members worked a full day at their mentors' schools one week and then the next participated in a full-day seminar-workshop with cohort peers and instructions. The biweekly cohort meetings provided time for participants to reflect together about what they were learning and how they were applying that learning to their practices and also plan for their upcoming fieldwork. During the cohort meetings principals often shared their successes or challenges, which helped novice and aspiring principals conceptualize new notions about school leadership. The pattern of alternating fieldwork and group meetings help to stimulate linkage between theory and practice.

School-based action research. Program designers realized the work conducted in schools had to be relevant for everyone concerned, and thus, disciplined inquiry became the vehicle for providing authentic leadership practice. Each semester cohort members were assigned to small inquiry teams to conduct collaborative action research about authentic issues at their mentors' schools, during the spring semester in an elementary school and then a secondary school the next fall.

Action research studies were the primary assignments. Each inquiry project required a written proposal, human subjects research approval, literature reviews, data collection and analysis, a written report, and PowerPoint slides. Progress reports were shared during the biweekly seminar-workshops, and feedback was provided by instructors and cohort members. At the close of each semester, inquiry teams presented their findings formally to the host school and at a luncheon sponsored by the superintendent.

Summer institutes. The program also included three summer leadership institutes. Because socialization was the overarching theory of change and community building was a theory of action, institute attendees included cohort members, all district administrators,

and selected teacher leaders. During the institutes, participants (a) aligned the K-12 math and science curricula, (b) investigated ways to differentiate curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and (c) studied balanced school leadership (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003) and reviewed the statewide framework for school improvement.

Mentors and Instructors

The superintendent made final decisions about who served as mentor principals. Mentors were selected based on personnel criteria (e.g., years experience, personality compatibility, travel distances between schools, potential learning opportunities) and characteristics of their schools (e.g., location, student populations and accompanying learning needs, faculty composition, community-based support, educational programs and facilities, student performance achievement). Working in two schools—at different levels and with different mentors—provided opportunities for cohort members to learn more about the district and other school communities and to develop collegial relationships with experienced principals. Cohort instructors visited each host school several times each semester to provide assistance when needed for completion of the action research project.

Seven of the 12 mentor principals participated actively throughout program implementation. Two elementary school principals worked as mentors for both cohorts; a high school mentor for Cohort A participated as a member of Cohort B because a veteran principal was needed to balance group composition. Four secondary principals who participated as members of Cohort A served as mentors for Cohort B. The extended service by these individuals helped to assure program coherence over time.

Cohort instructors included five UK professors (three tenure-track and two clinical) and the director of curriculum and instruction for PCPS who were selected based on their experiences as public school teachers and administrators and their expertise as leadership educators. Following each cohort meeting, the instructors reviewed the planned activities for the next session, made adjustments to the curriculum to address learner needs, and

distributed preparation and instructional responsibilities. The project director served as the cohort leader.

Program Evaluation: Case Study Methodology

Evaluation of program effectiveness was a required condition for external funding. Thus, data collection occurred at regular intervals, beginning at the first cohort meeting in January 2003 and continued through the third summer institute in June 2005. The case study design was selected to frame the program evaluation because the inquiry was bound by a specific time period and encapsulated in a particular structure (Creswell, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). The project director served as the primary investigator; a doctoral student served as program coordinator and provided research assistance. The program evaluator was a professor at a research university in another state.

Data Sources: Triangulated Perspectives

Data collection strategies included surveys, reflections, focus-group interviews, observations, and input from members of all key stakeholder groups. Although participation was voluntary for secondary study participants, all cohort members were required to participate because they received academic, professional, and monetary benefits through the grant. The case study intentionally focused on capturing perceptions of cohort members at various times throughout their program experiences, rather than only at the beginning and end of their yearlong professional development. Their responses over time provided ongoing evaluation of implementation progress and guided the instructional team in adapting the curriculum to accommodate changing needs of the participants.

