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Abstract

The primary purpose of this study was to describe and compare the leadership succession plans currently in place in two school districts in Ontario. Due to the mass retirements of school administrators and the impending shortage of qualified candidates with experience to move into these positions school districts are faced with the challenge of attracting and preparing candidates for the administrator role. In addition the school districts need to ensure that practicing administrators are assisted with their professional development in renewing practices and policies that meet the demands of the changing role. The conceptual framework of this investigation focused on succession planning, recruitment and selection of candidates as well as the socialization process of school administrators. This focus was primarily based on essential knowledge, skills and attitudes needed by school administrators for effective leadership and how this leadership development is one response to meeting the demands of the current accountability system.

This qualitative study encompassed 44 on-site visits. There were 20 visits to District A (seven interview visits and 13 observation visits) and 24 visits to District B (seven interview visits and 17 observation visits) over a period of eight months for the school year 2000-2001. The data collection was guided by a series of intensive semi-
structured interviews with district office personnel (Directors, Superintendents, Educational Officers) and focus group interviews with candidates (aspiring to be administrators) and school administrators (Principals and Vice-Principals, new and veteran) across both sites. There were a total of 43 participants. A record of written field notes and dictated observations on the formal and informal exchanges and interactions among the participants as well as a review of pertinent documents were used in the analysis.

The findings are presented in two case studies in both narrative and tabular form. The case studies were also cross-analyzed to determine significant similarities and variations in succession planning strategies and priorities across both districts. Many of the findings were tied to the context of each district. The findings of this study revealed a picture of the leadership succession planning processes and structures that two school districts currently have in place for the preparation of candidates to school administrator positions. In addition, it described the renewal processes for practicing school vice-principals and principals that help them prepare for their changing roles. The overall findings showed that school districts need to consider a leadership succession planning model that includes four aspects as they pursue leadership succession planning: principles and structure (philosophy, organization, and responsibility) for leadership succession planning; recruitment and selection; socialization; and accountability.
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CHAPTER ONE

Contextualizing the Problem

In a new era when school districts are re-examining every aspect of education in the search for more effective schools, many school districts report problems with finding qualified leaders for their schools. Due to the relatively low number of qualified candidates who pursue the administrator role, research has shown that many school districts are now looking beyond the education system in their quest for leaders (Jordan, McCauley & Comeaux, 1994; Sheldon & Munnich Jr., 1999; Pounder & Merrill, 2001, Gutheries & Saunders, 2001). A recent article in the New York Times Supplement (January, 2001) showed that the trend in recruitment practices for many school districts in the United States has moved towards considering the appointment of professionals from outside the realm of public education. For example, Seattle has recently renewed its schools under the leadership of a retired Army General, while Atlanta has just recruited a retired Army Colonel as superintendent of operations in its district office; Los Angeles has turned to a former Colorado governor to lead its school district; Milwaukee employed a highly visible Social Service Director as superintendent; San Diego is relying on a former prosecuting attorney; Philadelphia schools have been led under the direction of an ordained minister while New York City has taken the leadership reins from respected and experienced educators and handed them to a securities industry lawyer. Just as many of these retired non-educators are accepting positions in district offices, so are they being appointed to administrator positions in public schools.

There is no research currently available that shows similar school district practices occurring in Canada. However, as in the United States, presently in Ontario there is an unusual shortage of qualified candidates applying for entry to the administrative recruitment pools for the province's critical school leadership roles—vice-principals and principals, particularly in the candidate pool for vice-principals. The research on effective schools clearly emphasizes the importance of the school administrator's role, both principal and vice-principal, in school and student success. With the major changes to Ontario's education system and the huge turn-over anticipated
in the ranks of administrators over the next few years, the need for comprehensive professional development programs to ensure a supply of well-qualified aspiring and practicing school leaders is crucial. In order to meet these new challenges as well as the changing expectations for the administrator's role, school administrators will need ongoing support and training from district office personnel to obtain new knowledge and a wide range of new skills.

The job of a school administrator in today's society covers a wide range of situations and requires a variety of skills. Research has shown that administrators deal with many kinds of problems during a typical day, and that much of their work is carried out face to face with parents, students, teachers, and other administrators. As some research has indicated, their work can be characterized by brevity, fragmentation, and variety (McKinney & Garrison, 1994; Gregory, 2000).

It is unusual for a school administrator to be able to spend more than a few minutes at a time on a task or be able to complete a major responsibility without interruption. The conversations and meetings that administrators engage in during a typical day address matters that range from faulty plumbing to student activities to the curriculum. The administrator meets or talks with more than a dozen people on a variety of topics on a daily basis. Most of these meetings are relatively brief. Requests for money, conferences with parents of unruly children, and classroom observations have long been part of the administrator's job. However, some activities would have been rare occurrences for most administrators 25 years ago.

Examples of these categories of interaction include meetings with police investigating students suspected of dealing in drugs, discussions with counselors about runaways who have been abused, upcoming meetings to discuss ways of improving student achievement, and meetings to consider ways of funding proposed changes in school staffing.

According to Evans (1995) in Education Week the following Want Ad was published in one of the local newspapers in search of a school administrator. It emphasized the complexities associated with the job of being a school administrator:
WANTED

A miracle worker who can do more with less, pacify rival groups, endure chronic second guessing, tolerate low levels of support, process large volumes of paper and work double shifts (75 nights out a year). He or she will have "carte blanche" to motivate, but cannot spend much money, replace any personnel or upset any constituency.

The above advertisement is a clear indication of the qualifications required of school administrators who wish to pursue the school administrator's role in the public school system in an era of ongoing school reform. Although the value and impact of the educational reform movement over the past two decades may be cause for debate, many researchers have asserted that one fact remains clear: the role of the school administrator has increased in its complexities (DuFour & Eaker, 1988; Renihan, 1990; Sackney, 1991; Parkay & Hall, 1992; Leithwood, Steinbach & Begley, 1992; Fullan, 1996; Lipham, Rankin & Hoeh, 1985; Isherwood, 1994; Abbott, 1994; Ashby & Krug, 1998; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Smith & Piele, 1989; Roher & Wormwell, 2000; Gregory, 2000). The ground rules have been changing. The authoritarianism and aloofness that marked the leadership style of some school administrators in years past has fading appeal in the collaborative and collegial climate associated with current educational reform.

Few areas of public policy in the last two decades have witnessed the flurry of reforms and innovations that have characterized K-12 public education. Spurred by a national concern about the quality of public education, provincial, state and local school districts have undertaken hundreds of reforms, touching not only on traditional topics such as curricular content, instructional methods, and teacher training but also fundamental issues of organizational structure and finance. Among the trends that are having the most profound effect on the work of school administrators are the changing demographic characteristics of students and fiscal realities of schools. There are currently more special needs classrooms than ever as well as more classrooms that regularly include students whose first language is not English. Multicultural settings are also more common (Garcia, 2000) and many children in school are living with single parent families who live below the poverty line. Funds for education have been dramatically reduced over the past number of years and many decisions about education have become centralized (Parkay et al., 1992; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1999). Reform is being
implemented in all areas of education simultaneously including curriculum, governance, structures, assessment, and accountability. There is increased emphasis on improving school quality and on making schools more responsive to the needs of students.

In responsive school organizations, much time and energy are devoted to listening to what the needs of clients are. Listening helps the organization members learn what their customers regard as its strengths and weaknesses, what is being done well and what needs improvement. Without this data, personnel are likely to lack the information needed to take appropriate corrective action (Ziegenfuss, 1988). Responsive schools are schools in which teachers and administrators hold themselves accountable first and foremost to the people who depend on the school's performance—parents, students, and the community (Seyfarth, 1999). In addition to the level of responsiveness there is a focus on decentralization and restructuring as well as the changing roles for parents and teachers.

Over time the role of the school administrator evolved in response to the need for better instructional leadership, in addition to the more traditional managerial role associated with all phases of school operations. Now, changing conditions in society and the schools are combining to create new expectations for administrators. To meet the challenges and expectations for effective school administration there is a need for what George Webber refers to as a:

"Growing people", the creation and cultivation of a climate throughout the organization in which people are actively given the opportunity to try out their new talents and skills, are deliberately exposed to progressive challenges, are given training and study opportunities that broaden their perspectives and abilities, and, perhaps, most important of all, are given management and leadership tasks that permit them and the organization to learn who and what they are in relationship to the organization's mission.

(George B. Webber, Secretary-General of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies).

