THE STANDARDS MOVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: THE QUEST FOR RESPECT

John R. Hoyle
Texas A & M University

According to LeRoy Walser (1989) "Standards are conceived by most educators as static constructs—as imposed requirements" (p. 1). Others view standards as an essential element to professional status and a measure for quality performance. The development of professional standards in educational administration/ leadership is a continuous quest to find consensus among scholars and practicing administrators about a common body of knowledge and a set of competencies, dispositions, and language to seek quality in the professional preparation and development of school leaders. Thomas Glass (1998) defends the importance of professional standards to seek alignment between the academic curriculum, field-based learning and actual job performance. Since the late 1940's scholars in educational administration and leaders in professional school administrator associations have attempted to apply a variety of guidelines and standards to direct their members to master a common knowledge base to assure competent professionals. This chapter includes attempts by bold pioneers who penned the first set of standards to improve administrator preparation and licensure in a fledgling field. Next, is a chronicle of the impact of the AASA *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators* on subsequent standards created by several professional societies, including the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), Chief State School Officers (CSSO), Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELLC), and the National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Education (NCATE). Next, the author presents research findings linking emerging standards to successful practice, attempts at national licensure, impact of standards-based leadership research and ethical practices.

The earliest recorded attempts to create standards for administrator preparation and licensure were fueled by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) founded in 1954. NCATE was established to provide voluntary accreditation for academic institutions preparing professional personnel for education. The following year in 1955, the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration (CASA) was established by negotiations between the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the Kellogg Foundation. One of CASA's first projects was to develop a set of standards for the preparation of school administrators. According to Hollis Moore (1964) this development took CASA "into areas of state certification and professional accreditation" (p. 27).

The standards were included in a book *Something to Steer By* published by AASA in 1958. This publication had a distribution of 25,000 and became influential in increasing in the use of standards of preparation, professional development for school administrators, school board procedures for selected school superintendents and suggestions for needed research in the field (Moore, 1964). The initial use of the standards in the accreditation process emerged in 1958 from a cooperative venture between the NCATE and AASA's CASA. According to Moore (1964), AASA declined an accreditation role and recognized NCATE as the sole accrediting body in teacher education and thus responsible for policing preparation programs in educational administration.

Thus, AASA's CASA was the dynamic force in launching the standards movement by creating benchmarks for improving the selection, preparation, and development of leaders for educational institutions. As presented earlier twentieth century pioneers in educational administration Elwood Cubberly, Paul Mort, Julian Butterworth, Walter Cocking, Roald Campbell, LaVerne Cunningham Laurence Haskew, Daniel Griffiths, Paula Silver and others elevated the status of school administration by stressing higher standards through greater academic rigor in university preparation programs. However, the new NCATE standards were not viewed by all scholars as the answer to increasing the prestige of school administration as an applied academic discipline

Laurence Haskew (1964) raised doubts about the standards by writing, "Standards, procedures, and actions of NCATE thus far show little evidence of departure from traditional norms for institutional accreditation and, hence, display only long range promise for significant change in the picture of professional preparation" (p. 346). Over the next 25 years concerns grew about the relevance, research base, and actual applications of the standards for the preparation of school leaders. In the late 1970s CASA began a revision of the standards to increase the quality of administrator preparation programs and their graduates seeking leadership roles in schools.

Paul Salmon, Executive Director of AASA, commissioned the 1982 AASA Professor in Residence, John Hoyle, to collaborate with CASA, critique the earlier standards, review current literature and collaborate with professors, leaders of administrator professional groups and practicing school administrators to develop a more comprehensive set of standards for the preparation and licensure of administrators at both campus and system levels. These new *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators* (Hoyle, 1982) were endorsed by CASA, approved by the executive board and Paul Salmon for distribution to national reviewers including the National Association of Secondary Principals (NASSP), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), National Association of School Boards (NASB), curriculum scholars, and policy makers. Moreover, the *Guidelines* were presented for critical review in 1982-83 at the annual meetings of the American Association for Educational Research (AERA) in Montreal and the National Conference of Professors of

Educational Administration (NCPEA) in Missoula, Montana. After numerous revisions the final document became the only established guidelines/standards in the field of educational administration. The *Guidelines* became the benchmark for licensure in several states and were applied by NCATE for reviewing administrator preparation programs from 1983 until 1995. The primary intent of the *Guidelines* was to contribute to the improvement of university preparation and professional development programs and assist professors and staff development directors in reviewing their current programs to determine if the recommended competencies and skills in preparation were being tested and addressed. The *Guidelines* were created as a guide and not a rigid set of rules for all preparation programs. The authors of the document said it this way:

> AASA recognizes the danger inherent in developing *Guidelines* that may vary from the programs substantially from the programs provided by some institution. Professionalism depends on creativity and the capacity of individuals and institutions to capitalize on these unique strengths. Since uniform standards rigidly applied may impair the flexibility that programs need to meet local and regional needs, AASA desires that these guidelines not be used to limit program development or the expertise of a given faculty.