The secondary study participants contributed outsider assessments and provided important contextual and historical information about the district. A group interview conducted in June 2004 that involved the PCPS leadership team and cohort instructors was particularly informative. During the 2-hour interview, the group reflected about their efforts

to improve school leadership during the previous several years and discussed how PEP had begun to change the community of administrative practice throughout the district.

Researchers from WestEd visited the district in late July 2004 and conducted a series of interviews with program participants and supporters to gather additional data for the 2005 USDE publication. Those interviews were audio-taped by the project coordinator and then professionally transcribed. The transcriptions provided additional data for triangulation.

Primary Study Participants: Cohort Members

Thirty applicants were selected by the PCPS leadership team to participate in one of the two cohorts. Selection criteria were based on the knowledge, dispositions, and skills that the leadership team determined an ideal principal would possess: (a) understands Kentucky's core content and learning goals, (b) believes that all children can learn at high levels, (c) has a thorough knowledge of curriculum and assessment, (d) demonstrates instructional leadership within his or her school community, (e) shows evidence of being a master teacher, (f) works well as a team member, (g) shows evidence of being a lifelong learner, and (h) understands the teaching and learning process.

A total of 30 applicants were admitted to the program. Table 1 displays the composition of each cohort at the beginning and conclusion of their advanced leadership development.

Table 1

PEP Cohort Compositions

Total Participants (N=30)	Project Beginning		Project Ending		
	Teachers	Principals	Teachers	Principals	HSE
Cohort A (n=15)	7	8	2	11*	1
Cohort B (n=15)	8	7	2	12	1

* In June 2005 the district did not renew the annual contract for one principal participating in Cohort A. The opening was filled by a teacher member of Cohort A.

Cohort A included 8 women and 7 men whose ages ranged from 25 to 60 years when they begin their professional development in January 2003. At that time their total years of experience as educators ranged from 4 to 26 years; tenures of principals ranged from 6 months to 6 years. The group included five principals, three assistant principals, and six administrator-certified teachers and a media specialist.

Co*hort B* included 5 women and 10 men whose ages ranged from 28 to 56 years when they began their professional development in January 2004. Membership included four principals, three assistant principals, one teacher on special assignment as acting principal, six administrator-certified teachers and a media specialist. When the cohort began its leadership development, participants' years of experience as educators ranged from 4 to 25 years; the tenure of participating principals spanned from 6 months to 7 years. Cohort B differed from Cohort A because three participants worked in a nearby district; they met the same admission criteria as those from PCPS.

Secondary Study Participants

Mentor principals, district administrators, and cohort instructors also participated as case study participants. They provided their insights and assessments during several focus-group interviews and through questionnaires administered throughout the case study. With their permission, some electronic mail messages to the principal investigator were used as data sources.

Data Analysis: Qualitative Strategies

Progressive data analysis was conducted concurrently with data collection to assess progress of participant learning and project implementation and to identify need for additional or modified data collection. Ongoing analyses of questionnaire responses, interview transcriptions, and participant writing samples included qualitative, grounded theory, and content analysis techniques (Kvale, 1996; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Miles &

Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Weber, 1990). The bulk of data analysis was conducted during program evaluation using a qualitative data analysis software program that allows cross-case comparisons among various subgroups. The director of curriculum and instruction, cohort instructors, and program coordinator reviewed all study reports before distribution. These member checks helped to assure accuracy (Stake, 1995).

Findings: Participants' Self-Reported Professional Growth

Cohort members were asked periodically to identify the professional effects of participating in an advanced leadership program. The two key finding that follow represent an analysis of responses to prompts on questionnaires administered shortly after the closing of each cohort (Cohort A: January 2004; Cohort B: January 2005) or comments made during the final focus-group interviews conducted during the June 2005 summer institute.

