

# **Executive Summary**

**Year I Scope of Work: October 2007 to June 30, 2008**

## **PreK-12 Principals: Issues in Evaluation, Professional Development, and Succession**

Prepared For

*Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement*  
760 Spring Street  
Atlanta, GA 30308

**Prepared By**

**Sally J. Zepeda**, Ph.D., Professor and Graduate Coordinator  
The University of Georgia  
Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy and  
Program in Educational Administration and Policy

**University of Georgia Research Assistants and Doctoral Students**

Ed Bengtson: Program in Educational Administration and Policy  
Oksana Parylo: Program in Educational Administration and Policy  
Deb Teitelbaum: Program in Educational Administration and Policy  
Kevin Shorner-Johnson: Music Education

June 18, 2008

## **Scope of Work**

In fall of 2007, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI) commissioned a study that examined the research and supporting literature about the supervision, evaluation, recruitment and selection, and professional development of principals and the work of the superintendent and other central office personnel. The first part of the review entailed examining these areas broadly. From a review of the research and literature, other noteworthy areas emerged. Both for organizational purposes and to inform the understanding of the context of the principalship, the annotated bibliography and literature review evolved to include the following areas:

1. The work of the principal;
2. Supervision, evaluation, and professional development of principals and the work of central office administration to enact these practices;
3. Socialization of principals; and,
4. Succession of school leaders, namely principals.

Three documents were produced by the research team. The documents include a scholarly annotated bibliography, the review of the literature, and an executive summary.

## **Executive Summary**

The success of any organization is dependent on the leadership that sets and maintains its direction. School organizations depend on their leader—the principal—to empower teachers and students, establish or sustain environments in which teaching and learning can occur, advocate for students and staff, and serve as a liaison to the larger community that the school serves. The importance of this role demands concentrated and purposeful study. This summary identifies important educational and societal changes affecting the role of the principal, how principals change in response to these factors, how principal effectiveness has been treated in the literature, and the means by which quality principals are identified and developed.

### **Societal Change Yields Shifts in Principal Job Descriptions**

School leadership positions in the western world are increasingly situated in information-driven societies. This transition from a focus on industry to information has increased the demand for creativity and innovation, customized responses, information searching, and the development and management of complex communication networks (Crow, 2006) amid a decrease in public trust in public schooling (Crow, 2006; Stevenson, 2006).

The decline in public trust in the education profession has led to increased accountability efforts that seek to quantify educational roles and responsibilities. Following *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, the public demanded that schools be held accountable for some measure of student performance. More recently, the *No Child Left*

©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.

*Behind Act* has increased the importance of student achievement measurements as indicators of the strength or weakness of a school.

Role expectations of the principal have undergone significant shifts due to societal transitions (Crow, 2006; Stevenson, 2006) and increasing accountability demands (Cooley & Shen, 2003; Crow, 2006; Moore & Slade, 1996; Rotherham & Mean, 2003; Shen & Crawford, 2003). The most profound of these shifts is a transition from principal-as-manager to principal-as-instructional-leader (Cascadden, 1998; Cooley & Shen, 2000; Moore & Slade, 1996; Smith, 2008). As Smith (2008) explained:

For years, school leadership was described in management terms – keep order, get the buses to run on time, clear the hallways – or in terms of the heroic figure.

Times are different now. Effective school leaders, who serve as successful change facilitators, cannot afford to be just managers. . . . Today, school leadership is more demanding and dynamic. It requires a principal with a different profile. (p. 242)

This shift in leadership responsibilities is apparent in an analysis of the published research on principals from 1985 to 1990. During this time period, articles in the ERIC database that cross-referenced "principal" and "leadership" doubled (Stronge, 1993).

These new expectations have not necessarily refocused principals' responsibilities but simply *added* leadership to continued managerial duties. The requirement for both skill sets has created an increasingly complex and demanding job (Chan et al., 2003; Griffith, 1999; Grubb & Flessa, 2006) described as highly time consuming and fragmented with often conflicting roles.

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

In 2003-2004, principals worked an average of 59 hours per week: elementary school principals slightly less (58.6); secondary principals slightly more (60.8) (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005). The number and variety of tasks a principal must accomplish during those hours give the job its fragmented quality. An analysis of principal behaviors indicated that they spent 2.14% of their time on a single function with 74% of functions lasting fewer than 9 minutes. Activities were largely unplanned (59%), sometimes ended with a decision (48%), involved face-to-face communication (71%), and occurred in the principal office (71%). In addition, time was divided between interactions with a large array of stakeholders including teachers (32%), outsiders (20%), students (18%), staff (17%), and parents (6%) (Rosenblatt & Somech, 1998).

