Winter 2017 Volume 2, Issue 1

TCPEA Conference within a Conference TASA Midwinter 2017 Research Proceedings

The peer-reviewed proceedings of the TCPEA CWC TASA Midwinter at Austin, TX January, 2017

Changing the Supervision Paradigm
Stephen Benigno

Examining Trust: A Framework for Collaborative Relationships Between Principals and Teachers
Jennifer S. Jones

Superintendent Preparation Program Internships: A Comparison between students in a preparation program and superintendents
Pauline M. Sampson and Kerry L. Roberts

Promoting Proactive, Empowered School Counselors to Addres At-Risk Student Needs
Brett Welch, Shannon Lafargue, Johnny O'Conner, J. Kenneth Young

Mentoring as a Succession Tool for Cultivating Faculty for Positions of Higher Education Administration
Jonathan M. Gary and Hollis Lowery-Moore

Changing the Supervision Paradigm

Stephen Benigno
Texas A&M International University

ABSTRACT
The teacher supervision process in the public schools has been under scrutiny for a number of years. Research has indicated that the teacher is the most influential person in the educational development of the student. "The one factor that has surfaced as the single most influential component of an effective school is the individual teachers within that school." (Marzano 2007) This research has been the catalyst for the development of formative strategies aimed at improving instruction in the classroom. Administrators have traditionally used transactional supervisory techniques to enforce and remediate specifically desired teacher behaviors in the classroom. Established theories and new instructional supervisory techniques are dictating a paradigm shift in the process of instructional supervision. Key to the paradigm shift is the development of the collegial and transformational relationship between the teacher and the school administration prior to that evaluation process. Leader-Member Exchange, Path-Goal Theories and Servant Leadership support specific strategies that may act as catalysts for developing that relationship. This manuscript will illuminate those theories and explore the possibilities for practical application of strategies that support those theories in developing that transformational relationship.

INTRODUCTION

For some reason the emphasis on relationship building in our schools and communities has fallen by the wayside. It may be the emphasis on technology, the cell phone craze, the multi-media influence or even the change in the global climate. Whatever the reason, the necessity for people to develop collaborative and transparent relationships is more important now than ever. Communication between supervisors and subordinates in the private and the public sector has been traditionally driven by the hierarchical relationships, pecking orders, "top down orders from headquarters, my way or the highway." The public school environment has not been immune to those transactional philosophies of management. Principals and school administrators have traditionally observed, evaluated and executed summative decisions regarding the expertise or lack of expertise of the school employee. It may have been a teacher, a counselor, a custodian or a co-administrator. The process has been the same for all.

Unfortunately these strategies continue today in many of our public schools. In addition to the transactional managerial approaches to evaluations, opportunities for teacher empowerment, collaboration, authentic professional development and communication are also noticeably absent from many our schools. In fact, many relationships between the school administration and the instructional faculty often border on abusive. During one visit to a local campus this writer heard over the intercom, "teachers, the halls are full of students, get in front of your doors and do your job!" One teacher came to this writer after attending my class and while in tears, described the evaluation she had with her principal. "My principal looked at me and said, "You should be ashamed of yourself and your student's scores, how do you get up in the morning and look at yourself in the mirror?" New teachers are also facing a crisis, a lack of support,

little professional development and an absence of mentorship are forcing an increasing number of these new teachers to resign from their positions as teachers and look for professional opportunities elsewhere. "About 50% of novice teachers "flee" the profession during their first 5 years of teaching". (Lambert, 2006)

Accountability, mandated expectations and the emphasis on data collection and analysis have altered the playing field considerably. Principals are now being required to facilitate and develop instructional promise in their buildings. Teachers are also more qualified and informed with regard to instructional design, differentiated instruction, student assessment, cultural responsiveness, response to intervention and even school administration. Many of these teachers are demanding accountability from their school leaders. School administrators are being held accountable for the performance of these teachers and that performance can often be predicated on the relationship that has been established between the teachers and the administration and how that relationship has facilitated the professional development of the teacher. How can we develop a collegial and collaborative environment that is conducive to instructional improvement, teacher empowerment and the development of a transformational academic culture?

THEORIES AND IMPLEMENTATION

Several theories address the development and the establishment of relationships between the principal and the teacher. The Leader-Member Exchange Theory "conceptualizes leadership as a process that is centered on the interactions between the leaders and followers." (Northhouse, 2013) A dyadic relationship is established between the leader and the member of the organization who is being supervised. That dyadic relationship is simply a "give and take" between the teacher and the administrator that evolves in complexity with the growth of their relationship. This dyadic union is based on the negotiated role responsibilities of the teacher and illuminates the extent to which that subordinate is committed to executing those responsibilities. "These negotiations involve exchanges in which subordinates do certain activities that go beyond their formal job descriptions" (Northhouse, 2013). In other words, to establish that dyadic relationship, school administrators must be transparent and authentic when they assign or request the assistance of the teachers in their charge. The interpretation of the Leader-Member Exchange Theory emphasizes not only the dyadic relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate but also describes the development of that relationship and the affective possibilities. According to Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991) the ongoing communication, collaboration and cooperation that takes place between the individuals involved in the dyadic relationship experience can evolve into a high degree of mutual trust, respect and an obligation to each other.

This theory can stimulate the implementation of a strategy that is congruent with most new models of instructional supervision and coincidentally will offer an opportunity for the administration and the teacher to develop a collegial relationship. A developmental strategy to establish the dyadic relationship involves an analytical approach to the instructional supervision process. Through the effective analysis of the qualifications, experience, demographics and observations of the teachers in the building, the school leader should be able to develop a detailed profile of each individual teacher. This profile can enable the administrator to create a strategy to individualize a formative supervisory approach for each teacher that will be beneficial to the teacher and the administration. This individualized approach and the development of the dyadic

relationship may stimulate feelings of respect and that respect may translate into the development of trust between the administration and the teacher. The benefits for employees who develop high-quality leader-member relationships include preferential treatment, increased job-related communication, ample access to supervisors and increased performance related feedback. (Harris et al., 2009)

First and foremost school leaders must be touch with their own emotional intelligence. Daniel Coleman defines "emotional intelligence"-a trait not measured by IQ tests as a set of skills, including control of one's impulses, self-motivation, empathy and social competence in interpersonal relationships. School leaders must be able to recognize their own leadership characteristics. Are they proponents of direct leadership? Do they prefer to facilitate? Or are they achievement oriented? Do they possess and can they implement specific leadership behaviors that may require empathy, understanding, listening, affirmation or validation? Additionally, these same school leaders must be able to understand their teachers. What motivates the teachers in the building? Which teacher is motivated by praise? Which teacher is validated through achievement? Who needs follow-through and refinement? The premise of the Path-Goal Theory, much like the Leader-Member Exchange Theory is the ability of a school leader to understand the motivation of the teachers in the building and be able to accommodate their needs by adapting motivational and supervisory strategies that are specific to the needs of the individual teacher.

If an administrator can clear the path for the teachers to achieve goals that are related to the teacher's areas of interest and passion, these same teachers could develop an intrinsic desire to collaborate in the evaluation process. Clearing the path for the teachers will involve an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the instructional staff. The identification of those strengths and weaknesses will enable the administration to target specific areas of expertise in the teachers and facilitate the growth of the organization by making those tailored assignments available to the identified teachers. These tailored assignments and opportunities to make authentic contributions to the school will encourage teachers to be more receptive to reinforcement and refinement suggestions during the evaluation process. By the same token, the school leader must be able to adjust their own individual strategies as they relate to the specific supervisory behaviors. By identifying the strengths and responsive preferences of the teachers, administrators should be able, through self-examination of their own strengths, preferences and style, tailor their approach and the supervision process to that of the individual teacher.

Listening, empathizing, validating and empowerment are just a few of the behaviors that are required of the school leader who promotes Servant Leadership. "Servant leaders place the good of followers over their own self-interests and emphasize follower development" (Hale & Fields 2007). Probably one of the most difficult concepts for a school leader to practice may be Servant Leadership. Simply speaking, the school leader must assume the role as a facilitator in the building. They must be able to identify the goals of the organization and of the teachers through a collaborative ongoing process which involves a lot of listening, understanding, collegial conversation and delegation. This empowerment may require the school leader to re-evaluate priorities and realign goals. Servant leadership is a selfless concept, a concept that will require the goals of the organization and of the teachers to take precedence over many of the traditional

individual leadership behaviors. The concept aligns with many of the new instructional supervision models. The Clinical Supervision model requires collegial conversation and collaboration throughout all facets of the supervision process. The school leader and the teacher will initiate and culminate the process together and the entire focus will be on improving the teacher's performance and instructional prowess. School leaders must be authentic and transparent when implementing this process. Servant Leadership requires the leader to be able to balance the daily transactional duties and responsibilities of the school leader with the ability to individualize the instructional supervision process. "Listening and purposeful responses from the administrator conducting the supervision are critical in initiating and developing an effective collaborative relationship with the teacher." (Benigno, 2016)

CONCLUSION

Effective schools are successful in mobilizing both the academic core of schools-teaching and learning-as well as practices which encourage affective relationships between adults (Ingersoll, 2003). The new models of instructional supervision require the administration to develop skills above and beyond the transactional strategies that were utilized with previous models of instructional supervision (Benigno, 2017).

School administrations must be able to move beyond the traditional supervisory concepts that have been used for decades. The strategies inspired by the Theories and concepts that were discussed in this paper are not new but they are supported. Collaboration involves communication, understanding and the development of a culture of trust. "In an effective culture, members are confident that they can share their professional struggles with anyone else in the culture without invalidating their work" (Gruenert, Whitaker 2015). This culture of trust can be developed through the empowerment of the instructional staff and with an administrative transparency that will inspire teachers to embrace the evaluation process. School leaders must be able to empower the teachers in the building by individualizing the instructional supervision process. They must transform the school culture through empowerment, transparency, presence and recognition. "The recognition of teacher success elevates morale in the school, acknowledges authentic accomplishment and serves notice that the administration knows what's going on in the building."(Benigno 2017) Transformational leadership and teacher empowerment will result in a collaborative and dedicated effort to improve instructional expertise and student performance in our schools.

References

Benigno, S. (2016). A viable solution to implementing effective instructional supervision. *Journal of Education and Learning, 5* (1), 128-132.

Benigno, S. (2017). Improving the supervision process: trust, presence, empowerment and recognition. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 4* (3), 1-4.

Coleman, D. (2016). *What makes a leader, why emotional intelligence matters*. New York: Bantam Books.

Gruenert, S., & Whitaker, T. (2015). *School culture rewired.* ASCD, Alexandria VA.

Graen G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1991) The transformation of professionals into self managing and partially self-designing contributions: Toward a theory of leadership making. *Journal of Management Systems, 3* (3), 33-48.