Changed Perceptions about the Principalship

Program designers perceived that creating cohorts with nearly equal numbers of novice principals and teachers—with at least one successful veteran principal—would greatly enhance learning. Peppered throughout data collected throughout program implementation is evidence of the learning that occurred because principals and teachers participated together in the cohorts, most noticeably by the often used word "we" in their comments. The opportunity to work closely with principals from across the district changed perceptions about the principalship. Regardless of their current positions or years of experience, participants reported gaining broader insights about principal responsibilities. For example, a media specialist wrote,

> Through PEP we learned about what leaders need to know and be able to do to educate students . . . how to raise expectations, increase student engagement and motivation, plan focused and sustained staff development, increase parental involvement, and use data to support student learning. Student achievement must

> be the number one leadership priority of principals. They need to find more effective ways to lead and organize their schools for learning by reexamining school values, school vision, instructional practices, cultural traditions, organizational structures, curricular decisions, and use of time and resources.

A Title 1 teacher in an elementary school provided a different insight that evidenced a leadership disposition.

> Participating in PEP has greatly broadened my knowledge of the principalship. I realize the roles and responsibilities of a principal are much more complex than day-to-day management and operations of a school. Principals must be effective instructional leaders within the school community. I believe principals must develop and promote a positive learning environment through a shared vision. Without a positive learning environment, school improvement is virtually impossible.

Novice principals and assistant principals shared slightly different perceptions about the principalship than their teacher peers. Nonetheless, their comments suggest that participating in the program expanded their insights about school leadership and provided guidance in adopting new behaviors. Their words indicate a more personal attachment to the issues they discuss. For example, a second-year elementary principal wrote about the importance of creating a school culture that supports student learning and teamwork.

> I now realize that much work goes into making the culture of the school one of high expectations and success. . . . There are many other factors, but before I participated in PEP, I just did not realize the daily effort that culture requires. I also now realize that an administrator must be the leader of a team effort. That often means allowing others to lead while the principal is an active participant in the process.

A cohort peer, who moved from a high-school teaching position to an elementary principalship just a few months before beginning the program, often shared his struggles as a new principal during cohort meetings. His written reflections throughout the year were quite candid, almost like journal entries. Working closely with mentors, cohort peers, and instructors enhanced his understanding of the principalship from two different perspectives and helped him gain confidence to make tough decisions. Following is a response he wrote to a prompt appearing on a questionnaire administered in January 2005, which was 18 months after he completed the program.

> PEP gave me the opportunity to view firsthand how successful administrators operate their respective schools. It has given me the opportunity to look at the principalship from the outside, rather than only from the inside. It has given me more self-confidence as a school leader and made me realize that change is sometimes painful and difficult. Two of my toughest decisions that came after much grief and sorrow were probably the two things that impacted student achievement the most. Both, when originally made, made me as popular as the bubonic plague! Some of my most vocal critiques will tell you now they were good decisions for [my school].

His newfound perspective about the principalship and confidence as a school leader becomes evident when compared with his response to a questionnaire prompt written in January 2004: “Without PEP, I would have probably requested or applied for a teaching position after [my first year as a principal]. Days away from my school gave me time to reflect on some of the monumental mistakes I made as a first-year administrator.”

The freedom to express true feelings about work responsibilities to trusted colleagues helped several other cohort members. During seminar-workshops during the second half of the program, a novice high school assistant principal complained that his sole responsibility was student discipline. Participating in PEP helped him understand that the

principalship encompasses many roles and responsibilities, and he began to realize that he was not gaining the type of experience that he needed to become a principal.

> PEP increased my awareness of the breadth of responsibilities involved in the principalship. I came to realize more clearly that being a principal requires all the skills of management and knowledge as I previously thought, plus knowledge about curriculum, psychology, communication, and motivational strategies.

His cohort peers suggested that he talk with his principal about his assuming additional responsibilities to give him opportunities to grow professionally.

Veteran principals also reported developing new perspectives about school leadership through their participation as cohort members. The high school principal who was both a mentor and cohort member learned that leading a school does not have to be a solitary activity.

> I have concluded that I am not alone in the issues I face in the principalship. PEP has provided me an outstanding network of support, both among fellow educators within the district and the five instructors who worked with us during the project. Along these same lines, I am now completely sold on involving many people in decision-making and school improvement processes. Additionally, the focus we placed on culture and climate has really made an impact on our school.