Section One of AASA *Guidelines* include a list of "Leadership Outcome Goals" for successful school leaders at both building and central office levels (Hoyle, 1985). The inclusion of both building and central office leaders in the document was based on the common belief at the time that discrete skills are extremely important to enable administrators to succeed in different administrative specialties—whether in the central office or as a principal or assistant principal at the building level, almost all administrative roles require a common set of administrative competencies and skills (Koontz & O'Donnell, 1959; Miklos, 1972). For each leadership outcome goal, the guidelines/standards include related competencies and skills.

Competency 1—Designing, implementing, and evaluating a school climate improvement program that utilizes mutual staff and student efforts to formulate and attain goals. This competency includes 8 skills areas and research rationale.

Competency 2—Understanding political theory and applying political skills in building local, state, and national support for education. Seven skills and research rationale are included.

Competency 3—Developing a systematic school curriculum that assures both the extensive enrichment activities and mastery of fundamental as well as progressively more complex skills required in advanced problem solving, creative and technological skills. Six skills and research rationale are included.

Competency 4—Planning and implementing an instructional management system which includes learning objectives, curriculum design, and instructional strategies and techniques that facilitate high levels of achievement. Seven skills and rationale are included.

Competency 5—Developing staff development and evaluation systems to enhance effectiveness of educational personnel. Five skills and research follow.

Competency 6—Allocating human, material, and financial resources to efficiently and accountably assure successful student learning. Six skills and research follow.

Competency 7—Conducting research and utilizing research findings in decisions to improve long range planning, school operations, and student learning. Four skills and research rationale follow. (These seven competencies and related skills became the foundation for other standards that have emerged since 1983).

Section Two of the *Guidelines* include Management Systems components, Content Components, Clinical Components and Professionalization and Renewal Component.

At the time the *Guidelines* appeared, there were widespread similarities in course titles in graduate programs, i.e., school finance, school law, school facilities, and human relations in school administration, school public relations, and organizational theory. However, within the course structure there was limited agreement in the profession about the knowledge and skill base that all educational administrators should processes the skills to assess program effectiveness on the actual practices of practicing school leaders. In spite of these concerns about overall impact on improving preparation, some observers viewed the *Guidelines* as a welcomed addition in codifying the knowledge base in the field and focusing on necessary knowledge and skills. According to Peterson and Finn (1985) "One commendable version [of standards] was offered by AASA spanning seven major areas of knowledge and skills. Under each of these headings, the AASA suggests administrators need a mix of empirical and theoretical knowledge and they need a feel for how to put their knowledge and skills into operation within the school organization so as to increase its effectiveness" (p. 53).

However, other scholars were not as sanguine toward the new *Guidelines*. They view them as a laundry list of discrete skills with little research or theory support base. In a session in the 1983 AERA conference in Montreal, the late Paula Silver commented to a large audience, "John, I admire your brave effort in attempting such a difficult task in defining our entire professional discipline with these competencies and skills. However, without a stronger research base, this attempt is like a large thin crust pizza. A lot of scattered meats and cheeses, but very little depth" (Silver, 1982). Proponents however, saw the *Guidelines* as an opportunity rather than a threat (Hoyle, 1985). They believed that graduate schools should examine their programs to ensure that these critical

skills and issues are being addressed and used to make necessary modifications in programs and personnel. As a result of varying opinions about the value of the *Guidelines*, AASA produced a book to provide a research base and rationale to add credibility to the *Guidelines. Skills for Successful School Leaders* by John Hoyle, Fenwick English, and Betty Steffy (1985) includes a chapter on each of the seven skills, supporting research and best practices for each skill, suggestions for implementing the skills and a mastery "Skill Accomplishment Check List" at the end of each chapter. Within two years this book became widely adopted as the unofficial curriculum guide for numerous university preparation programs including Texas, Montana, and Georgia. However, the criticism of the *Guidelines* continued. Bruce Cooper and William Boyd (1987) wrote, "…Under this rubric (which reads more like as assignment for a term paper in school administration than a competency) Hoyle lists a whole set of skills which sound amazingly like Luther Gulick's 1937 patterns of POSCoRB…. Hoyle's approach stands clearly in the rational 'scientific,' controlling world, though he does include a 'political theory' and 'political skills' competency. But, little thought is given to the political economy that drives behavior within the present context of public schools. In Hoyle's approach the One Best Model goes unchallenged" (p. 18). In spite of the criticism Cooper and Boyd agreed that the "ideas are comprehensive, well organized and thorough" (p.18). Albeit, the *Guidelines'* were embedded in the literature as the only recognized preparation *Guideline/* standards in the United States until the early 1990s.

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA)

In 1993 the NPBEA with Danforth Foundation support, appointed a group of representatives from AACTE, AASA, ASCD, NAESP, NASSP, NCPEA, and UCEA to develop a common set of NCATE Guidelines/ standards for educational leaders. The *Guidelines* were reviewed by numerous groups and individuals and a final draft was presented to the NPBEA and the Special Areas Studies Board (SASB) of NCATE. These 1995 *Guidelines for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* were derived from the earlier AASA *Guidelines*, AASA *Professional Standards for the Superintendency* (Hoyle, 1993), and other standards/guidelines by NPBEA (1993); NASSP in (1985); NAESP (1990); and others. In 1996 the Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) produced the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards which were soon adopted by a large number of states for the licensure of school administrators. Since the ISLLC standards were created by (CCSSO) had considerable political clout and financial support from the Pew Foundation and Danforth they became more widely recognized than earlier standards from which they were drawn. Martha McCarthy found that 40 states adopted the ISLLC standards and require individuals to pay a substantial fee to take the Educational Testing System (ETS) School Leaders