Hale, J. R. & Fields D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures. A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership 3, 397-417.*

Harris, K.J. Wheeler, A. R. & Kaemar, K.M. (2009). Leader member exchange and empowerment: Direct and interactive effects on job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 371-382.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Who controls teachers work? Power and accountability in America's schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lambert, L. (2006) Half of teachers quit in 5 years. The Washington Post, p. A7.

Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching.* ASCD, Alexandria VA.

Northhouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership, theory and practice.* (6th edition) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Examining Trust: A Framework for Collaborative Relationships Between Principals and Teachers

Jennifer S. Jones
The University of Texas at Tyler

Abstract
Empirical studies on trust frequently focus on importance of building trust, yet fail to emphasize the impact of trust in cultivating and facilitating collaborative environments. This study examined the facets of trust, the differences in levels of trust in principal and trust in colleagues, and the influence of trust in building collaborative relationships. This study analyzed the perceptions of teachers regarding trust in principals and trust in colleagues as provided by survey responses (N=327 teachers) from 15 participating urban schools. The correlational analysis indicated that significant relationships exist between the level trust in principal and the level of trust in colleagues with an r score of 0.79. Implications of this study suggest that school leaders must consider the relationship of trust and influence of trust on the collaborative school environment through the interactions between teachers and principals.

Introduction

Across the nation, the focus on public school academic achievement and school accountability has been placed under the microscope in the public's eye and among political leaders (Hallinger & Huber, 2012). With No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 and the recent reauthorization of the U.S. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) known as Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, school administrators are searching for answers for school improvement to address the governmental call for rigorous academic standards fueled by inadequate perceptions of literacy across the nation. Amid this scrutinized climate and pressure to excel, school leaders have amplified their reform efforts to meet the challenge and unrelenting demand for higher accountability standards. Specifically, the responsibilities of school achievements and failures rest on the shoulders of the school leader, namely the principal. At a time of unparalleled criticism, leadership has become a focal point for educational reform (Orr, 2006; Tschannen-Moran, 2003, 2014a) as accountability and educational reform initiatives have spurred distrust outside and within the public school system.

In response to the need for school reforms, school officials have embarked on new ways to improve school leadership. Marzano (2003) affirmed, "leadership can be considered the single most important aspect of effective school reform" (p. 27). According to Fullan (1998), school governance has been concerned for the most part with leadership: their persona and how leaders accomplish the day-to-day tasks. With both external and internal pressures to succeed, school leaders are seeking ways to raise the achievement level in their schools. Leaders cannot accomplish this solitarily, it must be done with a collective efficacy.

Leadership is perhaps the most powerful force related to improvement in any organization (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Glaser, 1997; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003; Yukl, 1998, 2006). Adopting a top-down approach to change teacher practices and forced buy-in creates resistance and problematic reform. Leaders must secure a genuine commitment from teachers to join in the change efforts. Securing this commitment begins when the leader shares the decision-making authority. According to Fullan (2010) the role of the leader in purposeful change "is to enable, facilitate, and cause peers to interact in a focused manner" (p. 35-36).

Literature on school improvement emphasizes the importance of distributed leadership in organizational change and teacher development where opportunities are provided for collaboration (Copland, 2003; Day & Sammons, 2014; Fullan, 2010; Hopkins, 2001; Little, 1990; MacBeath, 1998; Murphy & Datnow, 2003; Scribner, Sawyer, Watson, & Meyers, 2007). Collaboration can be defined as the mutual participation and interaction of all school constituents; school administrators, faculty, parents, students, and community members in the process of school planning. Hallinger and Heck (2010) suggest:

> "... that collaborative leadership focuses on strategic school-wide actions that are directed towards school improvement and shared among the principal, teachers, administrators and others. In the context of this study, collaborative leadership entailed the use of governance structures and organisational processes that empowered staff and students, encouraged broad participation in decision-making, and fostered shared accountability for student learning" (p. 97).

Leadership influences are governed by traits and qualities inherently originated by the leader. For leaders to influence others, there must be a relationship of trust. School reforms today call for collaboration and creating a climate and culture of care (Jones, Gill, & Sherman, 2005; Jones, Sherman, Combs, & Gill, 2005; Sergiovanni, 2004; Tschannen-Moran, 2001, 2003). A collaborative culture is illustrated by Nias, Southworth, and Yeomans (1994) as "the relationships between staff as people and the ways in which these influence their collective sense of purpose and commitment to fulfilling their roles in schools" (p. 258). Cohesiveness and collaborative relationships are essential for school productivity and to accomplish campus goals (Tschannen-Moran, 2014a).

A growing body of research exists on trust in school leadership and its impact on collaboration and school improvement (Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Bryk & Schneider, 2002, 2003; Gewertz, 2002; Hallam, Smith, Hite, Hite, & Wilcox, 2015; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2014a). Bryk and Schneider related trust as the "connective tissue" that unites individuals in collaboration for school reform (2003, p. 5). Trust in school leadership has become a significant topic as it relates to school effectiveness. Trust has been associated with the increased collaboration by faculty, students, and parents. Trust is also linked to principal characteristics and behaviors such as openness and communicativeness (Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Research over the last 25 years has recognized trust as a significant organizational aspect in schools (Bryk & Schneider, 2002, 2003; Coleman, 2012; Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, 2003; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2004a, 2014a; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy,

1998). Additionally, trust has been a focus on positive working environments the focus on productivity and the well-being of employees (Connell, Ferres, & Travaglione, 2003; Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan, 2000; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002 ; Mayer & Gavin, 2005; Tan & Tan, 2000). The National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA, 2015), a consortium of professional organizations revised the 2008 Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium Policy Standards (*ISLLC*) providing a framework on educational leadership policy and help define the "nature and quality of work persons who practice" educational leadership (p. 2). Within these standards, trust, effective leadership, and collaborative relationships are emphasized in tandem:

- Standard 2(b) Act according to and promote the professional norms of integrity, fairness, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, learning, and continuous improvement.
- Standard 1(b) In collaboration with members of the school and the community and using relevant data, develop and promote a vision for the school on the successful learning and development of each child and on instructional and organizational practices that promote such success.
- Standard 7(c) Establish and sustain a professional culture of engagement and commitment to shared vision, goals, and objectives pertaining to the education of the whole child; high expectations for professional work; ethical and equitable practice; trust and open communication; collaboration, collective efficacy, and continuous individual and organizational learning and improvement.
- Standard 7(e) Develop and support open, productive, caring, and trusting working relationships among leaders, faculty, and staff to promote professional capacity and the improvement of practice.

Principal-Teacher Relationship

Van de Grift and Houtveen (1999) defined educational leadership as the principal's initiative of school improvement, creating a climate of learning through stimulating and supervising teachers to the extent teachers fulfill their duties competently. Educational researchers believe there is a significant relationship between leadership and its effects on the school's mission and goals (Bamburg & Andrews, 1990; Duke, 1982; Marzano, 2003, Mosley, Boscardin, & Wells, 2014). Trust is associated with increased faculty participation in the school change effort and student achievement (Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010; Bryk & Schneider, 2002, 2003; Gewertz, 2002; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). Relationships of trust influence the school environment by the interactions and processes in the school, such as openness, communication, collaboration, climate, and culture.

Trust has a considerable influence on effectiveness and organizational health (Bryk & Schneider, 2003, 2002; Cunningham & Gresso, 1993; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). The relationship between teachers and principals is an emerging topic of research that is differentiated from the larger body of leadership styles and behavior research (Walsh, 2005). The relationships between principals and teachers vary dramatically among schools and within schools. Walsh asserts that the achievement of students is directly affected by those relationships. The principal must establish a successful culture and climate by setting clear a purpose and

expectations for students and teachers to improve achievement. To create this climate and culture, relationships of trust must be established.

Trust

The development of trusting relationships in school reform has been identified as a key component through research (Brewster & Railsback, 2003; Bryk & Schneider 1996; Gewertz, 2002; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Trust has been found to be complex and multifaceted. Because of its complexity, researchers have sought to find a general agreement of the characteristics or constructs of trust.

Handford & Leithwood (2013) contends that trust in leadership has a substantial influence on teachers' trust in principals which significantly impacts student achievement. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), in their research on trust in schools, identified common conditions of trust through an extensive review of literature, including more than 150 articles on trust. The commonalities are described as the five facets of trust: (a) benevolence, (b) reliability, (c) competence, (d) honesty, and (e) openness. Along with the five facets, researchers included confidence and the willingness to risk vulnerability. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1999) maintained that in order build trust; attention must be focused on the five facets of trust.

Trust involves risk and people desire the assurance that when trust is given, exploitation of one's vulnerability is not made (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2003). When trust is absent, people become suspicious and cautious of the actions of others, therefore, openness, collaboration, and risk-taking decreases. Distrust decreases the reliance and support of one another in difficult situations and the willingness to be vulnerable is to others is diminished. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), suggested that the lack of trust could be to blame for the failure of many school reform efforts.

Statement of the Problem

Although trust is an essential ingredient for school improvement, there is great need for additional understanding of the relationship of trust and collaboration. Existing research has offered introductory support for trust and collaboration, but as increased literature on school trust emerges, there is little research in the systematic approach to developing trust, understanding the conditions that affect trust, and examining the role of trust in student achievement and collaboration. Consequently, additional research is needed to examine ways of developing and cultivating trust in schools to increase effective collaboration and sustainable reform efforts. Therefore, this study was designed to gather and provide information that will enhance the possibility of effective school improvement through building trusting relationships. Specifically, the salient goal of this study was to understand what conditions are necessary to improve student outcomes, and to what extent are mutual trust in colleagues and faculty trust in the principal related to increased collaboration for school success.

Methodology

Research Design

This quantitative study was designed to investigate the relationship of trust among urban school principals and teachers to determine the differences in trust levels within those relationships; to establish if a correlation exists between the levels of trust between trust in principal and trust in colleagues; and to examine

trust conditions beneficial for increased collaboration for school success. In addition, this study identified the attributes of these schools according to Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's levels of trust using the facets of trust. Middle and high school teachers from a large urban district were the primary source of data for this research. This study incorporated a mixture of descriptive and inferential statistics that included a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) to determine a linear correlation between variables.

Research Questions

The research questions provided a framework to guide this study. The following research questions were examined in this study:

1. What are the attributes of urban secondary schools according to the levels of trust and facets of trust?
2. To what extent does faculty trust in principals and colleagues vary within urban secondary schools?
3. Is there a correlation between teachers' level of trust in their principal and trust in colleagues?