Responding to this multiplicity of stakeholders often creates role conflict (Cascadden, 1998; Goodwin, Cunningham, & Childress, 2003; Lyons, 1999; Normore, 2004). The principal is expected to serve simultaneously as an instructional, organizational, strategic, and community/political leader, balancing the demands of staff, students, parents, taxpayers, and legislators. Meeting the needs of a diverse student population often conflicts with demands for uniform measures of accountability. Similarly, autonomous control necessary for innovation can conflict with local, state, and federal mandates (Goodwin et al., 2003).

Principals are expected to take a “the buck stops here” stance to their schools’ outcomes while simultaneously working in a model of shared leadership. Catano and Stronge (2007) warned that “bombarded with multiple theories of leadership and management, school principals will likely experience a significant amount of role conflict

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

and role overload as they work to fulfill the perception of what they are expected to accomplish and how” (p. 382). While principals affect student achievement by influencing teacher performance and school learning environments (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Heck, 1992; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), their effect on student achievement is mediated through an assortment of other learning-related variables. The resulting job makes great demands on a principal's time and carries with it high levels of stress (Chan et al., 2003; Cooley & Shen, 2000).

### **Becoming a Principal**

Individuals who prepare to become principals speak of a transformative process by which they gradually come to possess a more expansive vision (Browne-Ferrigno, 2003; McGough, 2003). McGough (2003) interviewed 23 principals to better understand pathways to and through the principalship. After becoming teachers, 10 of 23 became teacher-leaders within their school. Principals moved from teacher to principal through assistant principalships (8), school leadership positions in private institutions (4), interim and intern principalships (6), step principalships (3), and district administration (1).

An analysis of principals in Georgia reveals similar trends. The assistant principalship is the dominant pathway to the principalship. In FY07, 71.7% of Georgia principals were promoted from the assistant principalship. However, the same data indicate a potential problem. In FY06, 18.8% of the 3,126 assistant principals in Georgia left their positions, but only 39.6% of these individuals took on principalships. The remaining 60.4% either returned to teaching (10.2%), accepted other positions in the

Georgia school system (24%), or left the Georgia public school system altogether (26.2%) (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2008).

One stumbling block is a perceived mismatch between pre-service principals' identity and their perceptions of what a principal is or should be. Browne-Ferrigno (2003) noted that participants in a principal preparation program often compared themselves against the archetype of a successful, experienced male leader. A participant's inability to identify with that model may create a barrier to becoming a principal. In another study, Browne-Ferrigno and Muth (2004) concluded that "the hesitancy by many program graduates to seek principalships greatly concerns us . . . The composite findings from our research suggest that the disconnected linkage between principal recruitment, preparation, and placement is a critical problem" (pp. 476-477). This "disconnected linkage" may be accounted for by several factors.

Long work hours, high levels of accountability, and inadequate compensation (Cooley & Shen, 2000; Pounder & Merrill, 2001) cause many "[e]ducators across the board increasingly [to] see the role of the school administrator as being more challenging and less desirable than the job is worth" (Pounder & Crow, 2005, p. 56). Bureaucratic requirements that have only vague relevance to the daily tasks confronted by principals discourage potential leaders from pursuing leadership positions (Fordham Foundation, 2003). The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (2008) has reported a steady increase of teachers who have earned the credential for leadership but have remained in the classroom. In 2004, there were 600 classroom teachers who possessed leadership

certificates. In 2008 this number increased to 896 (G. Eads II, personal communication, April 16, 2008).

*The beginning principal*

Chan et al. (2003) identified that when new principals assume the principalship, they are often unprepared for the job due largely to a gap in the appropriate ability or knowledge necessary to address the demands of their new appointment. Weindling and Dimmock (2006) commented:

No amount of experience of preparation—whether through formal training or through experience as a deputy [assistant principal]—can provide a sufficient induction to what is a demanding and complex job. A major and essential part of learning to be a headteacher [principal] is acquired through living the experience. (p. 338)

Among the primary challenges encountered during the early career stages is that of dealing with the legacies of the school's past

Hargeaves and Fink (2006) noted that predecessors leave lasting marks on the culture of the school. The "ghosts of principals past," which include "past and existent cultures, leadership style and communication, inadequate buildings, weak and incompetent staff, low motivation and poor public image of the school" (Weindling & Dimmock, 2006, p. 338) must be embraced or exorcised by the beginning principal (Walker & Qian, 2006). The degree to which an individual successfully creates change or maintains excellence is roughly equivalent to the degree to which that the new principal can manage these legacies.