Exam as a prerequisite to reward or deny initial administrative licensure. The other ten states, including Texas created their own standards by adopting the AASA *Professional Standards for the Superintendency,* and developing a separate set for elementary and secondary principals. In a separate but similar effort the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) produced *Guidelines for Advanced Leadership Programs in Education.* Rather than revise these *Guidelines* in 2002, the ELCC which is a sub-unit of the NPBEA decided to merge with the 1996 ISLLC standards since they both drew extensively from the original AASA and NCATE documents.

In 2000 the NPBEA appointed another working group to integrate the ELCC and ISLLC standards to create new NCATE *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership*, restructure the standards to include doctoral level reviews, and add the performance assessment components. The members of this working group included scholars and administrators from administrator associations. The members included Scott Thomson, Chair, professors Diane Ashby, James Cibulka John Hoyle, Mike Martin and David Sperry; professional group administrators Agnes Crawford, ASCD, Neil Shipman, CSSO/ISLLC, Fred Brown, NAESP, Joe Schneider, NPBEA, and Honor Fede, ELCC staff. Discussion about the impact of preparation on performance outcomes and the value of course content and delivery highlighted each committee meeting. Disagreements continue among scholars about the value of standards and their link to NCATE accreditation. While professional administrator associations and state departments of education found standards useful in guarding licensure for principals and superintendents, members of the University Council for Professors of Educational Administration and NCPEA find the accreditation and program approval by the Educational Leadership Constituency Council (ELCC/NCATE) problematic. The strong emphases toward on-the-job performance and assessment and less emphasis on evidence of rigorous scholarship, theory development, and course content are viewed as quasi-vocational training by many university researchers. Scholars voiced opposition toward the ELCC/NCATE excessive focus on job performance of graduates at the expense of input measures and intellectual reflection valued in the scholarly community. This job performance focus dominates three of the five leadership outcome questions in the NCATE document listed below:

1. Have candidates mastered the necessary knowledge for the job they will perform?
2. Do candidates meet the state licensure requirements?
3. Do candidates understand teaching and learning and can they fulfill their responsibilities?
4. Can candidates apply their knowledge in schools/districts?
5. Can candidates promote student learning in their schools/districts?

While these questions are central to successful practice at the building and central office levels, they also assume that if graduates fail in any of these performance areas after one or 10 years in the field, then the graduate's advanced programs could be labeled inadequate and the institution given low marks for preparation. The ELCC has assumed the role of watchdog by serving as the program review body for NCATE institutions and lists of names of programs denied accreditation appear on their web site as a warning to others.

Because NCATE regulates only the certification arm of graduate programs, the 188 doctoral programs in NCATE institutions are not the focus of the program review process. Herein lays the dilemma: Since some doctoral degree programs in Colleges of Education are in counseling, human development, higher education, and educational psychology and not subject to the NCATE process, a college can lose its accreditation due to program reviews linked to K-12 educator preparation and thus mar the image of other programs in the college of education. This issue and the time commitment required by faculty and staff to prepare an NCATE report are listed as reasons that many colleges of education located in both prestigious and lesser known universities avoid the NCATE accreditation ordeal. However, in spite of these limitations, the new NCATE standards have generated greater efforts to align curriculum with the standards central to the licensure examination—School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA).

After several drafts and lively, sometimes heated discussions around scholarship and practice between scholars representing higher education and practitioners representing the professional associations, the standards were completed. Much of the disagreement occurred over the use of the ISLLC/ELCC standards as the sole knowledge source. Thomas Glass (1998) described the conflict this way, "In today's education world the distance between the functions of the superintendent and building administrator is quite pronounced and this distance exists in the ISLLC standards which promotes the concept of a single set of generic standards for all school leaders" (p. 3). The working group decided that the addition of components from the AASA *Professional Standards for the Superintendency* and from the 1995 NCATE document would strengthen the new standards to include skills for both building level and systems administrators. After final revisions, the NCPEA *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* adopted in October of 2001 is as follow:

Standard 1.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a school or district vision of learning supported by the school and community. (This is very similar to Standard 1 in the AASA *Professional Standards for the Superintendency).*

Standard 2.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all

students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. (Similar to standards 1, 6, and 7, of the AASA standards).

Standard 3.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by managing the organization, operations, and resources in a way that promotes a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. (Similar to standard 4 of the AASA standards).

Standard 4.0): Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by collaborating with the families of other community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. (Very similar to standard 3 of the AASA standards).

Standard 5.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairly, and in an ethical manner. (Very similar to standard 8 of the AASA standards).

Standard 6.0: Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (Similar to standards 2 and 3 of the AASA standards).

Standard 7.0: Internship. The internship provides significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply the knowledge and practice and develop the skills identified in Standards 1-6 through substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit. This standard is the most misunderstood because of the haphazard use of internships across the nation. Most university internships lack the funding and personnel to support a year-long required internship. However, efforts are underway though cohort arrangements to build field experiences into the entire course sequence.