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used to collect data for this study was the Omnibus T-Scale (2003) developed by Wayne K. Hoy, PhD and Megan Tschannen-Moran, PhD. Specifically, the instrument measures the overall (a) faculty trust in the principal, (b) colleagues, and (c) client (parent and student). For the purpose of this study, the research focused on the analysis of data from two dimensions of faculty trust: trust in the principal and trust in colleagues. Additionally, the instrument was used to identify the five facets of trust; benevolence, reliability, openness, vulnerability, and honesty; and to characterize each of these dimensions of trust.

The instrument consisted of a 26-item form. The items were statements followed by a 6-point Likert response set scale with a range from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Strongly Agree was scored as a 6, and Strongly Disagree scored as a 1. Eight items for teacher trust in principal and eight items for teacher trust in colleague. Content and construct validity were documented by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2003) through reliability and validity assessments by professors at Ohio State University from the College of Education and the Fisher Business School, who were considered as an expert panel. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of reliability for trust in principal was (.98) and collegial trust is (0.93) (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003) and for this study trust in principal was (.93) and collegial trust (.91) both demonstrating high internal reliability.

Population

The population of this study consisted of urban secondary public school principals and teachers of a large urban school district in Texas. The research design specifically focused at the middle and high school levels. The participants of this study consisted of professional principals and teachers from a sample comprised of secondary school campuses. The 15 schools that responded accounted for 20% of the schools requested to participate in the study. The participating schools consisted of nine high schools and six middle schools, with a population of 327 teachers (N = 327) who completed the survey, regarding their principal.

Findings

This study used statistical processes including both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics described the distribution of data and relationships between variables. Inferential statistics were the measures of the samples and parameters were measures of the population. Inferences were made from the samples to the population. The quantitative data for analysis was obtained through a single inventory survey using a Likert scale to collect results. Survey items that aligned for trust in principal scores were 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 15, 18, 23; and trust in colleague scores from items 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, 16, 19, 21. Items were reversed scored for questions 4, 11, 8, and 23. Upon completion of the data collections for this study, selected statistical techniques were applied.

Research Question 1

The first research question addressed in this study was, "What are the attributes of urban secondary schools according to the levels of trust and facets of trust?" The percentiles compared the teacher's trust scores to the scores of other teachers who took the survey. Descriptive statistics for the independent and dependent variables of the study were calculated. The mean of the trust-standardized score is 500 with a standard deviation of 100. The range of these scores beginning with a score of 200 is lower than 99% of the schools. A score of 300 is lower than 97% of the schools. A score of 400 is lower than 84% of the schools. A score of 500 on the trust scale is average. A score of 600 is greater than 84% of the schools. A score of 700 is greater than 97% of the schools. Lastly, a score of 800 is greater than 99% of the schools.

The descriptive statistics for trust in principal and trust in colleague scores in this study indicated the number of schools, the minimum and maximum score, the mean, and the standard deviation for the variables. Table 1 provides data indicating the level of trust in the principal and the level of trust in colleagues. Standard deviation and mean trust scores were calculated for both trust variables; for trust in principal (M = 447, SD = 123), trust in colleague (M = 435, SD = 115).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Trust in Principal Scores and Trust in Colleague Scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Trust in Principal (TP)	327	218	666	447	123.148
Trust in Colleague (TCo)	327	256	663	435	115.038

The facets of trust for each school are presented in Table 2 and Table 3. Teacher responses for both trust in principal and trust in colleague were represented for vulnerability, reliability, benevolence, competence, openness, and honesty. Table 2 reveals the array of Likert scale score for trust in principal. This study revealed a range from 1.0 to 6.0. The Tan school indicated the lowest score for the facets for trust in principal.

The facets or trust items were examined and the means calculated. The facet of benevolence was indicated as the highest variable for trust in principal in this study with a mean score of 4.0. The facet of competence followed benevolence with a mean score of 3.9. Reliability had a mean of 3.8. Honesty and openness had a mean of 3.7, whereas vulnerability had a mean of 3.6.

Table 2
Mean Ratings for Items Comprising Facets of Trust Variables for Trust in Principal

Schools	Vulnerability	Reliability	Benevolence	Competence	Openness	Honesty
Red	3.5	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.8	4.3
Royal	4.9	5.1	4.6	5.2	4.5	5.1
White	3.4	3.6	4.5	3.7	3.6	3.7
Green	2.8	3.1	3.8	3.4	3.2	3.7
Yellow	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.3	3.9	4.1
Black	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3
Purple	3.1	3.5	3.9	3.4	3.3	4.2
Orange	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.2	5.4
Gold	4.5	4.0	4.7	4.5	3.1	3.6
Brown	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.2	4.4
Gray	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5
Pink	2.4	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.3	2.3
Tan	1.9	2.0	2.9	2.4	2.9	1.8
Navy	5.7	5.4	6.0	5.8	5.7	5.7
Violet	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.0

Note: The scale for each item was 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree.

Table 3 reveals the array of Likert scale score for trust in colleague in this study revealed a range between 2.6 to 5.7. The facet of competence was indicated as the highest variable for trust in colleague in this study with a mean score of 4.3. Following competence, the next highest facet was reliability with a mean of 4.0. Vulnerability followed with a mean of 3.9. Openness with a mean of 3.7 is preceded by both benevolence and honesty with means of 3.8.

Table 3

Mean Ratings for Items Comprising Facets of Trust Variables for Trust in Colleague

Schools	Vulnerability	Reliability	Benevolence	Competence	Openness	Honesty
Red	4.4	3.8	3.5	4.0	3.8	3.6
Royal	4.6	4.9	4.5	5.3	4.2	4.5
White	4.0	4.1	3.9	4.4	3.6	3.9
Green	3.5	3.7	3.5	4.2	3.3	3.5
Yellow	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.0
Black	4.4	4.3	4.2	5.0	4.1	4.5
Purple	4.1	4.7	4.4	5.0	4.5	4.5
Orange	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.2	4.9	5.2
Gold	3.7	3.8	4.2	3.9	3.4	3.8
Brown	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.6	3.9	4.0
Gray	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.0	4.2
Pink	3.7	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.7	3.8
Tan	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.3	3.6	3.6
Navy	4.6	5.7	5.3	5.5	4.8	4.9
Violet	3.6	3.6	2.6	3.8	3.4	3.3

Note: The scale for each item was 1 = Strongly Disagree to 6 = Strongly Agree.

Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1999) suggested that trust building must include attention focused on the facets of trust. The facet of benevolence was indicated by teacher responses to the survey items as the highest variable for trust in principal. Benevolence in this study was described as the most common facet of trust. Benevolence is one of the most enveloping facets of trust as reciprocated acts of goodwill are imperative to creating and maintaining interpersonal relationships. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran defined benevolence as the "confidence that one's well-being will be protected by trusted party" (2003, p. 8). The results from data analysis in this study substantiate the importance of benevolence as one of the most enveloping facets of trust. When teachers believe their well-being will be protected by reciprocated acts of goodwill, trusting relationships will increase and the educational climate will be conducive to collaboration. Leaders must genuinely care for their teachers, take an interest in their well-being, and consider the needs of others to build a collective efficacy for the attainment of school goals and improved academic achievement.

Second, the facet of competence was indicated by teacher responses to the survey items as the highest variable for trust in colleague. Brewster and Railsback (2003) suggested that competence is the certainty in another individual's capacity to execute the duties necessary in their position. Competence is having the capability and level of skill to fulfill an expectation (Baier, 1986; Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Mishra, 1996). Data analysis in this study substantiated that competence is also critical in the development of trust in relationships. When teachers feel their colleagues are competent and have knowledge and skills, relationships of trust will

increase. Covey (2009) "Trust is confidence born of two dimensions: character and competence. Character includes one's integrity, motive, and intent with people. Competence includes your capabilities, skills, results, and track record. Both dimensions are vital" (para. 8). Francis (2004) found "Trusting teachers were also likely to perceive their colleagues as competent, committed to their students, and capable of using their own judgment while being cooperative and supportive" (p. 86).

Research Question 2

The second research question posed in this study was, "To what extent does faculty trust in principals and colleagues vary within urban secondary schools?" For each school, the trust score was converted into a standardized score and computed to determine the level of trust subset scores for both trust in principal and trust in colleague (see Table 4 and Table 5).

Fifteen schools participated in this study, nine high schools and six middle schools. The minimum score for trust in principal at the nine high schools was 349 with a maximum of 621. The five middle school scores ranged from a minimum of 218 for trust in principal and a
maximum of 666. Trust in colleague minimum score for the high school level was 302 with a maximum of 663. Trust in colleagues at the middle school level resulted in a range of 256 as the minimum and 631 as the maximum.

Two schools at the middle school level, Pink and Tan, scored in the 200 range, indicating a very low level for trust in principal. The mean score for trust in principal for all schools in this study was 447. The mean score for trust in colleague was 435 indicating a range lower than 84% of the schools. A score of 500 on the trust scale is average. A score of 600 is greater than 84% of the schools. None of the schools that participated in this study received a score within the range of 700-800. Whereas, a score of 700 is greater than 97% of the schools, and a score of 800 is greater than 99% of the schools. The school identified as Navy had the highest level of trust in principal out of the 15 schools, followed by Orange with a score of 621 for trust in principal. For trust in colleague, Violet had the lowest score 256. The Orange campus had the highest score of 663 for trust in colleague.

The variance of trust in colleagues indicated one school within the 200 range, whereas six schools fell in the 300 range. Four schools ranged in the 400 range, with two schools in both the 500 and 600 range. In comparison to the variance between scores of trust in principal and trust in colleague for each school, the lowest difference of scores was 13, with a highest difference of 125.

Table 4

Trust in Principal (TP) Scores and Trust in Colleague (TCo) Scores (High Schools)

School Level	School	TP Trust Score	TCo Trust Score
High Schools	Red	433 N = 15	368 N = 15
	Royal	572 N = 16	543 N = 16
	White	407 N = 31	387 N = 31
	Green	349 N = 37	302 N = 37
	Yellow	470 N = 39	445 N = 39
	Black	498 N = 12	485 N = 12
	Purple	386 N = 25	503 N = 25
	Orange	621 N = 14	663 N = 14
	Gold	437 N = 13	353 N = 13

Table 5
Trust in Principal (TP) Scores and Trust in Colleague (TCo) Scores (Middle Schools)

School Level	School	TP Trust Score	TCo Trust Score
Middle Schools	Brown	505 N = 45	419 N = 45
	Gray	509 N = 36	460 N = 36
	Pink	257 N = 15	358 N = 15
	Tan	218 N = 17	358 N = 17
	Navy	666 N = 7	631 N = 7
	Violet	381 N = 10	256 N = 10

Research Question 3

The third research question investigated in this study was, "Is there a correlation between teachers' level of trust in their principal and trust in colleagues?" For this study, the Omnibus Trust Scale was used to measure trust in principal. The Pearson Product Moment correlation was used to measure the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the independent and dependent variable. Table 6 reveals the correlations among the independent variable-trust in principal and dependent variable-trust in colleagues. The Pearson Product Moment correlation found a significant relationship between trust in principal and trust in colleagues with an r score of 0.79. The findings suggest that when teachers trust level in their principal increases, collegial trust increases. Tschannen-Moran (2001) suggested that trust is associated with the of success of effective teacher collaborations. When collegial trust is present "teachers can depend on one another in difficult situations; teachers can rely on the integrity of their colleagues" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998 p. 342).