The role of the administrator in effective schools has transcended the traditional notion of functional management, power, behavior style, and instructional leadership. Successful schools (Ogden & Germinario, 1995) have administrators who regularly engage in establishing a productive and professional school culture. According to Ogden et al.,(1995) "whether through collaboration, consensus building, personal influence, or
modeling, the principal creates a school's vision for success by promoting a school culture where staff, students, and community members have common school goals that become more important than individual self interests” (pp. 27-28).

Administrators need to build leadership, cooperation, and shared decision-making skills in others. They need to increase shared information, knowledge and resources to enable effective problem-solving (Cooper & Boyd, 1987). Many "non-teaching" administrators state that they spend a majority of their time on administrative and managerial tasks rather than on those that directly affect curriculum and instruction (Murphy, 1989; Murphy, 1992; 1999; Murphy, Beck, Crawford, Hodges & McGaughy, 2000). In looking at a typical school administrator, “it is clear that once appointed, the principal is expected to be all things to all people” (Boyer, 1983, p.221).

Citing Stalhammar’s study of school leaders in Sweden, Glatter (1991) points out that “school leaders need to possess or develop a well-thought-out and consistent view of their social and educational task as a whole, to provide them with a frame of reference as they deal with the myriad specific problems which arise during an improvement process” (p. 223). He argues for a substantial focus on organizational level issues in preparation programs.

According to Daresh effective leadership is one of the most important determinants of success in schools (Daresh, 1986a; 1986b; 1988a; 1988b; Daresh et al., 1992; 1990; 1994). Daresh claims that the quality of leadership demonstrated by school administrators, superintendents and other administrators have a major impact on the overall effectiveness of schools and school districts (Daresh, 1996; 1997; 2000). Administrative leadership remains key to school success. Administrators are the “gatekeepers and the gate-openers” of their school. According to Hargreaves and Fullan (1999) there must be strong connection between what is “out there” and what really matters for students. They assert that “this is almost impossible without leadership, intervention and support” (p. 105). There is recognition that without strong school leaders, efforts to improve student achievement will falter.

This idea that strong leaders are required is not new. In the 1960s, Harvard Scholar Ron Edmonds (1981) noted that effective schools tended to have effective administrators. The administrator has considerable influence over the environment in the
school building where the most meaningful actions in education occur. An effective administrator can create a climate that fosters excellent teaching and learning, while the ineffective administrator can quickly hamper the progress of the most dedicated reformers (Edmonds, 1981; Tanner & Stone, 1998).

Since the 1970s, researchers have focused on the principal’s role in shaping teaching and learning. In Keller’s (1998) article, “Principal Matters”, the investigation of effective schools and successful school change highlighted the importance of the principal’s leadership. Renihan (1999) summarizes the importance of the school leader by using a quote by Hawley and Echman, that “a terrific school principal can dramatically change what happens in a school. Among educators it is common knowledge to make a bad school better, change the principal for the better” (p. 6).

School systems everywhere are discovering that it is quite difficult to attract candidates to fill leadership positions, particularly at the school level. The situation in many Ontario cities has become particularly difficult due to the number of retirements. The Ontario College of Teachers in their study “Teacher Shortage Looms”, presented in Professionally Speaking (November, 1998), found that retirements of teachers with principal qualifications are growing at a faster rate than the general teacher population. As would be expected, principal qualifications and principalships are often achieved when one is well into a teaching career. Their study revealed that 44% of teachers with principal’s qualifications are likely to retire within five years and 64% within a decade.

According to the National Institute on Educational Governance (1998) research demonstrates that school administrators are recognized as important to student success within their individual schools and to the overall leadership in a school district or area. Blackman and Fenwick noted in the January 12, 2000 issue of Education Week that focus in the past was related to structural changes including standards and testing and ways of holding schools and students accountable. Now the education policy world is turning its attention to the personnel charged with making the system work—the school administrator. The issue remains, however, that few people are ready or willing to take on the job. In order to be best, adequate preparation for the role is vital.

Several bodies of research have indicated that the administrator is the “key” figure in the effort to improve schools, and the understanding of how administrators promote the
improvement process is becoming more complete (Brookover & Lezotte, 1981; Edmonds, 1981; Sweeny, 1982; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Duke, 1987; Gardner & Laskin, 1995). Similarly, the characteristics of successful administrators have been catalogued (Martinko & Gardner, 1984). It will not be enough for those who already hold school administrator positions to become familiar with the most salient issues: they must reach a level at which they can assert leadership and rally others on behalf of improvement. They need to build and refine the skills and knowledge required to lead and to manage change. To do this, they will require support from central office administrators who must exercise leadership in planning, bargaining, recruitment, selection, induction, appraisal, development, compensation, justice, continuity, accountability and information.

There has been very little research done on how school administrators become effective school leaders or how they are supported at the district level once they assume these roles. Moreover, it appears that the same school administrators are expected to meet the increasing accountability demands of their positions as reform agendas descend on schools, diversity flourishes and the conceptualization of leadership is forever changing.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

This study examines and compares the leadership succession plans of two school districts in Ontario. The investigation focuses on district leadership succession planning, recruitment and selection processes for school administrative positions, as well as the professional and organizational socialization opportunities and experiences of school administrators. In addition, the inquiry explores how these processes assist school administrators in meeting the expectations and demands of accountability. Four major research questions guide the study:

1. What is the philosophy and structure of the school district’s leadership succession plan?
2. How does the school district recruit and select school administrators?
3. What are the professional and organizational socialization processes for school administrators in the district?
4. How are school administrators held accountable?
Significance of this Study

This research project furthers our understanding of how school boards can improve the quality and effectiveness of school administrators by implementing a district educational training and preparation program. The program focuses on professional development geared toward enhancing essential knowledge, skills and attitudes needed by school administrators for effective leadership in the current role of administration.

This study documents how two public school districts in Ontario hold their school administrators accountable in their roles and functions as administrators. This study also explores how a leadership succession plan may improve the quality of administrators and describes formal and explicit as well as informal and implicit influences on socialization. This facilitates administrators’ learning processes for better understanding of accountability demands.

This study also serves as a snapshot of the efforts of school districts involved in an on-going commitment to continuous improvement. It adds to the growing set of studies on accountability and leadership development processes. It could also act as a model for other school districts providing guidelines and direction. The findings of this study extend, deepen, and question the understandings of how school administrators are recruited, selected, socialized and held accountable in their roles as administrators expressed in the current literature. It also provides practical descriptions and concrete examples of these processes to further inform practice and theory.

Limitations

However different the objects of investigation and the goals of inquiry, there are certain problems shared by all research methods. These problems which are particular to qualitative studies include generalizability of findings, interpretation, and researcher influence.

Generalizability. The degree to which findings derived from one context or under one set of conditions may be assumed to apply in other settings or under other conditions is problematic in case study research. By nature, descriptive and interpretative studies provide an in-depth consideration of particular events and portray processes and relationships in a specific context (Gray & Guppy, 1999). This intensive study of two
particular school districts over the course of an extended period of time could provide insights that would be of potential value to individuals working in other school districts or different contexts.

**Interpretation.** Merriam (1988; 1998) states that qualitative case study research assumes that there are multiple realities—that the world is not an "objective thing" out there, but a function of personal interaction and perception. It is a highly subjective phenomena in need of interpreting rather than measuring beliefs. This research is exploratory and inductive. There are no predetermined hypotheses, no treatments, and no restrictions on the end product. One does not administer variables or administer treatment. Case study research is often defined and described from the perspective of the qualitative or naturalistic research paradigm which defines the methods and techniques most suitable for collecting and analyzing data.

**Researcher Influence.** This study is influenced also by the sensitivity and integrity of the research investigator. Reliance on the investigator as a primary instrument of data collection and analysis can produce worthwhile insights about a phenomena; conversely, it can produce a pedestrian, incorrect, or even fraudulent analysis. In selecting this type of research design, something is gained and something is sacrificed. One can only weigh the design's benefits against its limitations and select accordingly (Anderson, 1989; 1990; Gray et al., 1999).