The 2002 NCATE standards are based on the early work of AASA's CASA and adaptations made by ISLLC and NPBEA. While mastery of every skill may not be possible, school leaders and those who prepare them have a collaborative model to guide research and practice to reach beyond minimum performance and lead to excellence in the most important role of school leader (National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education Standards *for Advanced Programs in Educational Administration*, October, 2002).

Research on Standards

At this writing limited grounded research appears in the literature on the use and effectiveness of standards for the preparation and development of school leaders. The earliest research on preparation standards was conducted by doctoral students. Michael McClelland 1983) found strong agreement among superintendents across the country as to the relevance of the AASA competencies and skills in being effective superintendents. Professor Don Piper (1983) at the University of North Dakota and Wallace Edgell (1983) found extremely strong support for the *Guidelines* and their reform efforts among professors of educational administration. These national studies established a valid common skill base that not only influenced new certification laws in several states, but also influenced university-based preparation programs for principals and superintendents. In fact, Edgell reported that 141 professors of educational administration and 31 department heads in UCEA institutions indicated that their departments presently were meeting 75 percent of the recommendations in the *Guidelines* and they would meet 100 percent within three years. Susan Sclafani (1983) and Virginia Collier (1987) found that the role of superintendent and his or her effectiveness cannot be viewed as a set of discrete skills separate from the context of the district. Superintendents who were identified as "effective" by professional organizations, universities, and state departments of education in each of the states, ranked the areas of school climate and curriculum among the top three of the eight major performance areas. Finance ranged from first to seventh place, depending upon the demographics of the superintendent's district. Finance was the most important to rural superintendents.

Mitchell Hall (1988) found striking similarities in his national study comparing effective secondary principals with a random sample. Effective principals tended to rank the performance areas of instructional management and curriculum among the top three of the eight major performance areas. Research to validate the 1993 AASA's *Professional Standards for the* Superintendency found links between perceptions of practicing school leaders and value of the 1993 AASA standards and skills (Candoli, Cullen, & Stufflebeam, 1997; Glass, 1998; Horler, 1996; Sass, 1989). Moreover, researchers found a positive .04 relationship between scores on student performance on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) test and school boards' use of the AASA *Professional Skills for the Superintendency* to evaluate superintendents' annual job performance (Hoyle, Ealy, Hogan, & Skrla, 2001). While the numerous research efforts to validate the AASA *Guidelines* and *Professional Standards* are primarily descriptive through self-report methodology, there appears to be adequate support for the template that guided others engaged in creating standards.

In 1999, ISLLC and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) collaborated in the development of a licensure portfolio that requires demonstration of knowledge, dispositions, and performances of ISLLC standards and indicators.

Currently 40 states have adopted the ISLLC standards and require individuals to pay a substantial fee to take the *ETS School Leaders* exam as a prerequisite to reward or deny initial administrative licensure. In addition, the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), a performance-based assessment instrument based on the ISLLC standards was developed by ETS to be used in combination with the other methods for initial principal and superintendent licensure.

Kelly and Peterson (2002) observed that ISLLC standards are grounded in a basic understanding of effective schools research and literature and present a general framework for improving and restructuring initial principal preparation programs. Unlike the AASA *Guidelines, Professional Standards for the Superintendency,* and NCATE's *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership* the ISLLC standards do not systematically identify specific competencies and skills needed to identify and apply expert knowledge and skills for the development of high performing school leaders. Peel, Mobley, McFadden, and Burham (2002) investigating the value of the ISLLC standards in preparing principals found the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators were important for job success and that all six standards are important to very important on the job.

Perhaps the most vocal critic of the ISLLC document is Fenwick English (2003) of the University of North Carolina. He believes that the epistemology of the ISLLC Standards is inadequate and should not be used as test criteria by the ETS. According to English, "standards that rest on a non-empirical base can neither be measured (except by testimonial), and they turn not on any rational basis of authority, but rather on charismatic authority" (p. 124). There is precious little research to support these [standards and previous sets] as any more than trends, hardly the basis for national licensure." English quotes Joe Murphy (2000) coauthor of the ISLLC standards, "Why would anyone expect these standards to be completely research-based and empirically supportable?" (p. 412). English continues his assault on the ISLLC exam and its scoring by stating, "The correctness is determined not by empirical or research foci, but by consensual opinion of existing practices" (p. 126). He continues, "There are no theories to be tested in the standards. They are tenets of faith and their implementation amounts to a test of conviction" (p. 131).

Boeckmann and Dickson (2001) found little relationship between the ISLLC standards and their value among school superintendents. They observed that the standards were not likely to be incorporated into actual daily practice by busy school superintendents. However, Ramirez and Guzman, (2003) discovered that superintendents did incorporate the standards into their work. Superintendents viewed standards 1-6, to be very relevant in their leadership roles, i.e., "vision of learning," student learning," and "resources management," "community collaborations," "fair and ethical," and "larger political," (p. 35, 36). Other observers believe that the ISLLC standards have strengthened the century long effort to reinforce similar

standards, teach a common knowledge base in preparation programs, and add prestige by requiring candidate to pass a more rigorous licensing exam.