The studies by Brewster and Railsback (2003), Bryk and Schneider (2002, 2003), Gewertz, (2002) and Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) support the findings in this study as they found the association of trust with increased faculty

participation in the school change effort. In an environment of trust, collaborative behaviors increase, communication is open, and teachers feel they can depend on both principal and colleagues in challenging times. When opportunities are provided for teams collaborate effectively, teacher performance improves, and student achievement increases (DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005; Gallimore, Ermeling, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2009; Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen- Moran, 2007; Louis, 2006; Ronfeldt, Farmer, McQueen, & Grissom, 2015).

Table 6

Correlations Between Trust in Principal and Trust in Colleague Variables

		TP	TCO
TP	Pearson Correlation	1	.787(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.000
	N	327	327
TCo	Pearson Correlation	.787(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	-
	N	327	327

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A strong positive correlation was discovered between trust in principal and trust in colleague, [$r(327) = .79, p = .000$]. The findings suggest that when teachers trust level in their principal increases, collegial trust also increases. The studies by Brewster and Railsback (2003), Bryk and Schneider (2002, 2003), Gewertz, (2002), and Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) support the findings in this study as they found the association of trust with increased faculty participation in the school change effort.

Conclusion

A myriad of challenges face those who are charged with the responsibility of public education. Over the past 20 years, reform initiatives have been sparked by state and national mandates. Many public school systems have participated in change efforts to meet these rigorous standards of accountability. Building trusting relationships can increase the opportunity for collaboration and have a considerable influence on the organization's success. Effective leaders must consider the facets of trust and the role of trust in establishing an environment conducive to collaboration and school improvement. When principals take time to cultivate a climate of trust, environmental conditions become advantageous for risk-taking, innovative ideas and instructional strategies, and a commitment for change grows. When principals are benevolent, teachers will feel their well-being will be protected by reciprocated acts of goodwill, trusting relationships will flourish. Furthermore, when teachers feel their colleagues are competent and have knowledge and skills, relationships of trust will grow.

Studies by researchers have described trust as the foundation of school effectiveness (Bryk & Schneider 2002, 2003; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Kratzer, 1997; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995;

Tschannen-Moran, 2004a, 2004b; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). This study concurs with the findings of Tschannen-Moran's study in 2003. Tschannen-Moran found a significant link between trust in principals and trust in colleagues. When principals are trustworthy, the levels of trust in colleagues also increases. Elevated trust in principal helps facilitate collaborative relationships by providing teachers with a sense of support, opportunities for shared decision-making, and creates a culture of care. Research upholds that the role of the administrator is to create a climate and culture that will bring improvement (Deal, & Peterson, 1999; Jones, Gill, & Sherman, 2005; Jones, Sherman, Combs, & Gill, 2005; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1994; Sergiovanni, 2004). Principals influence the trust of their teachers. (Hallam, Smith, Hite, Hite, & Wilcox, 2015). Trusting relationships sets the stage for effective coaching that encourages teacher development.

In summation, the results of this study demonstrated a strong relationship among teacher trust in principal and trust in colleagues. As leaders struggle with school reform, it is imperative to understand what makes a leader effective and how developing relationships of trust affect the organization. School leaders must consider the facets of trust and its influence on the school environment between the interactions of both teachers and principals. Trust in leadership is essential in building collaborative relationships and boosting collective responsibility and commitment. In the absence of trust, vulnerability is guarded, communication is closed, and teachers are less willing to work interdependently. The principal plays an essential role in establishing an environment of trust that stimulates collaboration. With the influence of trust, leaders can create a climate that secures a genuine commitment for change and school improvement.

References

Baier, A. C. (1994). *Moral prejudices.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. URN: ISBN 9780674587168

Bamburg, J., & Andrews, R. (1990). School goals, principals and achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement 2*(3), 175-191. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0924345910020302

Brewster, C., & Railsback, J. (2003). *Building trusting relationships for school improvement: Implications for principals and teachers.* Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from http://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/trust.pdf

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (1996). *Social trust: A moral resource for school improvement.* Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from ERIC database. (ED412630)

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in Schools: A core resource for school Improvement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation. URN: ISBN-13: 978 0871541796

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in Schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership, 60*(6). Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational leadership/mar03/vol60/num06/Trust-in-Schools@-A-Core-Resource-for School-Reform.aspx

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press. URN: ISBN: 9780226078007

Butler, J. K., & Cantrell, R. S. (1984). A behavioral decision theory approach to modeling dyadic trust in superiors and subordinates. *Psychological Reports, 55*(1), 81-105. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1984.55.1.19

Coleman, A. (2012). The Significance of Trust in School-Based Collaborative Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 15*(1), 79-106. Retrieved January 5, 2017 from ERIC database. (EJ952535)

Connell, J., Ferres, N., & Travaglione, T. (2003). Engendering trust in manager subordinate relationships: Predictors and outcomes. *Personnel Review, 32,* 569-587. doi:10.1108/00483480310488342

Copland, M.A. (2003). Leadership of inquiry: Building and sustaining capacity for school improvement. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis,* 24(4), 375 395. Retrieved January 5, 2017 from ERIC database. (EJ782423)

Covey, S. M. R. (2009, February 9) How the best leaders built trust. Retrieved from https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/organizational-and-employeedevelopment/pages/leadersbuildtrust.aspx

Cunningham, W. G., & Gresso, D. W. (1993). *Cultural leadership.* Boston: Allyn Bacon. Retrieved January 11, 2017 from ERIC database. (ED377582)

Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Tan, H. H. (2000). The trusted general manager and business unit performance: Empirical evidence of a competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal, 21,* 563-576. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(200005)21:5<563::AID-SMJ99>3.0.CO;2-0

Day, C., & Sammons, P., Education Development Trust (United, K., University of Nottingham, United, K., & University of Oxford, United, K. (2016). Successful School Leadership. *Education Development Trust.* Retrieved January 5, 2017 from ERIC database. (ED565740)

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. URN: ISBN-13: 978-0787962432

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 611-628. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611

DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities.* Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service. URN: ISBN-978-1932127423

Duke, D. (1982). Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness, *NASSP Bulletin, 66*(456), 1-12. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/ 019263658206645601

Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95 § 114 Stat. 1177 (2015 2016). Retrieved on December 28, 2016 from https://www.ed.gov/essa?src=ft.

Francis, M. B. (2004). Teacher trust in principals, clients, and colleagues and its relationship to the overall performance of private church schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(07), 2450. (UMI 3181453)

Forsyth, P.B., Adams C.M., & Hoy, W.K. (2011). *Collective trust: Why schools can't improve without it.* New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved January 5, 2017 from ERIC database. (ED523580)

Fullan, M. (2010). *Motion Leadership: The Skinny on Becoming Change Savvy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. URN: ISBN: 9781412981316

Fullan, M. (1998). Leadership for the 21st century: Breaking the bonds of dependency. *Educational Leadership 55*(7), 6-10. Retrieved on January 4, 2017 from ERIC database. (EJ563892)

Gallimore, R., Ermeling, B. A., Saunders, W. M., & Goldenberg, C. (2009). Moving the learning of teaching closer to practice: Teacher education implications of school-based inquiry teams. *Elementary School Journal, 109,* 537-553. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from ERIC database. (EJ844058)

Gewertz, C. (2002, October 16). "Trusting" school community linked to student gains. *Education Week, (22)*7, 8. Retrieved on December 28, 2016 from http://www.edweek.org /ew/articles/2002/10/16/07trust.h22.html

Glaser, R. (1997). Leadership: Paving the road to trust. *HR Focus, 74*(1), 5-6.

Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). A theoretical and empirical investigation of teacher collaboration for school improvement and student achievement in public elementary schools. *Teachers College Record, 109,* 877-896. Retrieved on January 4, 2017 from ERIC database. (EJ820449)

Hallam, P. R., Smith, H. R., Hite, J. M., Hite, S. J., & Wilcox, B. R. (2015). Trust and Collaboration in PLC Teams. *NASSP Bulletin, 99*(3), 193. doi:10.1177/01926 36515602330

Hallinger, P. & Heck. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: Understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School leadership and Management, 30*(2), 95-110. Retrieved on December 11, 2016 from https://www.eduhk.hk/apclc/ dowloadables/Publications/2010/Collaborative%20leadership%20and%20school %20improvement.pdf

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980–1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9,* 157 191. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0924345980090203

Hallinger, P. & Huber, S. (2012). School leadership that makes a difference: International perspectives. *School effectiveness and School Improvement,* 23(4), 359-367. Retrieved on December 11, 2016 from https://www.eduhk.hk/apclc/dowloadables/Publications/2012/ School%20leadership%20that%20makes%20a%20difference%20Internatio nal%20perspectives.pdf

Handford, V., & Leithwood, K. (2013) Why teachers trust school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(2), 194 - 212. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/ 09578231311304706

Hopkins, D. (2001) *School improvement for real.* London: Falmer Press. doi:10.1023/ A:1024769427254

Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 9,* 184-208. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from ERIC database. (EJ587651)

Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus T-Scale. In W.K. Hoy & C. G. Miskel, *Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools* (pp. 181-208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing. Retrieved on January 5, 2017 from http://mxtsch.people.wm.edu/scholarship.php

Jones, T. B., Gill, P. B., & Sherman, R. (2005). Perceptions of school culture toward dimensions of excellence: Do stakeholder's agree? In C.L. Fulmer and F. Dembowski (Eds.), *Educational Leadership: Crediting the past, challenging the present, and changing the future, NCPEA 2005 Yearbook* (pp. 45-52). Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Roman and Littlefield Publishing Group.

Jones, T. B., Sherman, R., Combs, J. P., & Gill, P. B. (2005, February). *Understanding existing culture for school restructuring: Who cares?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kruse, S. D., Louis, K. S., & Bryk, A. S. (1994). *Building professional community in schools.* Madison, WI: Center of Organization and Restructuring Schools. Retrieved on December 17, 2016 from http://www.learner.org/workshops/principals/materials/pdf/kruse.pdf

Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record, 91*(4), 509-36. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from ERIC database. (EJ412496)

Louis, K. (2006). Changing the culture of schools: Professional community, organizational
learning, and trust. *Journal of School Leadership, 16,* 477-489. Retrieved on January 24, 2017 from
https://www.academia.edu/7389122/Louis_K.S._2006_._Changing_the_culture_of_schools_Professional_community_organizational_learning_and_trust._Journal_of_School_Leadership_16_4_477-489

MacBeath, J. (ed.) (1998). *Effective school leadership: Responding to change.* London: Paul Chapman. URN: ISBN 1-85396-413-1

Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. URN: ISBN-13: 978-0871207173

Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations* (pp. 261-287). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. http://
dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452243610.n13

Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal, 48,* 874-888. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2005.18803928

Mosley, J. I., Boscardin, M. L., & Wells, C. S. (2014). Perceptions of principal attributes in an era of accountability. *Journal of School Leadership, 24*(6), 1038-1072.