Although the researcher can turn to guidelines and regulations for assistance in dealing with some of the ethical concerns likely to emerge in a case study, the burden of producing a study that has been conducted and disseminated in an ethical manner lies with the individual investigator. No regulation can tell a researcher when questioning of a respondent becomes coercive, when to intervene in abusive or illegal situations, or how to ensure that the study's findings will not be used to the detriment of those involved (Adler & Adler, 1994; Merriam, 1998). The best that an individual researcher can do is to be conscious of the ethical issues that pervade the research process, from conceptualizing the problem to disseminating the findings. Above all, the investigator must examine his or her own philosophical orientation vis-à-vis these issues. Self-knowledge can form the guidelines one needs to carry out an ethical investigation with concrete reliability and validity.
Delimitations

The study does not attempt to analyze relationships between school administrators and district office personnel except from the point of view of support, authority and access to resources as forms of professional development. While the study does not intend to provide a critical perspective or to test a hypothesis, it examines and describes the purposes, intentions and processes of developing and implementing leadership succession planning in two school districts from different points of view. It describes a phenomenon and adds to a body of knowledge about the role of school districts in preparing their administrators for their assigned roles and functions.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

This review draws on the literature addressing how school district leadership succession plans may improve the quality of school administrator performance at a time of high demands for accountability. It's important to set the stage for this review by providing some background on the extensive efforts to reform education on a global front. The chapter is structured in the following way: The review begins with a general overview of the current school reform efforts. This is followed by a review of the literature for three main constructs: (1) leadership succession planning, (2) recruitment and selection processes for school administrators; (3) and school administrator socialization processes. All three constructs are set within the social context of accountability. Consequently a review of the appropriate literature affiliated with accountability is also included. Finally, a conceptual framework is presented that draws the literature review together to illustrate the parameters according to which this study was conducted.

Current Status of Educational Reform
Being free and unfree at the same time is perhaps the most common of our experiences. It is arguably the most confusing (Bauman, 1990).

When an organization is not effective at what it does, a general assumption is that poor design may be the reason. Redesigning the organization involves identifying reasons that the existing design does not work well and reconfiguring it in some way to improve its functioning. Basically, as asserted by many researchers, the purpose of restructuring an organization is to improve its effectiveness (Bolanos, 1994; Colon, 1994; Clark & Lacey, 1997; Foster, 2001; Slavin, 2001).

In the early 1970s a piece of paper was issued as a proclamation to all school administrators from the Director General of Education in South Australia (New South Wales) when the progressive education movement was in full swing. It stated:
I have been asked to define more clearly what is meant by the freedom you and your staff have been exhorted to use in your schools. Let me say at the outset that you as Head of your school, by delegated authority from the Minister and the Director General, are in undisputed control of your school. Within the broad framework of the Education Act, the general curriculum advised by curriculum boards and approved by me, the Director General of Education, and the general policy set by your Division and communicated to you by circular, you have the widest liberty to vary courses, to alter the timetable, to decide on the organization of the school and the government within the school, to experiment with teaching methods, assessment of student achievement and in extra curricular activities (Jones, 1970).

The appeal in this Memorandum—to abandon as soon as possible the orthodox, fixed timetable and the strictly regulated movement of staff and students as the blueprint of the school day—has been echoed by most school reformers since.

In the 1970s, innovation received negative reviews (Sarason, 1971; Smith & Keith, 1971; Goodlad, 1973). People were adopting innovations without asking why, and giving no thought to follow through. Most of the 1970s were a decade of acknowledged failure in school reform. However, in the late 1970s local schools and school districts were paying more attention to developing the instructional leadership of administrators, using effective schools research and providing staff development.

In the 1980s educators were attempting more basic reform. A greater state role and site-based restructuring were on the horizon; hence, comprehensive reform was established. During the 1980s, public school reform increased dramatically. By the end of the decade, a shift had occurred from the external call for reform at the outset of the decade to efforts to restructure the system from the inside (Milstein, 1993).

Milstein (1993) defines restructuring as "systemic change or transformational with the intent of improving educational effectiveness in ways that meet the changing needs of our society" (p. 3). Milstein (1993) emphasizes that systemic change means that restructuring is comprehensive. All aspects, including mission, goals, structures, policies, administrative roles, participation, and relationships are candidates for change because they impact what is taught (current curricular content), how it is presented (instructional delivery), and where it occurs (the setting). The rush toward educational restructuring has its genesis in earlier efforts to improve the performance of the economy by changing the
way in which commercial and industrial organizations operate. Capturing the tone of that effort, the authors of the path-finding book *In Search of Excellence* note:

At a gut level all of us know that much more goes into the process of keeping a large organization vital and responsive than the policy statements, new strategies, plans, budgets, and organization charts can possibly depict. But all too often we behave as though we don’t know it. If we want change, we fiddle with the strategy. Or we change the structure. Perhaps the time has come to change our ways. (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 3).

Both the impetus for restructuring educational systems and the reform movement of the 1980s occurred against this societal backdrop. During the first half of the decade, various public and private reports (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Carnegie Forum, 1986) drew a stark picture of the public school’s performance in educating the nation’s youth. By the end of the decade, the image being portrayed was one of a failing educational system:

The rapidly changing global society and economy require a very different worker and citizen than the schools are now graduating. Indeed, the existing system is unable to prepare the graduate our country needs. The high percentage of dropouts, the large number of failing students hidden behind the mean scores on standardized tests, and the graduates who are not ready for work or additional learning constitute an embarrassing testimony. Many students leave school without even minimal skills (National LEADership Network, 1991, p. 7).

Broad scale public debate led to many state-level policy initiatives aimed at reforming school districts. By the mid-1980s, over 200 state-level task forces, blue ribbon commissions, and study groups, were at work around the country. The large scale reforms enacted in 15 to 20 states in the US in the first years of reform movement transformed education—not just in those states but in all states (Pipho, 1992, pp. 278-279). The responsibility of reform was put in the hands of the very same school districts that were criticized as not being equal to the task. With demands to “do something” remaining high, but with little agreement about goals or provisions of means to guide the effort, leaders of school districts across the country found that the ball was squarely back in their court. Efforts undertaken by school administrators to respond came to be called “restructuring” (Pipho, 1992; Fullan, 1994).
In the stacks of books, articles, and journals about educational change authors commonly wonder why attempts to change the way that schools function are so short-lived. Somehow or other, after a period of experimentation the system returns to stasis. The more things change the more they remain the same (Molinario, 1998; Whitty, 1998; Levin, 2001). Various plausible reasons are posited and examined to explain the stasis but they seldom include the rules and regulations among the contributory factors for school reform (Angus, 1998; Miller & Kantrov, 1998; Kearns, 2001).

The term "school reform" is a cliche. It commonly implies "improvement" so that the terms school reform and school improvement are usually taken to be synonymous. According to Angus (1998) this need not be the case. Angus (1998) asserts that "the benefits of a reform may be in the eye of the beholder, perceived rather than real." (p.1-2).

Reform also commonly implies change on a grand scale that occurs over months, perhaps years. It is thought to be a deliberate, planned intervention to improve some aspect of the operation of schools. Simkins, Ellison & Garrett (1992) define educational reform as "a substantial and systematic attempt to change the content, structure and/or power relations in an educational system by legislative means with a view to achieving educational achievement." (p.3).

Major reform attempts have two essential ingredients according to Simkins et al., (1992). First, there must be a strongly held view that something is wrong with education, and sufficiently wrong to make legislative program worthwhile. Second, there must be a degree of consensus among those who can legislate about possible solutions. This, in turn, will be based upon a set of values concerning what is desirable in education and how it might best be attained (Simkins et al., 1992; Simkins, 1997; Simkins, 2000).

Movements for educational reform on an international scale have characterized the 1980s, and the rate of change has not looked like it is abating in the 1990s. Governments of both left and right have been legislating, and are continuing to legislate, major programs of reform all over North America, both in Canada and United States and in New Zealand and Australia (Peters, 1992). Moreover, major changes have taken place in other parts of the world. According to Peters (1998) in England and Wales the reforms of the Conservative Government (1986, 1988, and 1992 Education Acts) and associated changes which have been introduced by administrative and other means have been
relentless. In the 1990s there was a realization that initiating multiple innovations had been the problem. The response to the need to carry out comprehensive reform has been to advocate "systemic" strategies (Seyfarth, 1999; Fullan, 1994). Assessment, curriculum and instruction, administrative and staff development, personnel recruitment, selection and promotion, and state/district/school action are to be systemically linked (Bartel, 1994; CAP, 1999; Seyfarth, 1999; Coffin & Leithwood, 2000).