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

As an individual moves beyond the beginning principalship, problems related to acculturation tend to lessen while others remain constant or increase in intensity. In a 10-year longitudinal study, Weindling and Dimmock (2006) found that early concerns about the acceptance of new ideas, public image, ineffective school management teams, staff morale, communication, and staff development decreased in intensity. However, as these challenges decreased, management of time increased as a "very serious" or "serious" concern; problems with supervisors (governors) increased somewhat in seriousness; and problems with incompetent staff remained relatively unchanged.

### **Supervision and Evaluation of Principals**

Traditionally, the supervision and evaluation of principals have been described in terms of a closed process, shrouded in “mystery [and] politics” (Smylie & Crowson, 1993, p. 82) by which a single stakeholder, usually the superintendent, rendered a “high-inference judgment” (Duke, 1992, p. 112), possibly based on overall good- or ill-will toward the principal. Alternatively, principal effectiveness has been measured by comparison with either a singular ideal of performance (Louden & Wildey, 1999) or upon minimum competencies that rewarded mediocrity. Most experts agree these processes are short on validity and reliability. Unfortunately, the term “effectiveness” comprises numerous intangibles and situational factors that are ephemeral, elusive, and exceedingly difficult to identify or measure.

Confidence and self-efficacy have been correlated with principal effectiveness (Cheung & Walker, 2006; Sackney & Walker, 2006). Similarly, Duke (1992) identified

"Traits," that is, stable elements of an individual's personality, as one of several constitutive components of principal effectiveness. Contending that the underlying beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions affected how a leader approached every decision, Cheung & Walker used the dichotomous continuum of "shape changers" and "inheritor maintainers" to measure these intangibles. Strong inner beliefs contributed to the confidence and self-efficacy necessary to make changes.

Leaving aside questions regarding the accuracy of the instruments used to measure such elements, the appropriateness of their use is highly dependent on the purpose of the evaluation and when in the principal's career they are employed (Duke, 1992; McCleary, 1979; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993). Pre-service or beginning principals with high confidence and self-efficacy beliefs may simply lack a deep enough understanding of how difficult the job of principal is, understanding that would cause more reflective individuals to doubt themselves. Likewise, while it might be appropriate to evaluate principals on the basis of Traits as part of the hiring process and to establish whether their personalities are compatible with the school's culture, it would be counterproductive to use Traits as an indicator of growth, given that Traits are unlikely to change.

Researchers have investigated the formation of interpersonal relationships as an indicator of effectiveness and found it had tremendous impact. Such relationships influenced superintendents' determinations of retention or dismissal (Davis, 1998), the ability of principals to develop teacher leadership (Mangin, 2007), and the likelihood of a principal to succumb to burnout (Friedman, 1995). Other factors affecting

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

superintendents' decisions to retain or to dismiss a principal include staff requests for transfer, poor student behavior or morale, complaints from parents and staff, and lower than expected student achievement (Davis, 1998).

Further complicating the definition of effectiveness is the changing role of the principal from manager to instructional leader (Behar-Horenstein, 1995; Cheung & Walker, 2006; Goodwin et al., 2003; Heck & Marcoulides, 1992; Stronge, 1993; Whitaker, 2003) even as school districts move away from centralized governance (Glasman & Heck, 1992; Houston, 2001; Smylie & Crowson, 1993; Whitaker, 2003). Emphasis on instructional leadership has greatly increased the role of measurements of student performance as an essential indicator of principal effectiveness. However, many principals contend that mixed messages are embedded in evaluation systems that continue to rely upon measurements of management efficiency (Rallis & Goldring, 1993).

Furthermore, using measures of student achievement as the primary or solitary means of measuring principal effectiveness raises concerns about the amount of impact that a principal has on student learning. As early as 1993, Stufflebeam and Nevo warned of the “serious error of selecting variables only because they correlate with student test scores . . . (or some other measure of principal effectiveness)” (p. 33). Several studies investigated methods of analyzing these relationships quantitatively (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Hallinger et al., 1996; Krüger et al., 2007). All studies rejected the use of simple, linear mathematical models (i.e., if the principal does X, student test scores will rise).