Murphy, J. & Datnow, A. (2003). The development of comprehensive school reform. In J. Murphy & A. Datnow (eds) *Leadership lessons from comprehensive school reforms.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. URN: ISBN-13: 978-0761978466

National Policy Board for Education Administration. (2015). The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. National Policy Board for Education Administration. Reston, VA: Author. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2015/ ProfessionalStandardsforEducationalLeaders2015forNPBEAFINAL.pdf

Nias, J., Southworth, G., & Yeomans, R. (1994). The culture of collaboration. In A. Pollard & J. Bourne (Eds.), Teaching and learning in the primary school, 258 272. London:Routledge.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved on January 5, 2017 from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf

Orr, M. T. (2006). Mapping innovation in leadership preparation in our nation's schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(7), 492-499. https://doi.org/10.1177/003172170608700706

Ronfeldt, M., Farmer, S. O., McQueen, K., & Grissom, J. A. (2015). Teacher collaboration in instructional teams and student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 52*(3), 475-514. doi:10.3102/0002831215585562

Scribner, J. P., Sawyer, R. K., Watson, S. T., & Myers, V. L. (2007). Teacher teams and distributed leadership: A study of group discourse and collaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(1),100. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06293631

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2004). Collaborative cultures and communities of practice. *Principal Leadership, 5*(1), 48-52. Retrieved on December 17, 2016 from ERIC database. (EJ766859)

Smith, P. A., Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Organizational health of high schools and dimensions of faculty trust. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*(2), 135-151. Retrieved on December 21, 2016 from ERIC database. (EJ634722)

Tan, H. H., & Tan, C. S. F. (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 126,* 241-260.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014a). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Boss. URN: ISBN-13: 978-1118834374

Tschannen-Moran, M (2014b). The interconnectivity of trust in schools. In D. Van Maele, P. B. Forsyth, & M. Van Houtte (Eds.), *Trust and school life.* Netherlands: Springer, 57-82.
URN: 978-94-017-8013-1

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004a). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. URN: ISBN-13: 978-0787974343

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004b, November). What's trust got to do with it? The role of faculty and principal trust in fostering student achievement. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration annual convention, Kansas

City, MO. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from http://static1.1.sqspcdn.com/static/f/275549/9729738/1291751319410/04ucea20.pdf?token=8qhEuRIjwtRqqzIC7W04l35UWVg%3D

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). Fostering organizational citizenship: Transformational leadership and trust. In W.K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel, *Studies in leading and organizing schools*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 157-179. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from http://mxtsch.people.wm.edu/scholarship.php

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *39*, 308-331. Retrieved on January 2, 2017 from http://people.wm.edu/~mxtsch/Scholarship/JEA_CollaborationandNeedforTrust.pdf

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 53*, 66-92. Retrieved on December 17, 2016 from ERIC database. (EJ1054239)

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*, 334-352. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578239810211518

Van de Grift, W., & Houtveen, A. (1999). Educational leadership and pupil achievement in primary education. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10*, 373-389. Retrieved on December 11, 2016 from ERIC database. *(EJ604801)*

Walsh, J. T. (2005). The nature of principal-teacher relationships at North Carolina Title I elementary schools of distinction. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 66*(03), 857. (UMI 3169123)

Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. A working paper. Retrieved on December 17, 2016 from ERIC database. (ED481972)

Yukl, G. (2006). Leadership in organizations (6th ed). Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall. URN: ISBN: 9780131494848

Yukl, G. A. (1998). *Leadership in organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.URN: ISBN: 9780138975210

Superintendent Preparation Program Internships: A Comparison between students in a preparation program and superintendents

Pauline M. Sampson and Kerry L. Roberts
Stephen F. Austin State University

Abstract

This qualitative case study evaluated the internship experience of one superintendent preparation program. Major findings showed that superintendents and interns need strong administrative skills, governance skills, advocacy skills, curriculum and instruction skills, management skills, interpersonal skills, ability to understand and use social media, and work in a political atmosphere.

Introduction

Texas Administrative Code allows for institutions of higher education, regional service centers, public school districts, or other entity approved by the State Board of Education Certification to provide certification for educators in Texas (§TAC 228.20). The state of Texas requires all accredited advanced certification for educational leaderships of principals and superintendents to complete an internship with practicing superintendents (§TAC 242.15. TEA). For candidates seeking professional certification as a superintendent each educator preparation program shall provide a practicum, as defined in §TAC 228.2 of this title, for a minimum of 160 clock-hours. The knowledge and skills for this practicum relate to the standards also identified in code. There is a specific requirement for the field-based practicum that must show proficiency in each of the standards (§TAC Chapter 228). The listed standards required for the superintendent certificate are instructional leadership; administration, supervision, and communication skills; curriculum and instructional management; performance evaluation, organization, and fiscal management (TAC §242.15) The internships are monitored and evaluated by the district superintendent in the field as the cooperating mentor and a university faculty supervisor. Currently, the interns have three visits from the university supervisor but these visits may be conducted via videoconferencing formats such as Zoom, Go-to-Meetings, Google, or Skype.

There is limited research on superintendent internships. A Google Scholar search and a ProQuest dissertation search led to only 15 empirical articles and four dissertations on educational leadership preparation programs in the last five years. Not specific to the superintendent preparation programs. This is not a new phenomenon as Murphy and Vriezenga (2006) only found four empirical articles on this topic from 1975-2002 in the journal, *Education Administration Quarterly* according to Kottkamp (2010). Kottkamp (2010) conducted an additional search for that same time frame and found one additional article bringing the total to five empirical articles on educational leadership preparation.

The importance of evaluation of educational leadership preparation programs was led by University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) in the early 2000s and

became increasingly important after the attacks on their quality by Levine (2005). The evaluation of School superintendent preparation programs must examine their practices to stay current and relevant in changing times. Many candidates in preparation programs are working principals and often do their internships in their own districts with their superintendents. Additionally, there is delayed time between their first job as a superintendent and their internship during the preparation program. Further, university educational leadership programs often work to connect theory with the practice components of educational leadership with some programs placing more emphasis on theory. The relevancy of the university preparation programs need to be grounded with the current superintendents. The superintendent position is more complex than ever before. (Cooper, Fusarelli, Jackson, & Poster, 2002; Kowalski, McCord, Peterson, Young, and Ellerson, 2011). Some of the issues that create this increased complexity are higher accountability demands, lower financial resources (Johnson, 2010), and increased levels of study diversity (Bjork, Glass, & Brunner, 2005). These issues are part of the learning for new superintendents while they are learning new school districts' expectations and community culture (Sanaghan & Lytle, 2008). Therefore, the increasing challenges require preparation programs to constantly examine their practices and coursework to ensure that while students are interns in preparation programs and as new superintendents will have success in their position as superintendent

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine Texas superintendents and the internship experience of students in one superintendent preparation program. The superintendent internship is a field-based requirement for the students in superintendent preparation program and this requirement deserves more evaluation. The superintendents' perspectives on relevant internship experiences are important. The significance of this study is tied to how the perceptions of superintendents are similar or dissimilar to the reality that awaits superintendents' interns after they become superintendents.

Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by the work on Kottkamp (2010) on program evaluation of educational leadership preparation programs and the current Texas state Administrative Codes.

Methods and Procedures

This qualitative research was a comparison that examined superintendent intern students' reflective narratives of their internship experience and compared those results with superintendents' recommendations for the needs of students in their educational leadership preparation programs. This qualitative case study was one university superintendent preparation program.

The following question guided the research:

> What are the requisite knowledge and skills of new superintendents that should be learned in the internship experience?

Twenty students in one superintendent preparation program and fifteen superintendents in an advisory group for the preparation program of one higher institution were the focus of this study. The superintendents were asked to provide feedback for superintendent preparation programs. Students provided their feedback in the form of a reflective narrative essay while the superintendents provided feedback during three advisory meetings. The narratives were imported in NVIVO 10. Then an analysis was conducted

by examining the frequency of key concepts and further reading to determine supporting quotations of the key concepts. The concepts from the superintendent interns were then compared with the key concepts from the superintendents. This study is significant as leadership preparation programs continue to see a need to evaluate their programs while staying relevant to the needs of future superintendents. The perceptual data provides the relevancy for superintendent preparation programs. Some of the skills needed by new superintendents that should be part of the preparation programs are board policies, accountability measures, contract negotiation (Sanaghan & Lytle, 2008).

Review of Literature

Many superintendents rated their own preparation programs highly between 1982-2000 (Glass, 2000). However, other researchers have found portions of the preparation programs to be lacking. Cooper, Fusarelli, Jackson, and Poster (2002) reported superintendent preparation was not a smooth process and that the preparation had too much emphasis on theory without the development of adequate knowledge base. Levine (2005) is often cited for his attacks on educational leadership preparation programs sharing that there were too many graduate programs awarding too many degrees in educational leadership and that these programs were not strong. Additionally, Wilmore and Bratlein (2005) conducted a national survey study analyzing the administrator internships at 43 universities with 22 universities having an internship over two sequential semesters.

The same year as Levine's (2005) report, Fusarelli (2005) reported that there was an increase in many state for alternative certification routes for superintendents. Adams (2010) also found that more superintendent applicants were coming from the business world and this led to more debates on superintendent qualifications, preparation and background.

Other research on preparation program courses showed that finance, law, and personnel management were identified as the most beneficial by first-year superintendents (Peterson, Fusarelli, & Kowalski, 2008). Other areas identified by the first-year superintendents in Peterson et al., study were practical experiences such as internship where students interacted with school boards and had to solve real problems that occur in the life of a superintendent. These same superintendents cited theory, lack of instructor experience, and not enough real-world projects as the primary weaknesses in their preparation (Peterson et al., 2008). Rochicheu and Haar (2008) added ten content areas that they believed were necessary content areas of any university superintendent preparation program. These content areas are strategic planning, students' due process rights, demographic changes and their effects, time management, site based management, public relations, recruitment of staff, empowering the staff, relations with the school board, and the evaluation of other administrators. Further, Robicheau and Haar (2008) stated that these content areas should be part of the internships. Again, the students in Robicheau and Haar (2008) study rated their program as effective and relevant.