In a review of School reform: Lessons learned from England (1996) by Kathryn Stearns, Laurence Peters (1998) from the U.S. department of Education discusses reflections from across the Atlantic. Some of the parallels to reforms occurring in the United States are seen in other English speaking countries, such as Australia, New Zealand as well as Canada. Peters states "What is most striking about the U.K. reforms is not so much the implementation of decentralized school management and market-based systems, but the dramatic disdain the reformers show for educational professionals” (p.260). Kathryn Stearns (1996) brings into focus how the postwar framework of British Schooling was dismantled in a way not replicated in any other advanced Western Nation. In 1988 Great Britain’s Parliament approved Margaret Thatcher’s plan to enact a series of “fundamental education reforms”. The core elements of the strategy included new national curriculum frameworks, national performance-based assessments at key learning stages, parental choice of government schools, and decentralization of budgets and staff function throughout the system. According to Peters (1998) after a good many fits and starts, the reforms were very much in place. The United Kingdom had successfully completed a major transformation of its schools.

The reform efforts of both the United States and United Kingdom are quite similar. Both began with the belief that their school systems had deteriorated to such an extent that the decline represented a major threat to continued economic competitiveness. It was the differing governance structures which led to different outcomes. The Thatcher government acted decisively whereas the American counterparts were forced to employ consensus building with all fifty state governors and Congress about what to do. Thatcher government felt they could ignore consultation with teachers and could impose reforms without regard to professional judgement. Consequently, the results of the first few years were nothing short of disastrous. In the words of Stewart McClure, editor of the
prestigious *Times Educational Supplement* (1996), he didn’t mince his words when he stated that he “could not think of any sustained period in the history of English education administration since the Second World War which was more disgracefully mismanaged”. Some people would consider the U.K. experience as representing “a road not taken”; others, however, might feel glad that the United States avoided some of Great Britain’s mistakes.

By contrast the United States governors had learned early in the 1980s that top-down reforms would not work (Tyack,1993). Tyack and Cuban (1995) in their recent book *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*, on the history of U.S. education reform suggests in a telling phrase that the governors learned the hard way that “excellence could not be coerced” (p. 80). The authors note that “as faith in top-down state mandates to raise academic achievement waned among policy elites, a new catchword became fashionable in education reform: education restructuring” (p. 80). It became an all-purpose term in the United States to describe a variety of reform ideas that had as their basis a desire to raise student achievement. The term was useful in that it brought advocates for teacher empowerment together with those who believed in uniform academic standards that linked all of these hard-to-reconcile approaches together, entitled “systemic reform,” allowed states a degree of flexibility and independence which was very different from the approach followed by the United Kingdom.

If there is a lesson to be learned from the British experience, it is, as Peters (1998) addresses, that of the old Chinese proverb: “Be careful to know what you wish for... the temptations of quick fixes, the substitution of political slogans for careful argument, and the dismissal of professional judgement can all lead to results very different from those intended” (p. 262).

Evidently, there have been some changes made in education since World War II. Schools are different in size and scope, in cost, in population they attempt to serve, in the range and number of objectives they set, and in the role and impact of federal, state/provincial, and local governments. These changes however, have emphasized quantity, not quality. The fundamental philosophy, processes, procedures, methods, materials, and technology of education are rooted in the past. According to the Rand Corporation, “Reforms that deal with the fundamental stuff of education—teaching and
leaning—seem to have weak, transitory, and ephemeral effects; while those that expand, solidify, and entrench school bureaucracy seem to have strong, enduring, and concrete effects” (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988, p. v).

Looking backward may not be of much assistance, other than to highlight what not to do in the future. Old assumptions for educational reform have governed strategies for over fifty years with disappointing results. It is time to plan the future from more promising basic beliefs. Demands have been made that education be changed, revitalized, restructured, retooled, and reformed. But fundamental structural change in schools has not happened, in spite of the national school reform studies and reports of the early and mid-1980s. It seems that attempts at change have not worked because they are layered on old structures and do not alter perception, thinking, or behavior. According to Goens & Clover (1991), “to achieve successful schools, organizations, people, and leadership must be transformed. Reaching success cannot be accomplished in structures that prohibit it, by people who do not perceive the need or value it, or by leaders who do not behave transformationally” (p. 57).

According to Fullan (1994) “the next phase—essentially the beginning of the next century—will either build on or ignore the key lessons of the past half century of experience with educational innovation and reform.” As we have discovered, and keep re-discovering, like Dorothy in The Wizard of Oz suddenly realizes “this isn’t Kansas anymore.” (Fullan, 1995)

Charlie Brown, the Peanuts character, stated, “No problem is so big and complicated that it can’t be run away from.” For school administrators, today’s problems cause frustration and the feeling that they are too convoluted to resolve. But schools and school districts cannot run from them: they must respond and adapt if they are to be successful and accountable. One of the ways in which school districts are responding to the demands of accountability is through the development and implementation of leadership succession planning.
Leadership Succession Planning

"A leader is a dealer in hope". Napoleon (Vance & Deacon, 1996, p.181)

The changes and complexities in education dominate the work of school leaders today and shape the dynamics and outcomes of leadership succession and district support (Pieter, 1994; Jacobson, 1996; Johnson & Licata, 1996; Gray, 1999; Harris, Hopkins, Clarke, Wikeley, Nicolaididou & Ainscow, 2001). The attention by educational scholars and policymakers to succession reflects their interests in the quality of a school's formal leadership and its educational effectiveness (Gordon & Rosen, 1981; Duke, Isaacson, Sager & Schmuck, 1984; Crow, 1987; Fauske & Ogawa, 1987; Bricey, 1989; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; King & Blumer, 2000; Sernak, 2000).

Since this study is focused on formal administration, one could argue that there is no need to address the meaning of leadership. However, for clarification of the term "leadership" I felt it was necessary to address its definition. In addition, as the study is literature driven, leadership development becomes a component of succession planning.

Defining "Leadership"

"Leaders are individuals who establish direction for a group of individuals who gain commitment from this group of members to this direction and who then motivate these members to achieve the direction's outcome." (Conger, 1992 p. 18)

There is an extensive body of literature available with references to "leadership" and what it means as a concept (Lieberman, 1988; Gilbert, 1991; Seyfarth, 1999; Senge, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1995; Sullivan, 1995; Fullan, 1997; McCowan, Eakin & Dusenberg, 1997; Freeston & Costs, 1998; Gil, 1998; Leithwood, 1999; Barber, 2000; Black, 2000; Goldsmith, Lyons & Freas, 2000; Day, 2000; Kennedy, 2000). Its meaning is contested and can sometimes vary across contexts or even within similar contexts over time (Monsour, 2000; Schuttllofle, 2000; Sebring & Bryk, 2000; Sernak, 2000; Thompson, 2001). Understanding the nature and processes of leadership is most likely to be enhanced as we come to understand better the arena in which leadership necessarily occurs—namely, the human mind. Gardner et al., (1995) defines leadership as "a process that occurs within the minds of individuals who live in a culture—a process that entails
the capacities to create stories, to understand and evaluate these stories, and to appreciate the struggle among stories" (p. 22). Throughout this section on leadership there will be a use of several quotes from and about “leaders” as well as “leadership qualities” that represent various leadership disciplines, all associated with education to various degrees, either directly or indirectly.


Gilbert (1991) refers to Winston Churchill as one of the great leaders of the 20th century with the following excerpt: “...it was May 13, 1940, and England was losing the war. The nation upon which the “sun never sets” was very dark indeed as the members of the House of Commons met with their Prime Minister, Winston Churchill. A few hours earlier, Churchill had told his Ministers that he had nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat” (p. 646). Now he repeated these words and declared:

You ask what is our policy? I will say: It is to wage war, by sea, land and air, with all our might and with all our strength that God give us: to wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime. This is our policy.

You ask what is our aim? I can answer in one word, victory, victory at all costs, victory in spite of terror, victory, however long and hard the road might be; without victory there is no survival. Let that be realized; no survival for the British Empire, no survival for all that British Empire has stood for, no survival for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goals.

But I take up my task with buoyance and hope. I feel that our cause will not be suffered to fail among men. At this time I feel entitled to claim the aid of all, and I say, “Come then, let us go forward together with all our united strength.” (Gilbert, 1991. p. 646).

Gilbert continues “…though considered to be a great leader, Churchill could not of course, evoke the immediate end to the war or even the beginning of the end. He was, however, able to inspire the English people to persevere until the war did end. He, like most great leaders, had the ability to communicate in such a powerful way that his listeners found themselves grasping his ideas and holding them as their own (Gilbert,
Other leaders, from Elizabeth I to Robert F. Kennedy, were also able to convey their passion in order to motivate others. They had the quality Warren Bennis (1985) calls "the ability of the leader to reach the souls of others in a fashion which raises human consciousness, building meanings, and inspires human intent that is the source of power" (Cited in Evans, 1995, p. 145). Books on leadership in education and beyond all seem to begin with a discussion of the critical role vision plays in the achievement of goals. It is we are told the compass that keeps us on the right path, the glue which holds our team together, and the yardstick we use to assess our successes (Bennis & Nanus, 1997).