He also reported that he now views the principal more as “a change agent than simply a leader or manager” and actively seeks “greater involvement from parents and community members in the daily life of our school.”

The inclusion of veteran, novice, and aspiring principals in the cohort memberships helped all participants to reconceptualize the principalship. The curricular foci, readings, and learning activities added to participants’ knowledge and understanding about the responsibilities and roles delegated to school leaders. Participants’ perceptions about school

leadership were influenced most significantly through collegial interactions during cohort meetings and while conducting research in their mentors' schools.

Increased Confidence and Readiness for the Principalship

During the June 2005 focus-group interviews, participants were asked if the second goal for the program—expansion of candidate pool—had been achieved. Positive responses were evident by heads nodding up and down and by numerous affirmative comments, such as "Absolutely!" and "Beyond a shadow of a doubt." During one interview, a high school teacher stated, "I wasn't sure that I was ready to be an administrator, but after PEP I see that I was ready and am now even more ready." Shortly before the interview, he delivered his application for a principalship to the district office. A month later he was selected to serve as an elementary principal.

Evidence that an expanded candidate pool had been created was found in responses to a prompt posed on the questionnaires administered in January 2004 and January 2005: *Are you ready to be a principal? Please explain your response.* A high school teacher wrote about his readiness to be a principal: "Before PEP, I knew I wasn't ready to take on the challenge of being an educational leader. After PEP, I realize that I was correct in my prior assumption. I now have the tools to be an effective educational leader." Likewise, a teacher on special assignment as the coordinator of a technology grant shared that she gained confidence through participating in the program. She wrote,

> I especially feel more confident as a school leader due to the fact that one of my own personal goals was that PEP would provide me with knowledge and skills to transition from teacher to principal. I now feel much more confident both in the school as well as outside the school. All the collegiality among the cohort members, mentors, and instructors provided me with a degree of confidence I would have never had before.

She became a middle school assistant principal in July 2005.

Several assistant principals also indicated that they felt more confident about their leadership abilities. For example, an experienced assistant principal explained,

> Participating in PEP gave me confidence in myself as an educational leader. I've always been able to lead, but the job of school leader was a bit overwhelming. Being involved in PEP allowed me to make mistakes and grow into an educational leader.

He applied for a principalship 6-months after the close of his program and today serves as the principal of a middle school.

Being confident about ones leadership abilities does not mean that one is ready for the responsibilities. A media specialist responded, "I have the ability to be an effective instructional leader [because] I have always promoted and facilitated academic excellence for all students. However, participating in PEP greatly increased my confidence and desire to become a principal in the near future." Despite feeling more confident and ready, she has delayed seeking an administrative position because her new husband asked her to wait a few years.

Another teacher wrote that his program experiences helped him understand that he can "lead by following." He too feels "more confidence" and developed a new ability to "individualize [his] leadership to meet the needs" of those with whom he works. The birth of a first child has delayed his seeking an administrative position because he is not willing at the moment to work the long hours required for high school principals.

The downside of being ready to assume school leadership is that the opportunity may not present itself. A veteran teacher became quite disappointed about not being invited for interviews when cohort peers were. She began to realize that she is still an educational leader whether she works in a classroom or an office. She stated,

> My perception of myself as an educational leader no longer rests solely on

becoming a principal. I understand that I can also be effective as a school leader in the capacity of a lead teacher. I understand that it takes more than just a principal to make a school a successful school.

In Kentucky site-based governance committees, known as School-Based Decision Making Councils, have final authority to make principal selections. The teacher who has applied for positions but never been invited for an interview is a middle-aged woman. Her gender and age may be stumbling blocks to her career advancement in this region of Kentucky.

Implications: Novel and Effective Leadership Development Strategies

Transforming the principalship and expanding the candidate pool required leadership development strategies rarely used in university-based preparation programs at the time PEP was designed and implemented. Three findings—socialization, continuous professional improvement, principal readiness and success planning—consistently emerged during re-analysis of data for this article as well as during program evaluation. The findings also link directly to the literature that guided our program design.