A follow up study of superintendents from four states showed similarities for strengths in finance, law, instructional leadership, management, and democratic leadership. Kowalski, Peterson, and Fusarelli (2009) examined new superintendents' perception of their preparation programs across four states. Eighty five percent of the superintendents in Kowalski, et al. (2009) shared that they felt well prepared as an instructional leader, 78% management, 92% as a democratic leader, and 80% as an

effective communicator. Conversely, the superintendents in Kowalski, et al. (2009) study stated that they were not well prepared to work with school boards or engage with the political issues. These same superintendents rated their program as effective with finance and law preparation but weak because of too much theory and instructors with no superintendent experience (Kowalski et al., 2009).

Quirk (2012) conducted a qualitative study of first-years superintendents in Missouri regarding their perception of the preparation program. The participants in Quirk's (2012) study rated their preparation needing more emphasis on finance, law, and real problems while there should be less emphasis on theory. Further, the participants shared a desire for instructors to be practicing superintendents or recently retired superintendents (Quirk, 2012).

Olivarez (2013) suggested a different model for superintendent preparation programs by assigning a superintendent mentor at the beginning of the student's work in the preparation program. Then all the field-work is guided by that superintendent around district events of instructional support services, curriculum and instruction, elementary and secondary campus operations, governance operations, support systems of security, food and transportation, external and internal communications, accountability and information/technology management and services, facilities planning and plant services, administrative and finance operations, and human resources.

A more recent study examined the perceptions of superintendents from one state of their preparation program (Johnson, 2016). Johnson (2016) found that the superintendents rated their preparation programs as weak in political leadership training, internship experiences, and leadership in varying sizes of districts.

Results and Conclusion

Superintendents' Feedback

Superintendents suggested several skills, knowledge and dispositions needed for superintendents to be successful. These skills, knowledge, and dispositions that need to be a part of an internship included the following: 1) understand social media, 2) be aware of the many things changing in the schools and the society, 3) understand the board's role and responsibility, 4) understand legislator's role and advocate for laws that are good for all students anywhere, 5) be a strong instructional leader, 6) build capacity of others in the school, 7) understand curriculum and instruction, 8) clear knowledge of finance and facilities, 8) network with others' for their support and expertise, 9) flexible and adaptable in current district, 10) good interpersonal and relation building skills, 11) make good decisions, and teacher and administrative evaluations.

The role of the superintendent needs to be an advocate that communicates actively for a strong public education system. One of the superintendents stated, "that superintendents need to be vocal and active for all of public education instead of protecting only their own school district".

While superintendents advocate for public education in general, they also must be able to communicate well about their own district. There is a growing use of social media and the role of this is important. One superintendent shared, "Social media is a major issue and people can be fired for things they do with social media." Another superintendent described that understanding the media is important. He stated, "It doesn't matter if it is true, it is the media and that sells papers. The superintendent needs to maximize media by promoting the school in positive ways." Part of dealing with the

media is public relations. A superintendent said it was important to learn how to deflect questions. A superintendent said, "You have to be a great actor and learn to listen and not react to many things that arise as part of the job." Along with the ability to react professional always, is the need to understand the importance of the power groups in the community. There will be needs for changes and this requires superintendents to convince others to help lead the change.

Board and superintendent relationship is a major component of the job. A superintendent must have a strong ability to work with their boards if they want to continue with their job in the district. One superintendent shared that he works with his board on the premise that he was hired to run the school and the board's role was to evaluate his job doing that. This same superintendent said, the board felt their role was to represent their constituents when in reality, their role is trustees for the district". Another superintendent shared that the vision and goals change as the board changes. Further, the superintendent must spend time with the board on student data. A superintendent said, "It takes communication with the board and they then sell it in the community."
Another area that is important for students to understand is that different size districts need different leadership skills. One superintendent shared,

In smaller districts, the superintendent needs to learn how to do everything. In larger in the larger district is often not noticed as much. Further, the superintendents expressed that students could learn many of the needed skills through role playing, studying case studies, observing news reports on education, completing internships in various sizes of districts, and using clinical style hours for each of the major standards of superintendents.

Intern Students' Narratives

Eleven Intern students reflected on the internship experiences that were designed to help them gain skills, knowledge and dispositions needed to be successful as a superintendent. These skills, knowledge, and dispositions included the following 1) facility maintenance projects, bonds, and technology; 2) human resource with interviewing new personnel and planning staff evaluations; 3) finance including budgets and bonds; 4) transportation; 5) communication with diverse community members; 6) board relationships; 7) vision and mission with district level plans; 8) curriculum alignment and instructional best practices; 9) leadership training and professional development.

Interns spent large portions of their time with a superintendent doing a variety of experiences and projects. The most frequent category for internship work showed 14 experiences with facility maintenance projects, bonds, facility assessments, and technology evaluations. One student spent a majority of time for the internship on facility and finance issues such as conducting a cost-benefit analysis for paying staff mileage or use of district vehicles. This same intern worked on gaining an understanding for a failed bond passage. The following quotes are samples of students' narratives in the facilities area of their internship.

"One of the projects during my internship was to assess technology needs on the elementary campus and recommend software and hardware that would increase student performance and efficiency"

"I had the opportunity to see where the district is growing and how the facility and construction plans are made each year for this growth".

The next category of internship experiences was communication with diverse community members. This category was described by eight students. Some of the samples of communication included how to work with all people in a variety of activities. Some samples for this area include the following quotes. "The most important lesson that I learned from my experience with the superintendent is, when you treat people with respect by listening to their opinions, making them feel important, and showing them that you are going to make a fair decision, then most often people will go out of their way to work with you. The superintendent I worked with was a master of communication". "What I appreciate most is the superintendent's ability to interact with everyone at a genuine level. He doesn't treat board members or graduate students differently. He makes you feel welcome." "I attended, planned, and participated in banquets, induction ceremonies, graduations, awards assemblies, and various other school and community sponsored events with the superintendent. The presence of the superintendent helps develop the relationship with the families and the businesses while strengthening the community support for the school".

The category of working with district level groups had some commonality with communication but it was specific to district advisory team meetings. Six students shared their involvement with this district committee as important to their internship. District advisory committee work to establish the vision and mission for the future while developing yearly plans as well as long term needs was the major function in this category. On student stated, "School campuses must strive for success, but it is imperative that they work together under one district vision to provide all students equity within the school district they attend".

The category of finance was the next most cited category for the internship. Finance was cited by six students. Although the bond passage could also fit in this category, most the bond experiences was examination of the facilities and not the financial component. Finance experiences were described as understanding the selling of Weighted Average Daily Attendance and the budget. One student stated, "I was part of the understanding and meetings related to a budget crisis. The superintendent and the board considered every aspect of the budget and made cuts they felt were secondary to the quality instructional programs".
Another student shared, "I participated in completing the financial template with the superintendent and region service center financial consultant. It became very real during this process how important accurate data is. Bad data means less money".
Transportation costs were also part of the internship experience.

The next category was curriculum and instruction. This category was cited by six students and included lesson plans, use of district data, and planning when AYP was not met. One student shared that he could "assist in the alignment of curriculum especially in the math area because of discrepancy in math scores between the elementary and junior high school".

Human resource was the next area described by students as part of their internship. This included recruitment and interviewing new personnel, staff and teacher evaluations, and planning professional development such as Lead4ward. This area was described by six students.

An area that many students expressed as a new experience was working with school boards. This was shared by 4 students. One student expressed that he learned

how the board united together. Another student said, "I learned that you need to spend quality time with each individual board member to build a relationship and to share district views. He also sets up a retreat with the board to establish unity and mutual respect". "I learned that superintendents spend most of their day dealing with public relations issues. It is the relationships that are developed that determine the success or failure of the superintendent in that district". Another students shared, "The superintendent must always be honest and upfront with the school board regardless whether it is good or bad news. I learned that you need to be honest and forthright with the community in all the different political and social factions within the community." A different student expressed, "One of my greatest lessons learned was the superintendent's ability to be firm with the board members when they were difficult. He did so tactfully and professionally without taking away from the board president".

One student shared that she had learned the differences in being a superintendent in a small district from a large school district. She explained, "The superintendent shared that in the small district, he oversaw everything. He became knowledgeable in every area of the district. In the large district, he shared that it was important to get to know all the power-houses in the district. Also, in the small district, you are very accessible to everyone". Perhaps one of the most poignant learnings was the determination that the position can be very lonely. The student stated, "I believe it is lonely at the top as a superintendent".

Limitations

There are limitations with this study in that it is only one superintendent preparation program of Texas and therefore is not generalizable to other preparation programs in Texas. Another limitation is the small number of participants in this study. This research could be further developed with quantitative research with a larger sample of superintendents and superintendent intern students as well as with other stakeholders such as faculty of preparation programs, school board presidents, and other administrators.

References

Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., Jackson, B., L., & Poster, J. (2002). Is "superintendent Preparation" an oxymoron? Analyzing changes in programs, certification, and control. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1*(3), 242-255.

Johnson, B. A. (2016). *Perceptions of practicing Illinois superintendents on the relationship between Educational Leadership Administrative Preparation Programs and their perceived job performance efficacy as defined by the 2011 ELCC District Level Leadership standards.* Doctoral dissertation retrieved from ProQuest dissertations and thesis database. #10118385.

Kottkamp, R. B. (2010). Introduction: Leadership preparation in education, *Educational Administration Quarterly,* Retrieved from 0011000010378609.

Kowalski, T., Petersen, G., & Fusarelli, L., (2009). Novice superintendents and the efficacy of professional preparation. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice, 5*(4), 16-26.

Kowalski, T., McCord, R., Peterson, G., Young, I., & Ellerson, N. (2011). *The American school superintendent: 2010 decennial study.* American Association of School Administrators. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Marzano, R., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance.* Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

McCord, R. (2008). Networks as a remedy for superintendent isolation. *New Superintendent E-Journal.* Retrieved from www.aasa.org.

McCord, R. (2009). *Strengthening the superintendent pipeline and professional development options.* University Council for Educational Administration. Retrieved from www.uceap.org.

Oivarez, R. D. (2013). Preparing superintendents for executive leadership: Combining administrative, instructional, and political leadership theory with real-world applications. *UCEA Review, 54*(3), 1-4.

Peterson, G., Fusarelli, L., & Kowalski, t. (2008). Novice superintendent perceptions of preparation adequacy and problems of practice. *Journal on Research on Leadership Education, 2*(3). 1-22.

Murphy, J., & Vriesenga, M. (2006). Research on school leadership preparation in the United States: An analysis. *School Leadership & Management, 26*, 183-195.

Quirk, B. D., (2012). *First-Year Superintendents' Perceptions of Preparation and Practice.* Doctoral dissertation retrieved from ProQuest dissertations and thesis database. #3510340.