According to an article Passing of a Prime Minister: Lessons for School Leadership in a recent publication of Canadian Principal (2000, Vol. 12), most of the discussions on leaders' visions don't spend a great deal of time exploring the qualitative differences among visions which leaders might advocate. That quality of a vision, Pierre Elliot Trudeau's life reminds us, is a significant factor in its effect upon people. Trudeau was a leader with grand visions, the likes of which can unite us and inspire us to believe that there is something beyond ourselves to which it is worthy to commit our energies:

"A country," he wrote in his Memoirs, "is something that is built every day out of certain basic values. And so it is in the hands of every Canadian to determine how well and wisely we shall build the country of the future" (Canadian Principal, 2000, Vol. 12, p.1)

That passing of the symbolic torch was echoed by his son Justin who, in his moving eulogy to his father, reminded Canadians, "It's up to us, all of us, now." In the aftermath of the passionate fervor loosed by his death, that powerful event could teach a great deal about leadership.

Schiffbauer (1999) asserts that a "successful leader will have a firm belief in his/her own vision and be able to express it movingly regardless of the listener's previous beliefs" (p. 2). Deal & Peterson (1998, p. 30) state, "In crafting school culture, school leaders are models, potters, poets, actors and healers. They are visionaries and dreamers". Dr. Martin Luther King embodied that ability in his, "I Have a Dream" speech when he proclaimed:

I have a dream that Mississippi, sweltering with the heat of injustice and oppression transformed into an oasis of freedom and peace. I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be
judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. (Washington, 1992, p. 104)

As the first leader of a democratic South Africa, Nelson Mandella, considered to be one of the greatest leader figures of the 20th century faces the challenge of leading his people into the 21st century. He serves as a snapshot for peace, unity and change for the people of South Africa—and the world. He states in his Memoirs that:

A leader is like a shepherd. He stays behind the flock, letting the most nimble go out ahead, whereupon the others follow, not realizing that all along they are being directed from behind.” (Nelson Mandella’s Memoirs, Long Walk to Freedom, 1995, chapter 3)

Capper (1993) argues for the multi-paradigmatic framework from which to approach educational leadership for today’s schools. She asserts that “educational leaders must be engaged in ongoing learning in the study of the social context of schooling as it relates to persons along the axis of oppression” (p. 57). Paulo Freire (1970), Brazilian educator, has been described as a leader by several generations of educators, social and political scientists and professionals in the area of exact, natural and biological sciences. Educational leadership has been influenced by Dr. Freire who helped to create a pedagogy founded on freedom. What he wrote about in his book, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, has been part of the lives of a whole generation who learned to dream of a world of equality and justice, who struggled and are still struggling for it.

Catherine the Great stated, “One must govern in such a way that one’s people think they themselves want to do what one commands them to do” (Greene, 1998, p. 27). Gardner & Laskin (1995) refer to Margaret Mead and Eleanor Roosevelt as great women leaders of the 20th century because they “affected the thoughts, behaviors, and feelings of a significant number of individuals. They epitomized individuals who begin by occupying a central role within their discipline but then move on to leadership in wider communities” (p. 84). Each of these women had leadership capacities in different disciplines—Mead, an anthropologist who studied child raising in the South Pacific, and Roosevelt , a president’s wife who once stated “Women who are going to be leaders must be willing to stand out and be shot at. More and more they are going to do it and more and more they should do it.” (Gardner et al., 1995, p. 202)
Yukl (1989; 1994) reiterates the many definitions of leadership asserted by various researchers. As cited in Yukl (1989), Hemphill & Coons (1957) stated that leadership is "the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (p. 7). Cited in Yukl (1989) Rauch & Behling (1984) asserted that leadership is "the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement" (p. 46). Jacobs (1970) as cited in Yukl (1989) stated that leadership is "an interaction between persons in which one presents information of a sort and in such a manner that the other becomes convinced that his outcomes will be improved if he behaves in the manner suggested or desired" (p. 232).

Stoll & Fink (1996) discuss educational leadership and leadership styles but do not define them. Darling-Hammond (1995) sees leadership as "the quality that enables people to make happen those things they believe in" (p. 47). This is reiterated by John F. Kennedy, considered to be a great leader, in how he had planned on addressing the American public in Dallas on November 23, 1963 but did not get the opportunity to do so:

We in this country, in this generation, are by destiny rather than by choice—the watchman of the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility, that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint, and that we may achieve in our time and for all time that ancient vision of "peace on earth, goodwill to men." (Kennedy, 1963)

Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach (1999) define leadership in terms of influence, direction and guidance. They claim that "variation in leadership concepts, types, or models can be accounted for by differences in who exerts influence, and its outcomes" (p. 5). Stodgill (1981) claims that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept." (p. 259) Begley (2000; 2001) states that there is a lack of consensus among academics and practitioners on what constitutes the ideal "school leadership". He identifies "five key dimensions of school leadership that include the principal as manager, program leader and learning facilitator, school-community facilitator, visionary and problem-solver." (2000; 2001)

The context and nature of leadership may vary as Leithwood et al., (1999) claim "what may be different is how the influence is exercised and to what end." (p. 151) With a belief that leadership is the intentional influence and guidance setting by one source of
action on another it becomes important to discuss approaches to leadership as it applies to school administrators.

Schlechty (1990) argues that the "school administrator should view himself/herself as a leader of leaders, creators of conditions in which other leaders thrive, and developers of leaders" (p. 43). Stoll et al., (1996) introduce three types of leadership: instructional, transactional and invitational with emphasis on the invitational leader whose "actions are intentionally supportive, caring and encouraging" (p. 109). Bennis et al., (1997) state, "effective leadership takes risks—it innovates, challenges, and changes the basic metabolism of the organizational culture" (p. 49).

Johnson (1996) identifies four approaches to leadership: transactional, transformational, cultural, and critical leadership. He emphasizes transactional leadership as "grounded in social exchange to reduce resistance to particular actions to implement decisions" (p. 217). Transformational leadership is "moving beyond the exchange relationship" (p. 220) to a "relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents" (p. 220). Critical leadership is important as "school based administrators are being encouraged to question current practice and driven by an interest to improve social conditions" (p.230).

Leithwood et al., (1999) identify six broad approaches to leadership from a major review of studies and research on leadership. These are instructional, transformational, moral, participative, managerial, and contingent (p. 24-25) (See Appendix C).

Research that has been done on leadership and learning within schools and organizations has resulted in significant changes in the way people work with one another in schools (Hoy & Miskel, 1991; Johnson, 1996; Leithwood et al., 1999; Tanner & al., 1998; Peterson, 1999). One of the most important developments has been the move from a hierarchical model of leadership to one that reflects a sharing relationship. The "laissez-faire" style of leadership (Hoy et al., 1991) cannot suffice the current demands for accountability, because leaders are now required to look beyond individual needs and individual self-direction. Organizational goals and collective vision, both requiring the manipulation of culture, are now common expectations. The bureaucratic leader (Hoy et al., 1991) who responds to formal demands by matching members with roles and tasks
and thus emphasizing control and conformity can be out of touch with collaboration and collegiality.

According to Sergiovanni (1990) "collegiality has to do with the extent to which teachers and principals share common work values, engage in specific conversation about their work, and help each other engage in the work of the school." (p. 23) Fullan (1998, p. 9-10) asserts that a "leader instills the certainty that his/her vision makes sense, regardless of how it turns out. It is hope, above all, that gives us strength to live and continually try new things, even if conditions seem hopeless." The remarkable capacity to inspire others, even when one is dispirited oneself, marks the leader as a true leader. Lincoln, during his Presidency, spoke of feeling such hopelessness that "it appears to me that even the Almighty is against us. I can hardly see a ray of hope." (Carnegie, 1932, p. 165) By modeling the adherence to the visions of great leaders, against all odds, leaders impel others to that same dedication.