National Licensure

In the past decade there have been two significant efforts to create a national licensure of school leaders. The first effort was launched by AASA called the Leadership Institute for School Leaders (LISA). Based on the AASA standards, LISA was to provide advanced executive development for the "best and brightest" superintendents in America. Participants were to engage in advanced professional development in several strategic areas and undergo a performance assessment by a national board of examiners, leading to the awarding of advanced certification. The program was to collaborate with several leading research universities and state administrator associations, and seek corporate support. A task force met several times over a two year period and contracts were let for curriculum development. As a result of turf battles among university departments reluctant to give graduate credit taught by professors from other universities, LISA never become a reality. The concept remains viable as a means of raising the prestige of persons wishing to reach the pinnacle of the profession

The American Board for Leadership Education (ABLE) was introduced by the NPBEA in 1999 to investigate possible national board certification for school leaders. This UCEA and NCPEA collaboration was another effort to re-visit and codify what school leaders should know and be able to perform and to define more sophisticated performance-based certification standards. This effort was driven by professional differences over emerging NCATE standards and a general confusion about standards was in use. The plan was to conduct studies to determine which standards are the more liable indicators of on-the-job performance. In addition certification could be earned on several levels, from beginning assistant principals to national distinguished recognition for the most outstanding CEO superintendents in the nation. Such recognition would be paramount to specialty board recognition of professionals in law, medicine, architecture, and accounting.

Both LISA and ABLE plans considered establishing relicensing processes and designing professional career development programs for current principals and superintendents. In 2004, AASA launched a new commission investigating possible programming for the development of for Systems Leaders. AASA with advice from the national advisory board investigated inter-disciplinary opportunities to upgrade systems leadership skills among sitting systems administrators and the professors who prepare them. In addition to LISA and ABLE, ISLLC launched two projects to promote professional development for certified school leaders. The first was the Collaborative Professional Development Process for School Leaders (CPDP), which is on-the-job skill building and school improvement. The second was the Assessment Portfolio mentioned above, which assists school leaders with re-licensure to strengthen job performance

and provide on-going professional development over a person's career. (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005). The movement toward national certification is growing along with other accountability measures. Current efforts by NCPEA, UCEA, AASA, and others to create new structures and conduct research to improve the leadership practices and the image of Americas' school leaders includes steps toward national recognition and perhaps licensure within 20 years.

Research on Leadership Education

The creation of preparation standard has not completely solved the mystery of why one school administrator is more effective than another. Scholars have found that standards influence leadership style that consists of a leader's general personality, demeanor, and communication patterns in guiding others toward reaching organizational or personal goals. Leadership studies in educational administration have been dominated by self-report perceptions of subordinates about their principal or superintendent's behavior patterns in decision-making, interpersonal relations, planning, instructional leadership and management efficiency. Among widely used instruments to assess leadership style are the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), Learning Climate Inventory (LCI), and the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI). These instruments gather faculty and staff perceptions of leadership skills and styles of administrators and other organizational dynamics of the school or district. Research reveals little empirical research about why some leadership styles in certain situations are more effective than other styles. Standards-based research is minimal in analyzing leadership styles across schools, school leaders, and situations, but there is general consensus that some leaders are better than others in reading the culture and adjusting their style to address multiple issues. Categories of leadership styles have increased in the post-modern literature. Among the more recent categories are charismatic leadership, social justice leadership, gender and race leadership and mentioned earlier, spiritual leadership. This post-modern position has heightened the urgency for leadership research to continue to reexamine established theories to insure that no voices have been excluded and to direct efforts to guide school leaders toward greater inclusiveness, equity and justice.

In addition to this book for the NCPEA conference in Washington, DC, in July, 2005 that reviews our past, present, and uncertain future, other exciting research ventures are underway to produce stronger evidence that administrator preparation programs are producing successful practicing school leaders and university scholars. A task force composed of members from UCEA, NCPEA, AERA-Division A, and AERA/TEA-SIG is creating a new journal focused on leadership preparation, and a forthcoming publication-- *Educating Leaders:* a *Handbook of Research on Leader*ship *Education.* The Handbook will contain ten knowledge domains to review existing research, identify gaps in the