Robicheau, J., & Haar, J. (2008). *A relevant model for preparing aspiring superintendents.* Retreived from http://cnx.org/content/m18035/1.1/

Sanaghan, P., & Lytle, J. (2008). Creating a transition map for a new superintendency. *New Superintendents Journal.* Retrieved from www.aasa.org.

Wilmore, E. L., & Bratlein, M. J. (2005). Mentoring and tutoring within administrative internship programs in American universities. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 13*(1), 23-27.

Promoting proactive, empowered school counselors to address at-risk student needs

Brett Welch, Shannon Lafargue, Johnny O'Conner, J. Kenneth Young
Lamar University & Calcasieu Parish School System

Abstract
This research explored the perspectives of male inmates regarding their educational experiences. The focus of the study was to identify commonalities and phenomena in relation to these experiences, school engagement levels, deviant behavior, and school staff-student interactions as it related to the at-risk student population.

Statement of the Problem

During the 2003-2004 school year, the nation spent an average of $9,116 per student on education, which was about 37% less than what was spent per incarcerated inmate (Amos, 2008). Although the path to incarceration is varied, research has found that education plays a meaningful role in the process. For example, research found dropouts were more likely than high school graduates to be arrested or incarcerated (Amos, 2008; Cassel, 2003), and that male dropouts were more likely to have an arrest record than males who completed school (Miller & Porter, 2007). In an analysis of data from 15 Texas counties, research found that there was a strong, positive relationship between dropping out of high school and violent felonies (Ikomi, 2010).

Most chronic juvenile offenders begin their delinquent careers before the age of 12 (Onwudiwe, 2004). In fact, the United States juvenile population, citizens under the age of 18, is expected to increase to an estimated 80.3 million citizens by the year 2020 (Statistical Briefing Book, 2014). With this projected increase, it is paramount that not only criminologists and the criminal justice system take note, but also educational leaders as they prepare for growing school systems and potentially growing problems. Most at-risk students share common disadvantaged circumstances that increase the likelihood that they will not be successful in school. However, it has been suggested that teachers and other school related factors may indeed present the greatest risk for academic underachievement.

Prison populations are rarely studied in terms of educational experiences and perceived levels of motivation. Since most prisoners had at-risk characteristics in childhood and half are high school dropouts, it seems logical to investigate their educational backgrounds and motivational levels (Hall, 2006). Thus, this study reflectively examined the perspectives of current inmates who dropped out of high school.

Theoretical Framework

Specific theories and perspectives that shape the framework for this study were as follows: chaos theory, labeling theory, and strain theory. Education and Criminology

have been described as linear or closed systems of functioning (Doll, 1987; Forker, 1997; Milovanovic, 1994). Marion (2002) described closed systems theory organizations as self-contained and largely untainted by external forces or issues. Educationally, this linear view excludes students as active participants of meaning with diverse views, needs, and goals (Doll, 1987). In terms of delinquent behavior, linear systems overlook one major problem with human behavior – forces outside the system have an effect on the systems functioning (Forker, 1997). Chaos theory, on the other hand, is defined as a science of large interactive systems and nonlinear cause and affect (Marion, 2002). Chaos theory provides a framework for conceptualizing the embodiment of all disciplines and theories regarding the role that education plays in student outcomes.

The basic assumption of labeling theory is that perceived negative labeling may lead to one's development of negative self-efficacy and possibly greater delinquent involvement (Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963). Lemert (1951) defined formal labels as those obtained through contact with social control agencies, and informal labels as those generated by parents, teachers, and peers. The present study emphasized informal labeling of students by their teachers.

Finally, Strain Theory focuses on the individual's negative relationships with others. These negative relationships increase the likelihood that individuals will experience negative outcomes. Agnew (1992) noted that as adolescents enter a larger and more demanding social world, their desire for autonomy from adults and acceptance by peers may contribute to the adolescents being treated negatively by others. The negative affects create pressure for corrective action by the adolescents, and one possible response is negative behavior (Agnew, 1992).

Methods and Procedures

Using a qualitative/phenomenological research method, one hour interview sessions were conducted with twelve inmates. The sessions took place at a Louisiana correctional center. At the completion of the first round of interviews, the interviews were transcribed, coded, and cross-referenced for commonalities and phenomena related to the topic discussed and the researcher's questions for the study. The criteria for selection were: (a) male, (b) aged 18-30, (c) former juvenile offender, (d) high school dropout, and (e) attended P-12 school. The reason for the young age group in the prison population was to keep the experiences relevant to the issues of P-12 educational system in recent past. Participants were chosen for their potential to contribute valuable data to the research. The available participants were either current or former GED students at the correctional center.

Results and Potential Implications

The results of this study indicated that the school counselor was absent during critical stages of the inmates' schooling journeys. In many cases, the inmates stated a complete lack of knowledge or awareness of the services provided by their school counselors. Fitch, Newby, Ballestro, and Marshall (2001) examined the perceptions of future school administrators regarding the role of the school counselor. Their study suggests that school administrators lack appropriate training and knowledge regarding the school counselors' role and that school administrators' views of the counselor's role is critical to the counselor's actual job duties. Job duties that are unrelated to their role such as record keeping and disciplinarian duties should be

eliminated or decreased; and roles related to their professionally determined functions such as individual counseling, group counseling, and classroom guidance should be adhered to.

The inmates' lack of counselor interaction may be attributed to this counseling perspective to some degree. If administrators focused on the role of the school counselor and ensured that their abilities were allowed to function in their professionally designed capacity, future students on the path to academic failure may have more interaction with these professionals. Another counselor intervention for students may be to train teachers the art of interpersonal communication. Most teachers and administrators are not trained extensively regarding this very important skill. Counselors' training is centered on the art of communication. Counselors could use this background to provide teachers and administrators with the necessary skills to establish and sustain interpersonal relationships with students and parents.

Educational Importance of the Study

The findings highlight an issue that is supported by literature on the role of a school counselor. One could reason these findings would be quite different if the inmates' interviewed had experiences with more engaged counselors. The literature suggests that the counselors whom the inmates deemed as absent or uninvolved were robbed of their time by other, non-counseling duties, which precluded them from devoting adequate time to student needs. If school counselors were empowered to function in their professionally-designed capacity, future students on the path to academic failure may have more interaction with these professionals, and this interaction could be the bifurcation point that develops new tracts for the students and subsequent academic engagement.

This study reinforced the importance of educational stakeholders establishing meaningful relationships with at-risk students and their families. A championship sports team once had a sign above the tunnel leading out to the stadium's field that read, "Blame no one, Expect nothing, Do something." It is easy and commonplace sometimes to pass the buck regarding inadequacies and failure of students and children, but it takes a true professional to address a problem, assign no blame, expect nothing, and do something about it. Imagine the consequence of all stakeholders' holding this perspective. This synergistic, philosophical approach to helping students could provide the momentum they need to negotiate and succeed in the educational process.

References

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of delinquency. *Criminology, 30,* 47-87.

Amos, J., (2008). Dropouts, diplomas, and dollars: U.S. high schools and the nation's economy. *Alliance for Excellence in Educations,* Retrieved from http://www.all4ed.org/files/Econ2008.pdf

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance.* New York: Free Press.

Cassel, R. N. (2003). A High School Drop-Out Prevention Program for the At-Risk Sophomore Students. *Education, 123*(4), 649+.

Doll, W. E., Jr. (1987). *Foundations for a post-modern curriculum.* Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Fitch, T., Newby, E., Ballestero, V., & Marshall, J. (2001). Future school administrators' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*(2) 88-99.

Forker, A. (1997). Chaos and modeling crime: Quinney's class, state, and crime. In D. Milovanovic (Ed.), *Chaos, criminology and social justice* (pp. 55-74). N.Y.: Praeger Publishers.

Ikomi, P. A. (2010). Juvenile violent felony referrals and high school dropouts: Is there a relationship?. *International Journal of Academic Research, 2*(4), 379 384. Retrieved from www.ijar.lit.az

Lemert, E. (1951). Social pathology: A systematic approach to the theory of sociopathic behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, R. (2006). *Voices behind bars: correctional education from the perspective of the prisoner student.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of New Orleans.

Marion, R. (2002). *Leadership in education: Organizational theory for the practitioner.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Miller, C., & Porter, K. E. (2007). Barriers to employment among out-of-school youth. *Children & Youth Services Review, 29*(5), 572-587. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2006.11.001

Milovanovic, D. (1994). Construction of subjectivity in law. *Emory International Law Review. C.J., 8,* 72-98.

Onwudiwe, I. D. (2004, October). Theoretical perspectives on juvenile delinquency: Root Causes and Control. *Corrections Today,* 66, 153+.

Statistical Briefing Book. (2014) *Juvenile population characteristics: Overview.* Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/population/overview.html

Mentoring as a Succession Tool for Cultivating Faculty for Positions of Higher Education Administration

Jonathan M. Gary and Hollis Lowery-Moore
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor

John Ebersole (2014) reports a looming leadership crisis in higher education. Davidson (2013) cited reoccurring expressions of concerns about "the shortage of talented faculty leaders at our institutions of higher learning" (para. 1). Where will we find our future higher education leaders? Across the United States, leaders in institutions of higher education are asking this question. Leske (2014) stated "from the Ivy League to large public research universities, institutions have dipped into the corporate talent pool for leaders who, for better or worse, have brought [leadership] approaches shaped in very different environments to higher education" (para. 2). "Higher Education institutions are facing continuous pressures for change. Over the past few decades' traditional principles of academic leadership and collegial forms of governance have been rapidly replaced by management principles adopted from the private sector" (van Ameijde, Nelson, Billsberry, & van Meurs, 2009, pp. 763-764). Along with higher education institutions reaching beyond their campus borders, the expectancies on the establishments' traditional ways of governance has transformed. Laske (2014) warned that "if higher education is to become more businesslike and entrepreneurial without losing its soul, the trick will be hiring leaders who understand both spheres, corporate and academic" (para. 3). Davidson (2013) stated that she does not believe higher education should have to go beyond the institutional walls to find its leaders. Without having to turn to the corporate world, institutions of higher education can find leaders "who straddle the academic/corporate fence" (Laske, 2014, para. 6). However, since many institutions do not offer "clear pathways to leadership", what must institutions do in order to find their leaders from within (Davidson, 2013, para. 2)? Higher Education should have systems in place to assist faculty members, found within the boundaries of the institution, in becoming future administrative leaders. Cripps (2014) explained the benefits of this approach:

> By privileging and expanding managerial administrator hires, we miss the opportunity to distribute academic leadership skills across highly educated, deeply analytical employees with robust institutional ties and a finger on the pulse of university life. Leadership skills are transferrable, making investments in faculty-administrators contributions to the quality of faculty service across the entire institution. Faculty-administrators are close to the ground on educational initiative and have campus networks they draw on to advance initiatives by recruiting colleagues and building support. (para. 13)

Exploring mentoring strategies that can prepare faculty for positions of higher education leadership is the purpose of this literature review.