Socialization

Data collected during this case study support the premise that important socialization occurs when teachers and principals participate together in leadership activities (Aiken, 2002; Begley, 1992; Cordeiro & Smith-Sloan, 1995; Crow & Glascock, 1995). Teachers and assistant principals participating in PEP developed new perspectives about the principalship by listening to principals share issues and concerns about their leadership actions and the feedback provided by cohort peers and instructors. Working with principals as equals, while conducting action research in schools, also helped teachers and assistant principals gain greater confidence in their abilities to lead schools. Likewise, principals discovered the value of collaboration within and across their school boundaries and now seek advice and support

from others: No longer are they lone leaders. Several admitted to gaining greater appreciation for teachers as instructional leaders.

Continuous Professional Improvement

Study findings support Lane's (1984) contention that "the making of a principal" is an ongoing process. All participants grew professionally, sometimes stimulated by an assigned reading or classroom learning activity, but more typically through active-learning experiences in schools and guided reflection about those experiences. Likewise, findings support the premise that leadership mentoring engages veteran, novice, and aspiring principals in reciprocal professional development (Capasso & Daresh, 2001; Heck, 1995; Matthews & Crow, 2003) which, in turn, improves the community of professional practice continuously improves (Beyu & Holmes, 1992; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). The program-sponsored activities provided opportunities for administrators and principals across the district to work closely together in meaningful ways.

Principalship Readiness and Succession Planning

Some graduates of preparation programs are not ready for the principalship because they have not completed the necessary role transformation from teacher to principal (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003; Crow & Glascock, 1995; Glasman & Glasman, 1997; White & Crow, 1993). The findings from this case study not only support previous research, but also provide evidence that socialization experiences stimulate role transformation. Learning that career patterns for men and women often differ (Ortiz, 1982) is also helpful.

Successful completion of a graduate program in educational administration and passage of licensure examinations makes one eligible to serve as a principal. Becoming a successful school leader, however, requires important dispositions and skills (e.g., integrating new knowledge into authentic practice, reflection about school-leadership issues, confidence to take calculated risks as educational leaders). As this case study found, filling open principalships also requires concerted efforts in succession planning (Hart, 1993; Jones

& Webber, 2001). Many viable candidates are already working in district schools and simply need to be identified, recruited, and prepared in new ways for the role.

Closing Thoughts

The grant that supported implementation of the Principals Excellence Program allowed program designers and instructors to field test recommended best practices for principal preparation and evaluate their effectiveness. External funding also provided the freedom for the application of novel and innovative approaches to leadership development. Two design elements of PEP that proved to be particularly promising can easily be adopted for university-based preservice programs.

First, the cyclical pattern of classroom learning and field application proved to be a major influence on practitioner learning. The alternating pattern of working 1-week as an inquiry team in an unfamiliar school setting, and then reflecting about those experiences as a group the following week, required cohort members to think about problems and issues in diverse ways. Working in new settings developed “new eyes” through which cohort members, and even mentors, examined more closely the culture and practices in their own schools. Because host schools used action research findings to plan school improvement efforts, the importance of using data to make decisions was validated. Action research is a powerful instructional strategy that develops inquiry and analysis skills. When professors use action research to improve their courses, they model reflect practice for their students.

Second, creating closed cohorts composed of veteran, novice, and prospective principals supported community building and helped develop relational trust among participants and instructors. Leadership mentoring was not limited to the principals who supported field-based experiences or the cohort instructors who facilitated classroom learning activities. Commentary by cohort members indicates that their greatest learning came through listening to peers share their experiences. The conversations, and occasional heated debates, forced everyone to examine their perceptions about the principalship and

develop new understandings about contemporary school leadership. Professors who make learning, instead of teaching, the central activity in their classrooms create environments where all participants are valued and sharing of ideas and insights is encouraged.