The research report on "In-School Leadership for Saskatchewan Schools," (Renihan, 1999) contains a brief review on leadership effectiveness. It reviews articles through the 1990s beginning with a brief look at Barth's (1990) work that describes the responsibility of the principal as developing a community of learners by: articulating the vision of the school; sharing authority with teachers; involving professionals in decisions; clarifying responsibilities; sharing responsibility for failures; giving teachers credit for success (p. 10). The role of the administrator even in this shared and collaborative structure is not lessened since the administrator remains the singular individual at the "nexus" of leadership in the school (p. 10). As Lashway (1997) emphasizes, above all else, administrators, as school leaders, must create a climate and culture of change. They do this by speaking about the vision often and enthusiastically, by encouraging experiments, by celebrating successes and forgiving failures, and by remaining steadfast in the face of the inevitable problems and missteps.

In summary, there are common themes that arise throughout the literature concerning the definition of leadership. Based on various researchers and scholars these themes include influencing, setting direction and guidance by creating a vision, empowering others, planning creative action, developing effective communication, risk-taking, and having knowledge of teaching and learning. These traits of effective leaders
have a unifying effect on a group of people around a set of clear values and beliefs to accomplish a clear set of goals. This type of leadership, as it applies to school administrators, inspires higher commitment and capacity building among organizational members that lead to personal development and organizational productivity of all involved.

What is Succession Planning?

Leadership succession is an organizational event of tremendous importance to those who work in schools. It is the "process of transition occurring between a new leader's appointment and the end of his or her first year as a new leader" (MacMillan, 1996, p. 7). However, a standard period crucial for the acceptance of the administrator by the staff does not appear to exist and its length varies from context to context (Weindling & Early, 1987; 1995; Hall & Mani, 1989; 1992; MacMillan, 1996). Succession planning is a management process which is organized to ensure that leadership positions are appropriately filled when they become vacant (Johnson, 1999; 2001). It is conceptualized as an interactive process through which one is integrated into membership in the organization (Hart, 1985a; 1985b; 1987; 1988; 1992; 1993). It can be very disruptive, and its results can be ineffective and dysfunctional if the new principal does not become an integrated and respected member of the social system whose leadership has received the affirmation of the school as a whole. As Gordon & Rosen (1981) indicate:

The leader's effectiveness or lack thereof will be more visible during such a period, and the tactics that make a difference are more likely to be observable than in quieter times. It is during such periods that old allocation of resource battles are fought over again, divisions that were suppressed come to the fore, performance standards are re-evaluated, role and responsibilities are redefined and new goals are set. (1981, 27, p. 229)

In contrast, when a successor achieves this goal, his/her ability to have a positive impact on the school and its performance is substantially enhanced (Hart, 1993; Robinson, 2000). As this process develops and unfolds in school settings, an administrator undergoes a group membership "boundary passage" resulting in varying degrees of acceptance and legitimacy by the school's staff and/or faculty and others. According to Hart (1993) the manner in which this transition is negotiated has many ramifications for
the successor as well as for teachers and others. Hart (1993) asserts that succession may be among the most important professional transitions school administrators ever make. It affects many people in a school, stimulating interactions and breaking up routines that require people to reestablish shared expectations, work patterns, and relationships. While school administrators and those who work with them find the experiences that come with a succession event salient and disruptive (whether positive or negative), inquiry related to succession and to the interaction of individuals with important groups to which they belong remains diffuse (Hart, 1993).

As a result, it becomes critical to search for strategies that will better prepare and sustain administrators for this job in the future. To help alleviate problems in leadership succession it would seem appropriate that school districts consider different strategies when embarking on the planning of school administrator succession.

Administrator succession planning is no longer simply a matter of finding the right person for the principal’s job. It is a dynamic, on-going process of systematically identifying, assessing, and developing leadership talent for future strategic tasks (Hart, 1993). This is applicable to any organization. Strategic goals can only be achieved if an effective program for leadership succession is in place. Succession planning becomes essential to ensure that leadership growth keeps pace with the growth of the organization as well as meet the changing expectations of the leadership roles (Hennecke, 1984; Mintzberg, 1994; Pieter, 1994; Legore, 1995; HCG, 1998; Hochberg, 1999).

Changing Expectations

Schools are resilient institutions that change slowly, even under considerable pressure, but the current unprecedented level of dissatisfaction with the schools and the public’s insistence that schools do a better job of preparing students suggest that change is inevitable (Tyack, 1993; Roher & Wormwell, 2000). School administrators are feeling the effects of the public’s changing expectations in the push to adopt new and expanded administrative roles, including those of accountable instructional leaders, constructive political leaders, and responsible managers. Administrators are in a vital position to influence the direction of change and must respond to the public’s demands without
losing sight of the need to protect the children's interests (Roher et al., 2000; Gutherie & al., 2001).

In the past, organizations have focused succession planning efforts on the preparation of high leadership potential individuals. However, expectations are changing for the role of administrators. Today, school organizations are learning that the focus must be not only on these high potential individuals, but also on the context of these individuals to the leadership team. Effective succession planning examines how each succession candidate would add value to team performance. According to the Hagberg Consulting Group (1998), succession planning and clear expectations help school districts by: engaging senior management in a disciplined review of leadership talent; guiding development activities of administrative teams; bringing selection systems, rewards systems and leadership development into alignment with the process of leadership renewal; assuring continuity of leadership; avoiding transition problems and; preventing premature promotion of principals through professional development.

**Professional Development of School Administrators**

Part of the impetus for change and accountability in professional development practices comes from recognition that schools generally are not conducive to adult growth and learning. To transform schools into places in which educators can learn, it will be necessary first to identify conditions that promote or constrain educator learning (IPSA, 1989; Hord, Jolley & Mendez-Morse. 1992; IEC, 2000; CCSSO. 2001). Socialization experiences and development of competence through training and interaction with colleagues are among the ways that employees learn and grow. Organizations can support the development of competence by providing training, collegial exchange, and feedback.

Professional development is more likely to enhance the growth and integrity of administrators if it is planned with the dynamics of the administrative career and the stages of adult development in mind. Knowledge of career patterns of teachers and the dynamics of administration help central office personnel plan development activities and advise individual teachers and administrators regarding choices of growth options. Staff development activities that are appropriate and useful for teachers at one stage of their
careers may not be as suitable for those who have already passed through that stage or who have yet to enter it (Van Berkum, Richardson, & Lane, 1994; Seyfarth, 1999). However, it is not advisable to limit the focus of staff development activities to an individual’s current or proximate stage of development. Taking a longer range view has the advantage of introducing teachers to developmental experiences early in their careers that prepare them for more advanced career stages (Leithwood, Begley & Cousins, 1993).

**Career Patterns and Induction Programs for Administrators**

Career development patterns are usually thought of in two stages—exploration and stabilization. The exploration stage involves making a provisional choice of occupation and trying out one or more occupational roles. This is followed by a stabilization stage during which the practitioner defines an area of focus, attempts to master essential aspects of the job, and searches for a situation with a satisfactory mix of opportunities, responsibilities, and rewards (Huberman, 1990). According to Daresh (1988b) and Daresh et al. (1988; 1992), there are three dimensions needed to be included in any effective approach to preparing and supporting school administrators throughout their career in their roles and functions as administrators: academic preparation, field-based learning, and personal and professional formation. These dimensions are part of the professional development needed by administrators.

*Pre-service preparation* consists of those learning activities and other processes that take place prior to initial job placement. Recruitment, selection, training, licensure, and placement into a first job are all components of the pre-service preparation program phase.

*Field-based learning* or induction may be defined as the period in a person’s career when he or she is in a new position in an organization, under a new role definition. The process of induction is something that is not necessarily concluded after one year in a new job. Induction may take several years to complete, depending on the conditions in the organization, the nature of the role, and the characteristics of the individual (Daresh, 1988a; Daresh et al., 1992; Rogers & Druring, 1988; Sparks, 2000).

In-service education consists of learning opportunities that are provided to individuals while they are actually engaged in the job. These opportunities may be
directed specifically at helping an administrator to perform the duties of his or her job more efficiently or effectively, or it may be directed toward the personal growth and development of the administrator performing his or her job, regardless of the expectations of the job.

According to the National Policy Board on Administrative Preparation (1989) when aspiring administrators enter the field of educational administration they presumably have little basic information concerning the nature of school management. The majority of one's learning in the earliest phases of pre-service preparation might involve heavy emphasis, if not exclusive reliance, on academic preparation. As people progress through the various stages of their careers, learning will occur more frequently from an experiential base otherwise known as "learning by doing". While academic preparation decreases throughout a career and field-based learning increases, there is never a point where either of these dimensions disappear altogether.