Leadership Cultivation

Laske (2014) explained that the private sector seeks to attract "top candidates" but to do so "requires a strategic, targeted, tailored approach that's heavy on leadership cultivation. Higher education institutions would be wise to consider doing the same" (para. 7). When institutions of higher education begin to focus on leadership cultivation, specifically within the walls of the institution, then it will be possible to identify America's future higher education leaders. "These tasks of cultivation aren't easy, but the harvest they yield makes them well worth the effort" (Wenger & Snyder, 2000, para. 5).

Future Administrative Leaders

With the need to foster upcoming leaders for higher education, institutions should have methods in place to assist faculty members to grow into future administrative leaders. The problem is developing future leaders in higher education. Cripps (2014) pointed out that "leadership skills are transferrable" (para. 13). Significant research on mentoring programs in the fields of business, medicine, and education exist. Enrich, Hansford, and Tennent (2004) reviewed 300 research-based mentoring articles, which revealed that mentoring across the three professions (business, medical, and education) is highly valuable because of the profit of mentoring on individuals and the parent institution. Grogan and Crow's (2004) review of articles "reinforced a belief that purposeful mentoring of aspiring leaders and new leaders provides effective professional development and serves the organization well" (p. 467). Mentoring strategies can be one aspect of developing future leaders in higher education. Daresh (2004) stated, "there is a value and a need to look into more effective approaches for the development of educational leaders" (p. 496). Can mentoring be the necessary succession tool to cultivate future higher education leaders from the existing faculty?

Mentoring in the Workplace

Literature reveals that the concept of mentoring in the workplace exists and is valued. Thorndyke, Gusic, and Milner (2008) stated, "mentoring is a central component of professional development" (p. 1). While, Grogan and Crow (2004) added that mentoring is "vital for career advancement" (p. 463). The articles reviewed by Grogan and Crow's (2004) "reinforced a belief that purposeful mentoring of aspiring leaders and new leaders provides effective professional development and serves the organization well" (p. 467). Cohn, Khurana, and Reeves (2005) stated as benefit to the mentee and organization that "they [senior leadership] must mentor emerging leaders, from their own and other departments, passing on important knowledge and providing helpful evaluations and feedback" (para. 22). In addition, "Mentoring is a two-way process with the mentor [organization] having as much to gain as the mentee" (McKimm, Jollie, & Hatter, 2007, p. 6).

Mentoring in Educational Institutions

Mentoring in educational institutions is a common practice. Darech (2004), Goodwin, Stevens, and Bellamy (1998), plus Gorman, Durmowicz, Roskes, and Slattery (2010) point out that in K-12 and higher education, mentoring produces the same positive results. Daresh (2004) presents the long-term values of mentoring in an academic setting. The author discusses five benefits to the protégé. They are: 1) they feel more confident

with their professional abilities, 2) it assists them in making the connection between educational theory and daily practice, 3) their communication skills improve, 4) mentoring teaches the tricks of the trade, and 5) mentoring gives the protégé a sense of ownership and belonging. For the mentor the benefits include increased job satisfaction, added recognition from peers, and personal satisfaction in the role of mentor since it gives them the opportunity for career advancement (Daresh, 2004).

Authors, Goodwin et al. (1998) used the thirteen schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) in Colorado to answer two questions about faculty-to-faculty mentoring. Using questionnaire and data collection, the authors sought to answer "faculty members' attitudes, perceptions, and experiences about faculty-to-faculty mentoring so as to better understand their operational definitions of mentoring and views about effective mentoring in SCDEs" (Goodwin et al., 1998, p. 334).

A second group of authors, Gorman et al. (2010) focuses on the mentoring of women in higher education in the School of the Sciences (SOS) at Stevenson University (SU). Their research revealed "what works" principles and procedures that are effective regardless of gender and institution (Gorman et al., 2010, p. 1). Several researchers note the positive results of mentoring. Goodwin et al. (1998) determined that high value was placed on mentoring that focused on scholarly research, instruction, and professional socialization; Daresh (2010) concluded that educational institutions set themselves and the protégé up for job success when mentoring is in place; Gorman et al. (2010) discovered that mentoring tools are beneficial to all entities (protégé, mentor, and organization); and Fountain and Newcomer (2016) explained that mentoring in higher education continues to be a priority to the institution.

Current Findings

In education, K-12 has historically led the way in using mentoring as a succession tool. Mentoring has been used with first year teachers in peer coaching settings, for supporting new principles, and training aspiring public school educational leaders (Daresh, 2004; Goodwin et al., 1998; Grogan & Crow, 2004). The use of mentoring in higher education has traditionally been experienced between academic advisor-to-undergraduate student, graduate committee chair-to-graduate student, and in faculty-to-faculty relationships (Goodwin et al., 1998; Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004). Recently, June (2017a) stated that "with a shrinking pool of potential academic leaders, a growing number of institutions have moved to groom their own" (para. 1). A number of universities are taking this approach. A few of the higher education institutions that have implemented leadership programs are Elon University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH), Ohio State University, Rutgers University, Stanford University, and the University of South Carolina. These six universities' programs include 1) a Pre-Doctoral Leadership Development Institute for future Ph.D. students at Rutgers, 2) The President and Provost's Leadership Institute at Ohio State which is geared towards department chairs and directors of schools, 3) the yearlong University of South Carolina Pipeline for Academy Leaders program specifically for directors, deans, and vice presidents, 4) eight different leadership programs at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for faculty in various stages of their higher education career, 5) the Faculty Administrative Fellows program at Elon University that allows associate level professors

the opportunity to work alongside senior level administrators for two-years, and 6) the Stanford Leadership Development Program designed for the Medical-school faculty (June, 2017a; Kiel, 2015; Lambert, 2015). These type of university programs are designed "to cultivate institutional leaders, in most cases from among the faculty ranks" (June, 2017b, para. 8). June (2017b) justified cultivating future leaders from within the faculty ranks by stating:

> "Ideally, such programs help demystify the path to becoming an academic leader while expanding the pipeline of future administrative talent that many institutions need. Growing their own leaders is one way for colleges to curb the frequency which with they must hire outsiders to fill openings for department chairs, deans, provosts, and other senior positions. Hires from within are already familiar with the culture of the institution and its mission and goals, which diminishes the learning curve often associated with such positions." (para. 8)

Conclusion

Kiel (2015), Senior Leadership Consultant, Center for Faculty Excellence at the University of North Caroline at Chapel Hill stated, "effective faculty leadership is important because faculty are the main stakeholders in the university who are committed to the core academic and democratic values that underpin higher education in the US" (p. 6). President Lambert (2015) of Elon University has "long believed that we in higher education could do a better job of intentionally cultivating academic and administrative leadership" (para. 2). The literature supports the benefits of mentoring in higher education. Institutions of higher education that have implemented leadership development programs reveal that tapping into the existing resources of faculty for future leaders is possible. As a succession tool, mentoring can be one significant component of cultivating faculty for future positions of higher education administration. There is a need for research exploring successful mentoring efforts that lead to effective administrative succession in higher education institutions. Developing leaders from within institutions will be an effective tool for filling the gaps in administrative leadership described by Ebersole (2014), Davidson (2013), and Leske (2014).

References

Cohn, J. M., Khurana R., & Reeves L. (2005). *Growing talent as if your business depended on it*. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/2005/10/growing-talent-as-if your-business-depended-on-it

Cripps, M. J. (2014, May 12). *Essay call for new model job faculty member administrator*. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2014/05/12/essay-calls-new-model job-faculty-member-administrator.

Daresh, J. (2004). Mentoring school leaders: professional promise or predictable problems? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 495-517. doi: 10.1177/0013161X04267114.

Davidson, C. N. (2013, November 11). *Down with 'service,' up with leadership*. Retrieved from: http://www.chronicle.com/article/Down-With-Service-Up With/142897/

Ebersole, J. (2014, January 13). *Top issues facing higher education in 2014*. Retrieved from: http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnebersole/2014/01/13/top-issues-facing higher-education-in-2014/#4235fdc10242.

Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B., & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: a review of the literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 518-540. doi: 10.1177/0013161X04267118.

Fountain, J. & Newcomer, K. E. (2016). Developing and sustaining effective faculty mentoring programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 22(4), 483-506.

Goodwin, L. D., Stevens, E. A., & Bellamy G. T. (1998). Mentoring among faculty in schools, colleges, and departments of education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(5), 334-343. doi: 10.1177/0022487198049005003.

Gorman, S. T., Durmowicz, M. C., Roskes, E. M., & Slattery, S. P. (2010). Women in the academy: female leadership in STEM education and the evolution of a mentoring web. *Forum on Public Policy*, 1-15.

Grogan, M., & Crow, G. (2004). Mentoring in the context of educational leadership preparation and development – old wine in new bottles? Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 463-467. doi: 10.1177/0013161X04267107.

June, A. W. (2017a). *What 4 colleges are doing to groom new leaders*. Retrieved from: http://www.chronicle.com/article/what-4-colleges-are-doing-to/238881.

June, A. W. (2017b). *How to cultivate faculty leaders*. Retrieved from: http://www.chronicle.com/article/how-to-cultivate-faculty/238880.

Kiel, D. H. (2015). Creating a faculty leadership development program. *Academic Impressions*. Denver, CO: CR Mrig Company

Lambert, L. M. (2015). *A "grow your own" strategy to develop administrative leadership*. Retrieved from: http://www.agb.org/trusteeship/2015/marchapril/a grow-your-own-strategy-to-develop-administrative-leadership.

Leske, L. (2014, April 14). *Institutional leadership: A delicate dance between corporate and academic*. Retrieved from: https://evolllution.com/opinions/institutional leadership-delicate-dance-corporate-academic/.

McKimm, J., Jollie, C. & Hatter, M. (2003, revised 2007). *Mentoring: theory and practice*. Developed from 'Preparedness to practice, mentoring scheme'. (1999). NHSE/Imperial College School of Medicine

Thorndyke, L. E., Gusic, M. E., & Milner, R. M. (2008). Functional mentoring: a practical approach with multilevel outcomes. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 28(3), 157-164.

van Ameijde, J. D. J., Nelson, P. C., Billsberry, J., & van Meurs, N. (2009). Improving leadership in higher education institutions: A distributed perspective. *Higher Education, 58*(6), 763–779.

Wenger, E. C. & Snyder, W. M. (2000). *Communities of practice: the organizational frontier*. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/2000/01/communities-of-practice-the organizational-frontier