The evaluation of this program indicates that the two major goals—transforming the principalship, expanding the candidate pool—were achieved by the summer of 2005. The superintendent, who spearheaded change in the district through his visionary leadership, and other key district administrators retired in June 2006. Today, several program participants have been promoted to positions in the Kentucky Department of Education or have accepted administrative positions in other districts. A new administrative team now leads the district, creating change throughout the system. Although the lasting influence of the Principals Excellence Program on Pike County Public Schools is yet to be determined, findings from the exploratory case study indicate it has influenced the professional practices of those who participated.

Perhaps one of the most important lessons from PEP was the powerful reciprocal learning that occurred by including both principals and teachers in the cohorts and both professors and practitioners on the instructional team. Working together every week throughout an academic year, outside their own schools and with representatives from all three levels of schools, gave cohort members opportunities to develop expertise in collaborative leadership. The hierarchical framework of principal as leader and teacher as follower was dismantled—and replaced by a network of educational leadership peers. Likewise, meeting in a seminar-workshop format for a full day on a biweekly schedule gave us time to discuss leadership in theory and in practice. Taking runs, cohort members and instructors assumed roles as facilitators, guides, and provocateurs as we shared our interpretations of readings and recollections about experiences and then posed questions for greater understanding. Every cohort meeting with reflection about lessons learned that day. Our approach to developing school leaders dissolved the teacher-student power

relationships of formal education and bridged the imaginary gulf between leadership theory and practice.

---

[a]Findings from the exploratory case study conducted throughout project implementation have been disseminated through a variety of venues. Publications include journal articles and book chapters that focused on university-district partnerships and leadership development (Browne-Ferrigno, 2004; Browne-Ferrigno & Lindle, 2006; Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004a), rural education (Browne-Ferrigno & Allen, 2006; Browne-Ferrigno & Maynard, 2005), and sustainability potential (Browne-Ferrigno, Allen, Maynard, Jackson, & Stalion, 2006). Additional information about the project is available on the USED Web site (http://www.ed.gov/admins/recruit/prep/alternative/report.pdf) and e-Lead Web site (http://www.e-lead.org/programs/pep/links.asp).

References

Aiken, J. A. (2002, Winter). The socialization of new principals: Another perspective on principal retention. *Education Leadership Review, 3*(1), 32-40.

Arnold, M. (2004). *Guiding rural schools and districts: A research agenda.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Basom, M. R., & Yerkes, D. M. (2001, April). *Modeling community through cohort development.* Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Begley, P. T., & Campbell-Evans, G. (1992). Socializing experiences of aspiring principals. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 38*(4), 285-99.

Beyu, T. M., & Holmes, C. T. (Eds.). (1992). *Mentoring: Contemporary principles and issues.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2001, November). *Preparing school leaders: Case study summary and implications.* Paper presented at annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EA031708)

Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003). Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, purposeful engagement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(4), 468-503.

Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2004). Principals Excellence Program: Developing effective school leaders through unique university-district partnership. *Education Leadership Review, 5*(2), 24-36.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Allen, L. W. (2006, February 10). Preparing principals for high-need rural schools: A central office perspective about collaborative efforts to transform school leadership. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, *21*(1). Retrieved February 12, 2006 from http://www.umaine.edu/jrre/21-1.htm

Browne-Ferrigno, T., Allen, L.W., Maynard, B., Jackson, J., & Stalion, N. (2006). Fullan's sustainability elements as a framework to assess the lasting impact of systemic leadership development efforts. *Education Leadership Review, 7*(2), 97-110.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Fusarelli, B. C. (2005). The Kentucky principalship: Model of school leadership reconfigured by ISLLC *Standards* and reform policy implementation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*(2), 127-156.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Lindle, J. C. (2006). Kentucky's collaborative model for developing school leaders for rural high-need schools: Principals Excellence Program. In A. Danzig, K. Borman, B. Jones, & W. Wright (Eds.), *Learner-centered leadership: Policy, research, and practice* (pp. 171-186). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Maynard, B. (2005). Meeting the learning needs of students: A rural high-need school district's systemic leadership development initiative. *The Rural Educator, 26*(3), 5-18

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2001a, November). *Becoming a principal: Role transformation through clinical practice.* Paper presented at annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED465225)

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2001b, November). *Issues related to the effects of cohorts on learners.* Paper presented at annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED46522)

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2003). Effects of cohorts on learners. *Journal of School Leadership, 13*(6), 621-643.