The dimension that remains constant throughout an administrator's career is personal and professional formation. Daresh et al., (1992) define this formation as "the effort to enable an individual to become more aware of his or her own personal values and assumptions regarding the formal role of a school administrator." (p.54) The need to engage in reflection, to think about one's ethical stances and one's commitment to the profession, is constant, although the issues may differ. Mentoring, for example, might be seen as a consistent activity from pre-service to in-service.

The components of formation include: mentoring, personal reflection, educational platform development, appreciation of alternative styles, and personal professional action planning. By using these component elements of formation as part of a comprehensive professional development program for aspiring and practicing school administrators may lead to more effective leadership in schools (Daresh,1988; Miklos,1996). The three phases are distinct in an administrator's career. Yet they need to be understood in concert. They are interactive in nature, and an appreciation of pre-service leads to discussions of induction concerns, which in turn are related to in-service education. They are not to be considered to be separate and isolated events in a person's career (Daresh, 1988b; Daresh et al., 1992; Miklos, 1988).
The process of effective professional development for school leaders is something that demands serious planning and attention. It does not simply "happen" without any thought on the part of those responsible for directing such an effort—the district office (Milstein, 1993; McMahan, 2000; Reitzug & Hudson, 2000).

**District Planning**

The scene of the action for professional development is shifting from university campuses to district offices (Smith & Piele, 1989). Now personnel in the school districts are playing an increasingly important role in planning and implementing professional development for teachers and administrators. School districts need to provide special programs designed to support the work of beginning school administrators (Daresh et al., 1992; 1994; 1997). This should be done in the planning stage. The novice school leaders will be served well when efforts are made to help them through their first professional duties. The use of mentor-protégé programs is a positive program used in districts for novice administrators (Daresh et al., 1990; 1992; 1994).

Time must be provided as part of the training exercise to address the issue of "who, when, what, and how" things get done in particular districts (Daresh et al., 1992). Mentors need to receive general orientations to the goals of their districts, important policies, and procedures that are particularly important in each district. In this way, proteges will learn about committees, personnel, and the general structure of the organization in which they will work. But there are limitations to formal induction programs. For example, entry-year programs can never serve to repair total incompetence (Daresh et al., 1992). School districts need to be careful about finding and selecting only the most talented individuals for administrative roles. No induction programs can be designed to correct bad choices. In the planning for succession, professional development entry-year programs should be part of the comprehensive professional development efforts. Induction programs for beginning educators will likely fail to reach their full positive potential if they are developed solely as a way to comply with minimal performance expectations. Entry-year efforts will be successful only if they are viewed as a foundation on which school districts set out to build total professional development.
programs that are designed to meet the needs of not only beginning administrators but of all district administrators.

School Districts Invest in Training

It has been stated that the most crucial ingredient in preparing capable school leaders is individual school districts (Smith & Piele, 1989). Without the emotional and financial support of the central office the prospects for "growing" a healthy crop of new principals who can effectively lead schools during the upcoming decades is highly unlikely. Exemplary training programs will certainly cost money. According to Baltzell & Dentler (1992), the extent to which the school system invests in the preparation of principals is an index to other aspects of system quality. They assert that many school districts are not willing to make such an investment and, consequently, do not have a qualified pool of candidates from which to choose when an opening occurs.

According to Daresh et al., (1994; 1997) and Darling-Hammond (1995) some of the activities that have been used by some American school districts for leadership development include Administrative Training Programs where potential principals apply for and take a ten-week after-work course on leadership. Graduates then opt for a second eighteen-week, three credit course in administrative leadership, which includes skill development. Candidates are then invited to Administrative Competence Seminars where their interpersonal skills, communication and conceptual skills, and group leadership skills are formally assessed by a panel of senior administrators. Top ranked individuals are then placed in internships as full-time assistant principals for one full year under the guidance of successful administrators where they obtain experience in areas such as instructional leadership, staff development, and pupil personnel management, community involvement, and professional growth (Darling-Hammond, 1995).

It is hoped that more school districts will begin to realize that the training of capable leaders must begin long before they are needed. Effective training programs are of course only the first step in hiring capable principals. Recruitment, selection, and induction are other essential components in a comprehensive system that trains, obtains, and retains the most capable school leaders (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Daresh et al., 1997).
During leadership succession, when the relationships and patterns that shape a principal's impact on the school are formed, the organization and the new principal exert influence on each other. A successor who possesses knowledge about social influencing processes and skill in applying that knowledge can have a substantial impact on the outcomes of his/her own succession experience. District leaders can use the same body of knowledge to plan succession processes and design support activities for principals that make the results they desire more likely to occur. They can use knowledge about the interactions between a new member and the organization to modify principal evaluation processes and refocus principal's attention (Block, 1993; Clark, 1991; Coleman & Laroque, 1990; Walker, 1999; 2000).

Whatever our idealized view of leaders and despite calls for principals who shape the fundamental culture, structure, and goals of schools, research and practice support a more complex, interactive view of principal succession. Researchers and practitioners need to understand the succession process and manage its outcomes. Principals, their superiors, and school policy makers can use an organizational socialization perspective on principal succession to enhance the practice of school administration and the professional development of teachers.

School district leaders can assess their current practices and design flexible processes that support principals undergoing succession and lead to outcomes that advance district policies and goals. They can re-examine their use of mentors and match the design of their mentor programs to the outcomes appropriate to each school, provide systematic support and time for visits, diagnosis, and planning activities by principals that facilitate their transition to a new school, and consciously work to improve the outcomes of a succession beyond the careful search for and appointment of the best principal for a school. This includes training and support specifically designed to assist principals who are taking charge in a new assignment, recognizing that they face challenges common to major transitions, acknowledging that a unique mix between the principal and the school will give rise to the outcomes of the succession, and preparing the principals for the impact the school will have on them as well as the impact they hope to have on the school (Corbett & Wilson, 1992; Corbett, Wilson, & Webb-Dempsey, 1996).
According to various researchers (Pajak, 1989; Crowson & Morris, 1992; Dimmock & Wildy, 1992; Hallinger & Edwards, 1992; Fullan, 1993; Weiss, & Cambone, 1994; Angus, 1998; Elmin, 2000) district office personnel can also capitalize on the expectations for change that succession brings to implement new programs and work toward the improvement of schools. They can seize the opportunity that this major role transition presents to shape and expand the professional orientation, knowledge, and skills, both moral and technical, of the administrators who lead their schools. Among the technical orientation is the need to capture and understand the collective bargaining process.

**Contractual Considerations**

Another factor playing a vital role in administrator succession involves the consideration of collective bargaining. Since contractual issues are explored in the literature it is useful to include it as a component of administration preparation. Certainly no personnel issue in recent memory has had such a dramatic effect on school administrators as the collective bargaining movement in education. In the early years of collective bargaining, principals experienced a great deal of anguish and role conflict. *Canadian Principal* (1998) states that school administrators in Ontario, as in other Canadian provinces, were traditionally members of teachers’ groups and many considered themselves still to be the “principal teacher” of the building.

According to *Canadian Principal* (1998) recently, in 1997, the courts determined that administrators would be excluded from membership in teachers’ unions in Ontario—a membership they have had since the inception of those federations since 1944. This resulted in twice the anticipated number of teachers choosing to retire at the end of that year. Naturally enough, this exodus included principals and vice-principals, creating a larger-than-expected number of openings in these positions. No longer would they be covered by collective agreements which give them access to seniority rights, recall and redundancy provisions, the right to bargain collectively, nor access to due process of grievance and arbitration. In past years, such an increase in leadership opportunities would have resulted in a similar increase in interest. As a result of the removal of the administrators from the various federations the uncertainty surrounding the conditions of
employment of school administrators in the future, particularly those arising from
questions about the nature of contracts, tenure and due process, was an early deterrent.
Many vice-principals or teachers in line for vice-principalships, noting the future, at that
time, was ambiguous, chose to remain teachers in the union, at least until the vagaries
were removed.

Over the years, Ontario's larger boards have maintained pools of candidates for
future principal and vice-principal openings. In many of those boards, the pools have
been depleted as those people have been promoted into the unanticipated number of
vacancies, and as boards have had no time to find and prepare new candidates.

However, there are provinces where school administrators are still members of the
teachers' unions (Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and
Saskatchewan). Still, Ontario administrators have joined their colleagues in Quebec,
Alberta and British Columbia as Canadian in-school administrators who are no longer
members of teacher associations.