leadership preparation knowledge base, and discuss the implications of what is known including the status of standards and alternative strategies to improve the preparation of school leaders. Leading scholars have been invited to head the 10 domains to "bring it all together" and find the gaps, constructs and research findings to help unify the field among schools of education, professors, and professional developers. This new effort is a response to the ongoing quest for a more unified and agreed upon knowledge base in educational administration. A recent UCEA monograph by Joe Murphy and Michael Vriesenga (2005) of Vanderbilt University, found that most of the work on administrator preparation falls into four categories: (1) historical scholarship that tracks preparation over time—analysis that is often embedded in the larger development of educational administration; (2) scholarship of critique—often the result of holding preparation up to theory based standards from perspectives that have not been central to the field's development (e.g., ethics); (3) reform reports; and (4) the scholarship of alternative futures in preparation (p. 8). The authors examined a wide range of journals and monographs published about administrator preparation, but closely analyzed only four leading journals in the field: The *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, the *Journal of Educational Administration*, the Journal of *School Leadership* and *Planning and Changing.* From 1975 to 2002 they located 134 articles on the preparation function. The conclusions to their findings are not surprising of an applied professional discipline barely 65 years old. They found a limited quality academic research on the preparation of school administrators, very little research about the professors who prepare school leaders, but the authors were encouraged that the devotion to research on administrator preparation is expanding (p. 28, 29). Although the authors scrutinized other journals including the NASSP *Bulletin, Phi Delta Kappan,* AASA's *School Administrator, Peabody Journal of Education* and *Education*, others were excluded. Faced with time constraints the authors overlooked a goldmine in the NCPEA *Yearbooks* published since 1993. A casual perusal revealed over 50 chapters centered on preparation research. Indeed additional sources would have added credibility to the review, but Murphy and Vriesenga have provided valuable clues to investigating the elusive knowledge base in the field. This work was a primer to help mobilize the forces for the upcoming *Handbook of Research on Leadership Preparation.* The quest to increase the amount and quality of research in educational administration intensifies each year because of withering criticism from university, government and corporate leaders about a weak or missing knowledge base, obsolete teaching strategies and inadequate research productivity by university professors, and diminishing numbers of highly qualified candidates attracted to careers in school administration.

Additional research findings indicate that improving schools is highly dependent on principals' making learning the central aim of the school. By sharing leadership and engaging teachers in decision-making and self-renewal processes, schools are more, efficient, caring, and students are higher performers

than in schools with a weak principal. According to Glickman (1989, p. 6), principals serve as "leaders of instructional leaders." Principals' instructional leadership roles involve sharing responsibilities for improving curriculum, teaching, and assessing student learning and having expert knowledge to support these leadership activities. Studies of transformational leadership, though affirming the centrality of the principal's role in the change process, have not necessarily focused on improving curriculum, teaching, and learning.

The key is collective involvement of all teachers and staff in school activities that impact student well being and learning. A research report on successful leaders of learning by Leithwood and Reil (2003) captured the value of research in school improvement. First, leaders influence student learning directly by coalescing and supporting teacher efforts to achieve high expectations for student learning. Second, leaders create a core set of beliefs in terms of setting directions, developing people, and guiding the organization to accomplish shared goals for student learning. Third, school leaders use accountability mandates as a tool to help children learn. When state policies stress higher test performance, leaders provide instructional guidance by knowing best practices and creating environments that empower team learning. Fourth, the researchers reported that the best school leaders respond productively to the opportunities and challenges of working with diverse faculty that teach and nurture diverse groups of students (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005). Thus, members of NCPEA continue to conduct research to link administrator leadership to excellence in teaching and learning. This quest to find stronger evidence that link standards and related skills that promote improved preparation and on-the-job performance of school leaders is the primary reason that professors of educational administration are important to American education.

The Ethical and Moral Imperative in Preparing School Leaders

Since the 1950s scholars in educational administration have stressed the importance of interpersonal skills and ethical leadership (Campbell, 1964). Emerging standards and curricular reforms in administrator preparation have shifted from the boss-led side of scientific management espoused by Frederick Taylor and toward the human side of leadership espoused by Mary Parker Follett, Chester Barnard, Rosabeth Kanter, Stephen Covey, Terry Deal, Tom Sergiovanni, Micheal Fullan, Elaine Wilmore and others.

Lee Bolman and Terry Deal (1993) extol the virtues of ethical decision making by managers and the importance of caring for the corporate family with more soul, compassion, and understanding. Tom Sergiovanni (1992) calls for virtue in building school communities through moral leadership, which emphasizes service to others and making schools places of respect and devotion to doing the right things the right way. Steven Covey (1990) stresses "inviolate principles." He believes, "To the degree people

recognize and live in harmony with such principles as fairness, equity, justice, integrity, honesty, and trust, they move toward either survival and stability on the one hand or disintegration and destruction on the other" (p. 18). Moral leadership is paramount for schools to reach their potential as learning communities. Michael Fullen (2002) believes that while the terms "moral purpose: and "spiritual leadership" can be misunderstood or have religious connotations, he uses the phrase "moral purpose writ large." This phrase indicates a "principled behavior connected to something greater than ourselves that relates to human and social development" (p.14). For lasting reform and school improvement at least four aspects of leadership is evident. One, making a difference in the lives of students; Two, committing to reducing the gap between high and low performers within your school or district; Three, contributing to reducing the gap in the larger environment; and Four, transforming the working (or learning conditions) of others so that growth, commitment, engagement and the constant spawning of leadership in others is being fostered (Fullan, p. 14).

Writers for centuries have advised others to lead with heart, soul, integrity, kindness, equity, but only a few have focused on love as a leadership force in schools (Hoyle, 2002; Hoyle & Slater, 2001). In addition recent emphases on spiritual leadership (see AASA's The School Administrator, September 2002—Spirituality in Leadership) challenges others to seek the highest vision for all students and staff, reach for the highest human endeavors and serve before being served. Assertive and forceful leadership is required when students are not learning, administrators are not administering and support staff is not supporting, the well prepared superintendent and other school leaders take charge and create changes in attitude, performance, and, it needed, changes in personnel. Moral/spiritual leaders are determined that no child will fail nor can they stand by and ignore incompetence. Effective schools research and its focus on selected correlates direct educators to do what is right for each child and refuse to blame school failure on the child's race or family background. Leadership without spirit promotes schools with low teacher morale, disturbing numbers of school dropouts, unethical student accountability reporting, school violence and alarming failure rates. The AASA *Professional Standards for the Superintendency* includes five benchmarks for moral and ethical leadership behaviors that promote success for all students.