Browne-Ferrigno, T, & Muth, R. (2004a). Leadership mentoring in clinical practice: Role socialization, professional development, and capacity building. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(4), 468-494.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2004b, Fall). On being a cohort leader: Curriculum integration, program coherence, and shared responsibility. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development, 16*, 77-95.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2006). Leadership mentoring and situated learning: Catalysts in principalship readiness and lifelong mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 14*(3), 275-295.

Capasso, R. L., & Daresh, J. C. (2001). *The school administration handbook: Leading, mentoring, and participating in the internship program.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Clark, T. D. (1988). *A history of Kentucky*. Ashland, KY: Jesse Stuart Foundation.

Cordeiro, P. A., & Smith-Sloan, E. (1995, April). *Apprenticeships for administrative interns: Learning to talk like a principal.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for school leaders.* Washington, DC: Author.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crow, G. M., & Glascock, C. (1995). Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration, 33*(1), 22-43.

Crow, G. M., & Matthews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one's way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Drake, R. B. (2001). *A history of Appalachia.* Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

Educational Research Service, National Association of Elementary School Principals, & National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leadership we need*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Fullan, M. (2003). *The moral imperative of school leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gates, S. M., Ringel, J. S., & Santibanez, L., Ross, K., & Chung, C. H. (2003). *Who is leading our schools? An overview of school administrators and their careers.* Retrieved June 9, 2003, from RAND Web site: http://www.rand.org/publications

Glasman, N. S., & Glasman, L. D. (1997). Connecting the preparation of school leaders to the practice of school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(2), 3-20.

Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Greenfield, W. D. (1975, March 30-April 3). *Socialization processes among administrative candidates in public schools.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Grogan, M., & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 233-256.

Hamilton, D. N., Ross, P. N., Steinbach, R., & Leithwood, K. A. (1996). Differences in the socialization experiences of promoted and aspiring school administrators. *Journal of School Leadership, 6*(4), 346-367.

Harrison, L. H., & Klotter, J. C. (1997). *A new history of Kentucky.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Hart, A. W. (1993). *Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Heck, R. H. (1995). Organizational and professional socialization: Its impact on the performance of new administrators. *The Urban Review, 27*(1), 31-49.

Hessel, K. & Holloway, J. (2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC Standards to practice.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Hill, M. S. (1995). Educational leadership cohort models: Changing the talk to change the walk. *Planning and Changing, 26*, 179-189.

Hilston, J. (2000, November 26). Online graphic: Distressed counties in Appalachia, 2000. *PG News*. Retrieved October 20, 2003, from http://post-gazette.com/headlines/

Horn, R. A. (2001). Promoting social justice and caring in schools and communities: The unrealized potential of the cohort model. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*(4), 313-334.

Howley, A., & Pendarvis, E. (2002, December). *Recruiting and retaining rural school administrators.* Charleston, WV: AEL ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. Retrieved April 30, 2005, from www.ael.org/eric

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship.* Washington, DC: Author.

Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 192-212.

Jones, J. C., & Webber, C. F. (2001, April). *Principal succession: A case study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Kelley, C., & Peterson, K. (2000, November). *The work of principals and their preparation: Addressing critical needs for the 21st century.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Albuquerque, NM.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lane, J. J. (Ed.). (1984). *The making of a principal.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Lashway, L. (2003, December). *Finding leaders for hard-to-staff schools.* ERIC Digest 173. Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management. Retrieved March 26, 2005, from http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest173.html

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Analyzing and interpreting ethnographic data.* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Coffin, G. (1995). *Preparing school leaders: What works.* Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Matthews, L. J., & Crow, G. M. (2003). *Being and becoming a principal: Role conceptions for contemporary principals and assistant principals.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McAdams, R. P. (1998). Who'll run the schools? The coming administrator shortage. *The American School Board Journal, 29*(8), 37-39.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, K. (2004, November). *Creating conditions for leadership effectiveness: The district's role.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Milstein, M. M. (1992, October-November). *The Danforth Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) six years later: What we have learned.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, MN.