Hallinger and Heck (1996) investigated the use of bidirectional statistical models (path analysis, covariance structure models, latent variable models, and structural equation models) that have a greater chance of representing the principal's complex relationship with the outcomes of educational organizations. It appears that the relationships between teachers, students, administrators, and parents are too complex to be reduced mathematically to Principal Behavior X + Student Y = Student Outcome Z. The general consensus is that principals have only indirect, modest effects on student outcomes (Ediger, 2001; Glasman & Heck, 1992; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Hallinger, Bickman, & Davis, 1996; Krüger, Witziers, & Slegers, 2007; Rallis & Goldring, 1993).

The appeal of mathematical models is that they are presumably neutral, focusing on universal indicators of principal effectiveness. Even statistical analyses, though, are value-laden and morally accountable. If leaders are evaluated by criteria irrespective of the realities of the school setting, the results will be neither fair nor accurate. Such criteria may actually encourage leadership styles counterproductive to the particular school (Hart, 1992). Numerous studies suggested portfolios (Johnston & Thomas, 2005; Peterson, 2002; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1993) or action research (Glanz, 2005; Hart, 1992) as means of evaluating principals, holding them accountable for understanding their unique contexts and operating effectively within them. Such approaches, if conducted in the proper spirit, offer rigorous criteria without endorsing a custodial model of leadership.

Numerous studies cited the need to open up the evaluation process to multiple stakeholders. Almost unanimous support was given to including the principal's own voice, particularly in matters of goal setting and reflection (Clayton-Jones et al., 1993;

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

Erlandson & Hoyle, 1991; McCleary, 1979; Rallis & Goldring, 1993). This might be accomplished through informal conferences or more systematized performance contracts such as the Self Performance Achievement Record (SPAR) recommended by McCleary (1979).

Williams (2000) suggested the Audit of Principal Effectiveness to allow teachers to offer their “perceptions of principals’ effectiveness” (p. 271). Rallis and Goldring (1993) encouraged the formation of “a school-based team to coordinate and support evaluation activities” (p. 13). This team would include teachers, parents, “other community representatives, the principal, and possibly a student” (p. 18). The obvious pitfall of opening up the process to multiple voices is the potential for conflicting agendas. A multiple stakeholder model, the Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS), uses ratings from four separate forms that are each completed by a different stakeholder: superintendent, principal, teachers, and an external observer. Each form includes subsets of scores in a specified set of functional areas. Groups of items can be compared across stakeholders and against the self-rating provided by the principal. McCleary (1979) reported, “These profiles can be compared to other principals’ self-assessments, assessments by teachers, normative profiles, or the assessments of an external observer” (p. 49). In this manner, multiple voices yield greater validity, as opposed to simply more noise.

Lessons learned from research could play a critical role in informing decisions that render the supervision and evaluation process fairer and more effective. However, this area has rarely been the subject of research. An analysis of the content of four top-

tier journals—*Educational Administration Quarterly*, *Journal of School Leadership*, *Journal of Educational Administration*, and *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*—revealed that, out of 1,813 articles published since 1970, embarrassingly few articles had been written on the supervision (2) and evaluation (12) of principals. Clearly, more work is needed in this area.

### **Selection and Support Structures**

While the measurement of effectiveness is an important process to ensure principal performance, structures that support the selection and development of principals are vital to enhancing the leadership of schools. Considerable concern over the supply and demand of principals has arisen over the last decade (Gates, Ringel, Santibañez, Ross, & Chung, 2003; Hargreaves & Dean, 2006; National Association of Elementary School Principals, n.d.; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 2000; Roza, 2003). National trends indicate that principals are entering the position later and leaving earlier, resulting in shorter tenures (Gates et al., 2003).

#### *Succession planning*

Principal succession planning is essential to maintaining a school's fund of knowledge by ensuring that the right candidate is selected from a pool of qualified applicants. However, research reveals that succession planning is often haphazardly approached. It may be of some comfort that the problem is not limited to educational institutions. An analysis of 700 global organizations revealed that, though many CEOs felt they had adequate succession plans, the vast majority of these plans were no more than summaries of headcounts (Bersin, 2007). In a similar manner, Fink (2005) posited

©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.

that "educational systems tend to be loosely coupled" (p. 16) and that goal setting, recruitment, development, and accountability are often left unconnected. Human resource practices are all too often disconnected from the superintendent's vision (Roza, 2003; The Wallace Foundation, 2003).