1. Demonstrate ethical and personal integrity;
2. Model accepted moral and ethical standards in all interactions;
3. Promote democracy through public education;
4. Exhibit multicultural and ethnic understanding and sensitivity; and
5. Implement a strategy to promote respect for diversity.

Rigorous research about the knowledge base is linked to the survival of educational administration as a respected academic discipline, but without

the moral or spiritual dimension the field is without meaning in selecting and preparing tomorrow's school leaders. Research is needed to find effective uses of technology to deliver course content embedded with for face-to-face time with students to strengthen their interpersonal communication and team problem solving skills (Papalewis, 2000). This delicate blend of the "how" and "why" of technology will inspire current and future school leaders to build schools for children and youth based on ethical leadership, trusting and empowering others. Research about school leadership and student performance remains a fertile field for professors of educational administration. What does instructional leadership look like in schools that promote high standards of classroom teaching and learning? How do progressive schools respond to state and federal high-stakes testing and accountability? What traditions, symbols, and ceremonies are found in effective schools? And, how can colleges apply preparation standards to produce instructional leaders who mold learning communities in schools that produce higher student performance for all students who become our future leaders?" (p. 56). The research gauntlet has been thrown down. Where are the research warriors in educational administration?

Conclusions

The road to respect for developing preparation and licensure standards in educational administration has included dangerous curves, sharp rocks, and slippery slopes, but my, what an exhilarating ride. This leadership continues by NCPEA president Duane Moore, NCPEA Executive Director Ted Creighton, and UCEA Executive Director Michelle Young who provide leadership to navigate difficult paths and respond to critics in order to prepare new leaders for America's schools.

While the field was gaining speed on the wider avenues toward greater respect, barriers were placed to warn travelers about the "one best" theory direction in the field. To regulate erratic drivers, professors and practicing school leaders carrying standards entered the roadway. These standard bearers were sponsored by the American Association of School Administrators, the National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education, and the Council for Chief State Schools Officers. Some of these drivers were viewed as road hogs by the more scholarly drivers who believed that the final destination will be reached by reasoning and more rigorous research rather than narrowly defined and enforced standards.

While critics of preparation programs dart into traffic, leaders in the field swerve to avoid collisions and continue driving toward scholarly standards-based preparation and successful practice to manage the traffic congestion and produce excellent leaders for America's schools. Research efforts by NCPEA, UCEA, and NASSP are underway to improve driver training, reduce preparation accidents and pave the way for greater scholarship and practice in the field.

References

Achilles, C.M. (1988). Unlocking some mysteries of administration and administrator preparation. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools (pp. 41-67),* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Boeckmann, M., & Dickinson, G. (2001). Leadership values and performance. *Education,* 121(3), 494-497.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1993). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, R. (1964). Implications for practice of administration. In D. Griffiths (Ed.). *Behavioral science and educational administration.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 279-302.

Candoli, C.I., Cullen, K., & Stufflebean, D.L. (1997). *Superintendent performance evaluation: Current practice and directions for improvement.* Boston, MA: Kluwer.

Collier, V. (1987). *Identification of skills perceived by Texas superintendents as necessary for successful job performance.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin.

Cooper, B., & Boyd. W. L. (1987). The evolution of training for school administrators. In J. Murphy and P. Hallinger (Eds.). *Approaches to administrative training in education.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Council of Chief State School Officers (1996). *Interstate school leaders licensure consortium. Standards for school leaders.* Washington, D.C. Author.

Covey, S. (1990). *Principle-centered leadership.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Cunningham, L., & Hentges, J. (1982). *The American superintendency* 1982: *A summary report.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Edgell, W. (1983). *Educational administration professors' perceptions of the competencies and skills of the guidelines for the preparation of school administrators.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.

Educational Leadership Constituent Council. (2002). *Guidelines for advanced leadership programs in education.* Arlington, VA: Author.

English, F. (2003). The ISLLC standards and the enshrinement of mystical authoritarianism as anti-change doctrine in educational leadership preparation programs. In F. Lunenburg and C. Carr (Eds.). *Shaping the future.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 112-133.

Erickson, D.A. (1979). Research on educational administration: The state-of-the-art. *Educational Researcher, 8* (3), 9-14.

Fullen, M. (2002). Moral purpose writ large. *The school administrator,* 8(59), 14-18.

Glass, T. (1992). *The* 1992 *study of the American school superintendency: America's educational leadership in a time of reform.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, T. (2000). The 2000 study. In T. Glass, L. Bjork, & C. Brunner (Eds.). *The 2000 study of the American Superintendency: A look at the superintendent in time of reform.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Glass, T. (1998, April*). Professional standards, preparation, and evaluation of superintendents. Is there alignment?* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Associational Research Association. San Diego, CA.

Hall, M. (1988*). Effective high school principals: Perceptions of the importance of the competencies and related skills in the guidelines for the preparation of school administrators.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texas A&M University. College Station.