Milstein, M. M., Bobroff, B. M., & Restine, L. N. (1991). *Internship programs in educational administration: A guide to preparing educational leaders.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Milstein, M. M., & Krueger, J. A. (1997). Improving educational administration preparation programs: What we have learned over the past decade. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(2), 100-106.

Mullen, C. A., & Lick, D. W. (Eds.). (1999). *New directions in mentoring: Creating a culture of synergy.* London: Falmer Press.

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Preparing tomorrow's school leaders: Alternative designs.* University Park, PA: University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 178-191.

Murphy, J. (2005, February). Uncovering the foundations of ISLLC *Standards* and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 41*(1), 154-191.

Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.). (1999). *Educational administration: A decade of reform.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Muth, R., & Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2004). Why don't our graduates take administrative positions, and what's the cost? In C. S. Carr & C. L. Fulmer (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Knowing the way, showing the way, going the way* (pp. 294-306). Twelfth Annual Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.

National Staff Development Council. (2000). *Learning to lead, leading to learn: Improving school quality through principal professional development.* Oxford, OH: Author.

Norris, C. J., & Barnett, B. (1994, October). *Cultivating a new leadership paradigm: From cohorts to communities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Philadelphia, PA.

Ortiz, F. I. (1982). *Career patterns in education: Women, men and minorities in public school administration.* New York: Praeger.

Parkay, F. W., & Hall, G. E. (Eds.). (1992). *Becoming a principal: The challenges of beginning leadership.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Petzko, V. N., & Scearcy, L. R. (2001, April). The recruitment of aspiring principals: A two-year follow-up study. *Connections: Journal of Principal Preparation and Development, 3.* [Online publication]. Retrieved March 26, 2005, from http://www.nassp.org

Roza, M., Cello, M. B., Harvey, J., & Wishon, S. (2003, January). *A matter of definition: Is there truly a shortage of school principals?* Seattle: Center for Reinventing Public Education, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.

Roza, M., & Swartz, C. (2003, April). *A shortage of school principals: Fact or fiction?* [Policy Brief]. Seattle: Center for Reinventing Public Education, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stein, D. (1998). *Situated learning in adult education.* Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Digest No. 195).

Stout, R. T. (1973). *New approaches to recruitment and selection of educational administrators.* Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Takahashi, S. S. (1998). *The keeper of the house: Principals succession and the mending of the hearts.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Teitel, L. (1995). Understanding and harnessing the power of the cohort model in preparing educational leaders. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(2), 66–85.

United States Census Bureau. (2000). *Pike County quickfacts from the US Census bureau.* Retrieved October 17, 2003, form http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/21/21195.html

United States Department of Education. (2005). *Innovations in education: Innovative pathways to school leadership.* Washington, DC: Office of Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved May 30, 2006 from http://www.ed.gov/admins/recruit/prep/alternative/report.pdf

Usdan, M. D. (2002). Reactions to articles commissioned by the National Commission for the Advancement of Education Leadership Preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 300-307.

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.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

White, E., & Crow, G. M. (1993, April). *Rites of passage: The role perceptions of interns in the preparation for principalship.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Yerkes, D. M., Basom, M. R., Norris, C., & Barnett, B. (1995, August). *Using cohorts in the development of educational leaders.* Paper presented at the annual International Conference of the Association of Management, Vancouver, BC.

Yerkes, D., & Guaglilanone, C. (1998). Where have all the high school administrators gone? *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 28,* 10-14.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, PhD is an associate professor of Educational Leadership Studies at the University of Kentucky and chair of the Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association. She has published articles about leadership development in *Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership, Journal of Research in Rural Education,* and *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, as well as chapters in various handbooks and yearbooks. Her research interests include longitudinal influences of professional preparation and development on the practice of school leaders, educational innovation and school improvement, and educational policy analysis.