The results of a disorganized approach to succession can put educational organizations in great jeopardy. When principals leave suddenly and there is no succession plan in place, systems often settle for whoever can fill the position as soon as possible (Fink & Brayman, 2004). Poor principal succession can result in teacher apathy, low morale, and inconsistent school improvement efforts. A lack of continuity in the school's vision decreases its effectiveness (Fink & Brayman, 2004; Hargreaves et al., 2003; Hill, 2008). Additionally, an unstructured process of recruitment and replacement can raise concerns of nepotism and favoritism, concerns that can prompt individuals to seek other positions in organizations where opportunities for advancement are perceived as fairer (Rothwell, 2002).

Karveli and Hall (2003) and Leibman, Bruer, and Maki (1996) identified the characteristics of best-practice succession planning that support leadership selection and development. Of great importance is a clear link between the human resource department and the strategic plan of the organization (Fulmer, 2002). Best practices include a process that is transparent whereby stakeholders collaborate in identifying sought after competencies as well as plans to develop, assess, and reward those competencies in the individual who is eventually hired (Leibman, Bruer, & Maki, 1996).

A critical decision in succession planning is the degree to which the organization requires change. In planned continuity, superintendents desire continuation of the status quo. In planned *discontinuity*, dramatic change is desired, requiring a principal who will act as a change agent (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006). The requirements of planned continuity or discontinuity demand different understandings and skill sets (Griffith, 1999; Hargreaves, Moore, Fink, Brahman, & White, 2003); therefore, it is important to determine this factor in a succession plan.

When properly implemented, succession planning is a powerful knowledge management tool for the organization that it serves (Fullan, 2002; Hargreaves, 2005a; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; Rothwell, 2005). Organizations must seek to capture the outbound knowledge of exiting leaders if they wish to maintain continuity in the pursuit of organizational goals. Likewise, inbound knowledge from new leaders should fill organizational knowledge gaps. Acquiring and distributing both inbound and outbound knowledge demands a model of distributed leadership in which acquired knowledge is shared across the individuals of an organization as long-term goals are pursued (Hargreaves, 2005a; Hargreaves & Fink, 2006).

### *Structures of professional development*

One integral part of an adequate succession plan is the development of leadership capacities through professional development. The National Staff Development Council (2000) summarized,

Improving the quality of America's school leaders is the most feasible way to make a significant difference in American education. Beyond the fact that improving principal performance provides great leverage over school achievement at limited cost, school systems owe it to their communities to ensure that all principals meet high standards of performance and that they are engaged in sustained, serious study of the most effective ways to improve student learning.

(p. 15)

The traditional model of day-long workshops, however, generally defined as short-term, one-size fits all, and unrelated to the context in which it is to be applied (Fenwick & Pierce, 2002; Evans & Mohr, 1999; National Staff Development Council, 2000; Cardno, 2005; Nicholson, Harris-John, & Schimmel, 2005), has failed to provide adequate professional development to participants. Such "in-basket" training is ineffective and seldom used by principals after the workshop day (Evans & Mohr, 1999).

Fenwick and Pierce (2002) contrasted traditional, craft, and reflective approaches to staff development as a means of differentiating staff development models. Similar to the "traditional" model above, the researchers described the traditional model as limited in scope, duration, and attentiveness to individualized needs. In contrast, the reflective inquiry approach utilizes self-directed learning, is embedded in an individual's work, and

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

requires active, rather than passive, participant action. Other authors have claimed that good professional development is collaborative (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004), intentional or planned (Cardno, 2005), focused on a principal's needs (Marshall, Pritchard, & Gunderson, 2001), based upon student achievement (Haar, 2002), and job-supported and embedded (Lairon & Vidales, 2003).

Numerous authors (Haar, 2002; Houle, 2006; Kostin & Haeger, 2006; Marshall et al., 2001) cited the need for long-term, ongoing professional development. The Urban Principal Academy in Connecticut is one example of a professional development program that sought to transcend the traditional model of staff development by focusing on instructional leadership, capacity building, and personal renewal through a long-term program. Houle (2006) attributed the success of the program to the long-term nature of this professional development model.