Haskew, L. (1964). A projective appraisal. In D. Griffith (Ed.) *Behavioral science and educational administration.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 333-348.

Horler. B. (1996). *A comparison of criteria used in the evaluation of the superintendency in Illinois as perceived by school board presidents and public school superintendents.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Northern Illinois University, Dekalb.

Hoyle, J. (1982). *Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators*. Arlington, VA: The American Association of School Administrators.

Hoyle, J. (1985). Programs in educational administration and the AASA preparation guidelines. *Educational administration quarterly.* XXI (1). 71-95.

Hoyle, J. (1993). *Professional standards for the superintendency.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Hoyle, J. (2002). *Leadership and the force of love: Six keys to motivating with love.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hoyle, J., and Slater, R (2001). Love happiness and America's schools. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 82(10), 790-794.

Hoyle, J., Bjork, L., Collier, V., & Glass, T. (2005). *The superintendent as ceo: Standards-based performance.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Hoyle, J., Ealy, C., Hogan, D., & Skrla, L. (2001). Superintendent performance evaluation and its relationship to district student performance. In T. Kowalski & G. Perrault (Eds.) *21 century challenges for school administrators (pp. 272-285).* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.

Hoyle, J., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1985 *Skills for successful school leaders*. Arlington, VA: The American Association of School Administrators.

Hoyle, J.R. (1991, Fall/Winter). Point-counterpoint: Educational administration has a knowledge base. *Record,* 21-27.

Hoyle, J.R. (Winter, 2003). Educational administration: Atlantis or phoenix. *UCEA Review,* pp11-14.

Hoyle, J.R., English, F. & Steffy, B. (1998). *Skills for successful 21st century school leaders.* Lanham, MA: The Scarecrow Press.

Kelly, C. & Peterson, K. (2002). The work of principals and their preparation: Addressing critical needs for the twenty-first century. In M. Tucker & J. Codding (Eds), *The principal challenge: Leading and managing schools in an era of* accountability. (pp. 313-347). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Koontz, H., & O'Donnell, H. (1959). *Principles of management.* New York: Mcgraw-Hill Book Company.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership,*Philadelphia: Laboratory for student success.

McClellan, M. (1983). A national study of public school superintendents' perceptions of the relevance of the competencies and related skills in the guidelines for the preparation of school administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.

Miklos E. (1972). Training in common for educational, public, and educational administrators. Danville, Ill: Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc.

Moore, H.A. (1964). The ferment in school administration. In D. Griffiths (Ed.), *Behavioral science in educational administration.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1987). *Approaches to administrative training in education,* (Chapter 15). New York: State University of New York Press.

Murphy, J. (2000). A quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational administration. In P. Jenlink (Ed.), *Marching into a new millennium: The seventh yearbook of the national conference of professors of educational administration* (16-81). Lanham, MA: The Scarecrow Press.

Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2005). *Research on preparation programs in educational administration: An analysis. UCEA monograph series.* University Council for Educational Administration, University of Missouri, Columbia.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1990) *Principals for the twenty-first century.* Arlington, VA: Author.

National Association of Secondary School Principal. (1985). *Performance-based preparation of principals: A famework for improvement.* Reston, VA: Author.

National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education (2002). *Standards for advanced programs in educational administration, October.*

Papalewis, R. (August, 2000). *Asynchronous Partners: Leadership for the millennium.* The seventh yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Lancaster: Technomic Publishing Co., Inc.

Peel, H., Mobley, D., McFadden, C., & Burnham, J. (2002). *Can we adequately prepare principals to meet national ISLLC standards and are they important to job performance?* A paper presented at the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration Conference in Burlington, Vermont on August 9, 2002.

Peterson, K.D., & Finn, C.E. (1985). Principals, superintendents and adminstrator's art. *Public Interest.* 79, 42-62.

Piper, D.L. (1983*). Programs in educational administration: State-of-the-art perspective.* Paper presentation at the national conference of professors of educational administration, Missoula, Montana, August, 1983.

Ramirez, A., & Guzman, N. (2003). The superintendent search: An analysis of ISLLC standards compared to school board selection criteria, 4(2), 34-38.

Sass, W. (1989). *The AASA performance goal and skill area's importance to effective superintendency performance as viewed by professors of educational administration and practicing superintendents.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois, DeKalb.

Sclafani, S. (1987). *AASA guidelines for the preparation of school administrators: Do they represent the important job behaviors of superintendents?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shapiro, J.P. & Stefkovich, J.A. ((2001). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Silver, P. (1982) Personal comment during session on the AASA *Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators.* Montreal, Canada, April 12, 1983.

The National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education (2002). *Guidelines for advanced leadership programs in education.* Washington, DC: Author.

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1993). *Principals for our changing schools.* Arlington, VA: Author.

Thompson, S. D. (1989). Troubled kingdoms, restless natives. *Phi Delta Kappan.* 82(5), 358-375.

Walser, F.L. (1989). *Similarities and differences in procedures for developing and approving voluntary standards in selected organizations in education and the private sectors* .Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo.

Wilcox, J.R., & Ebbs, S.L. (1992). The leadership compass: Values and ethics in higher education. *Ashe-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1.* Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.