Mentoring and coaching are two prominent models of professional development that use embedded, collaborative approaches. Mentoring has been cited as a strong approach because it is adaptable to individual career stages (Petzko, 2004), fosters supportive relationships (Peterson & Cosner, 2005), and bridges gaps between expert and novice practitioners (Browne-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004). "The job of the mentor appears to be one that will continue to play a visible role in future schemes" of professional development (Daresh, 2004, p. 501). Browne-Ferrigno and Muth (2004) explained that "when mentoring effectively engages veteran, novice, and aspiring principals in reciprocal professional development, the community of practice continuously improves, expands, and deepens leadership capacity in schools and districts" (p. 189).

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

Behar-Horenstein (1995) examined Florida and Illinois certification and development systems and studied how these programs embedded themselves in the work of the principal. The author recommended a model of cognitive apprenticeship whereby a novice studies the processes that experts use to handle complex tasks. A critical component of this approach is the use of a "leadership analyst" (coach) who determines an administrator's needs, observes, conducts structured interviews, and provides on-the-job feedback.

While mentoring and coaching are often effective, researchers have cautioned that these approaches must be planned and supported if they are to work effectively. The selection and training of a quality mentor is critical to the mentorship program (Daresh, 2004; Hopkins-Thompson, 2000; Petzko, 2004). A good mentor should be capable of sharing knowledge and should be thoughtfully paired to meet the needs of a designated protégé (Hopkins-Thompson, 2000). Mentorships must also be supported over the long term so that focus is sustained (Daresh, 2004).

Structures that support and ensure the quality of principals are critical to developing the quality of leadership in school organizations. The importance of these structures has only been made more urgent by recent demographic data that reveal that a major transition is imminent. Nationwide, between FY93 and FY03 there was a 12.9% decrease in principals between the ages of 45 and 49 and a 9.6% increase in principals 55 and above. Over 55% of secondary principals are 50 or older (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2007). The mean age in Georgia saw a small reverse trend in the

*©2008 Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (developed by its GLISI, Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement and Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia). All rights reserved. Not to be used or reproduced without written permission.*

aging of the principal workforce (FY02: 50.1; FY07 49.2), but one that still demands attention (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2008).

### **Recommendations**

1. Based on a ratio of the principal population equaling 2.5% of the teaching population, in 2014, there is a projected need for 93,500 principals nationally. This figure represents an increase of approximately 11% since 2000. In Georgia, the impending retirement of baby-boom generation of principals coupled with a gradual increase in the number of principal positions to be filled underlines the importance of structures that ensure succession planning and knowledge management within school organizations.
2. The increasing complexity of the principal's job has created role conflict among principals. Systems can help resolve this conflict by providing a clear description of the role that the principal is to play in the context of his/her school. In addition, this defined role should be the basis for measuring performance.
3. Principals develop leadership potential through a process of socialization; however, structures that support principal development tend to unfold haphazardly. Systems can ensure support for new principals by developing frameworks and strategies for successful and intentional principal development.
4. The evaluation of principals needs to be based on criteria that reflect the realities of the school setting, making evaluation a practice of measuring those elements that principals can control within unique situations. Evaluations that are based on

- multiple perspectives from different types of stakeholders may yield a more accurate measurement of principal performance.
5. School systems can benefit from developing succession plans that align recruiting practices, job descriptions, professional development, and evaluation instruments with the system's strategic plan.
  6. Systems can support principals through professional development initiatives that are job-embedded, ongoing, and relative to the context of the school and district. In addition, professional development should reflect the strategic plan of the system and be tightly coupled with performance expectations.

### **Conclusion**

Educational organizations need strong visionary leadership to meet the challenges of our changing society. The importance of the principal and the increasing complexity of the position demand that attention be paid to recruiting, selecting, and developing leaders to guide schools into the future. The danger of losing intellectual capital through rapid principal turnover makes the task of succession planning and leadership development much more important. Educational organizations that make a difference “are led by principals who make a significant and measurable contribution to the effectiveness of staff and in the learning of pupils in their charge” (Hallinger & Heck, 1998, p. 158). The selection and development of high-quality school leaders needs to remain at the forefront of system-wide efforts to improve schools in Georgia and the United States.

Suggested Citation:

Zepeda, S. J., Bengtson, E., Parylo, O., Teitelbaum, D., & Shorner-Johnson, K. (2008).

*Executive summary—PreK-12 principals: Issues in evaluation, professional development, and succession.* Atlanta, GA: Georgia's Leadership Institute for School Improvement. Retrieved August 1, 2008 from <http://www.galeaders.org/site/default.html>