In addition, as school administrators are asked to serve on a board's bargaining
team, they become concerned about the adversarial role in which their circumstances
placed them. How for instance, can they oppose teachers at the bargaining table at night
and be expected to constructively work with them the next day? Or how, within the
school, can they be effective change agents if the staff view them as adversaries?
Complicating these frustrations is the increased use of strikes, shutdowns and "work to
rule" by teachers' unions to solve complex bargaining issues. Should a school
administrator cross a picket line? If so, will that action hinder future cooperative efforts
directed at program improvement?

With increased experience at the table, the bargaining process has become much
more sophisticated, and the administrator's role has become more clearly defined. From
time to time, administrators are asked to participate as management representatives at the
bargaining table. However, their most important role is in the area of contract
administration (Wilmore, McNeil, & Townzen, 1998). An administrator has complete
responsibility for administering contracts at the building level. He/she will have input
into final contract settlements but oftentimes the input will not become part of the final
settlement because of other considerations (Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985).
According to Lipham et al., (1985), the impact of collective bargaining, particularly on contract management and handling grievances, have shown to clarify the leadership position of an administrator in working effectively with a staff. The administrator’s role, responsibilities, and leadership style all are affected by the collective bargaining process. The collective/master agreement has strengthened the role as a middle manager but may place the administrator in an adversarial relationship with the employee groups in the building. Rather than bemoan this circumstance, creative principals will use it to strengthen their educational leadership position.

Uncertainty in Principal Succession

An administrator’s succession affects all who work in and with a school. It creates a period of apprehension and fear of the unknown with high expectations being held by the principals, teachers, and district superiors alike (Weindling, 1992; Schmitt & Schectman, 1990). In addition to the traditional concern over the appointment of principals new to the profession which has been happening at a high rate (Greenfield, 1985a; Firestone, 1990) research indicates that school leaders are often transferred from one assignment to another. It is apparent that on a global front the turnover rates stand high due to a result of the complexities and changes in the role of the principal. A great number of principals have expressed the desire to retire (possibly at age fifty-five) or leave the profession (Robinson, 2000).

Administrators are given the specific charge to lead, to exert formal authority over the school. Voluntary action by teachers and others directed toward the important goals new leaders hope to pursue, however, depends on new leaders’ abilities to secure the validation, support, and affirmation of the group as a whole whether it is a new school or a current school. This affirmation emerges from group processes that are complex, interactive, and diffuse. At the same time, principals must adhere to district norms and policies, pursuing goals and objectives set out by their superiors. Because of this complexity, those who undergo a principal succession find the experience important but difficult to analyze and even more difficult to influence (Hart, 1993). Conflicting advice abounds: bide your time; seize the day; don’t make waves; capitalize on your window of opportunity; be creative; and follow the Superintendent’s lead.
Major reforms designed to utilize knowledge about formal leaders' effects on schools to improve the preparation, induction, and professional development of school principals have coincided with the development of succession and effective schools research (Leithwood et al., 1992; Murphy, 1990). The dynamics and critical features of an effective principal/school relationship remain somewhat short term. The demands of practice often pressure new school leaders to abandon skills and knowledge acquired in pre-service education and conform to existing patterns of practice.

Administrators undertaking their first professional assignments must find ways to connect and integrate their professional knowledge and experience. Administrators moving to new assignments must carefully assess which attitudes and behaviors to take with them and what dynamics and unique challenges face them at the new school. For principals new to administration or new to a particular school, critical relationships and interaction patterns among themselves, their superiors, and the school social system are beginning at the time of their appointment (Hart, 1992; 1993). They form during the uncertainty preceding succession, throughout selection, and into the succession, when the new administrator is deeply embroiled in a complex social process and when time to reflect on their experiences may be difficult to find.

As a school administrator seeks to become a functioning leader and understand his/her relationships with others in the group, he/she is ultimately concerned with seeing his/her own fit. For those who appoint new leaders, uncertainty remains long after critical succession events occur (Ogawa, 1991; 1994). Succession becomes an integral part of the socialization processes of school administrators.

**Principal Succession and Socialization**

A major component of any succession process involves socialization whereby attention is drawn to the leader and the context simultaneously. It is important to briefly identify how succession and socialization are interconnected. However, a more detailed explanation of socialization is discussed later in the literature review.

The new administrator experiences the mechanisms by which he/she is shaped by the social forces around him and through which his/her self-awareness emerges. Socialization involves the learning of social roles (Merton, 1963; Becher & Carper, 1968).
It involves individual adjustments and adaptations to the expectations of a group. These adjustments make cooperative effort possible and represent an orientation toward the common needs of the group. Through this process principals come to internalize the values, norms, and beliefs of the groups to which they belong and to accept the meanings these groups ascribe to events, other people and ideas. In the process, administrators come to behave in ways consonant with the expectations of the school but not enslaved by it. Referring to school administrators, Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1993, p. 10) state, "The ideal socialization process positions one at the point of sharpest focus: not so close as to render the corporate image a fuzzy blur; nor so far away as to make the detailed features of the image unrecognizable."

The socialization of the administrators to the profession or occupation of school administration begins in training or preparation programs (Sussman, 1986; Warren, 1989; Hart, 1993; Whatley, 1994). As administrators secure administrative jobs and interact with other administrators they internalize the norms, values and behaviors generally accepted as part of their professional role. This is referred to as professional socialization (Bredeson, 1991; Bridges, 1992). When administrators enter a district and/or school as new members of the social group, they experience another form of socialization—organizational socialization (Schein, 1992). It teaches a person the knowledge, values, and behaviors required in a particular role within a particular organization. These values and norms may be very different from those learned as part of his professional socialization. Much of these processes depend on the participants who play huge roles in the succession assessment of the administrator.

**Succession Participants**

Hart (1993) asserts that the most important group of people that affect an assessment of an administrator's succession is the teachers. However, other administrators (predecessor and successor), clerical and custodial staff also play a role.

Generally the succession of the administrator unfolds for a faculty/staff in several stages (Hart, 1993; Ogawa, 1991). First, upon finding that a principal is leaving the teachers begin anticipating opening up the school in the fall with a new principal. They express anticipation about possible positive changes and fears that a new administrator
might infringe upon their independence. Second, based upon fears and expectations with which the staff approaches the arrival of the new principal, the staff generally finds that the successor more than fulfills their hopes. However, at times the opposite occurs as well (Hart, 1993). Third, the initial enchantment gives way to a period of chaos and distress for the staff. For example, when the principal is confronted with a school dilemma such as the transfer of the school secretary (Hart, 1993), the staff begins to question the successor’s commitment to the school.

Finally, teachers often resign themselves to existing situations and will retreat to their classrooms. A successor requires the validation of his or her leadership by the teachers and other members of the school in order to act in their behalf and influence their goals and actions. In this sense principals establish exchanges with individuals but also attend to processes that lead to social validation by the school as a whole (Hart, 1993). This social validation process is generally not an element in the administrator job description.

Development of Job Description

While there is little written information that links the development of the job description to leadership succession planning, as a variable in the conceptual framework of this study it may be an important factor in determining the level of efficacy of planning a succession. According to colleagues in the field of school administration, the development of the job description is an important factor that could be considered relevant as administrator input when preparing for the role.

The familiar adage “so goes the principal, so goes the school” may well be on the mark when characterizing the importance of a principal’s leadership. Although better preparation and selection of school leaders may not be the complete remedy for educational problems, it could offer an important beginning (Jackson, West, Hopkins & Huber, 2001). Hence, it becomes very important that school districts know and understand what the needs entail for their individual schools. Based on this needs assessment, it then becomes equally important that the role, functions and expectations of the principal are clearly defined and articulated at the outset.
School districts cannot afford to leave the job description, identification, preparation, and selection of outstanding school administrators to chance (Seyfarth, 1999; McCarthy, 1999). At the core of hiring the most capable administrators is the selection process based on the vacancy announcement. Principal selection begins with the declaration of a vacancy. Far too often, districts, especially large ones, do not specify in the vacancy announcement the particular school where there is an opening. Rather, the announcements call for applications for the principalship in general. Districts are more likely to attract appropriate candidates when they list information concerning the special needs and characteristics of a school in the vacancy announcement (McCarthy, 1999). Selectors can assess and match candidate's skills and leadership styles with the particular needs of a school in order to select the right person for the job.

The district personnel should include in the job description the needs to be accomplished by whoever fills the position; important characteristics of the existing staff, student's family background, cultures, extra-curricular concerns and feelings about school; and information about other executives in the school system (Seyfarth, 1999).

Recruitment and Selection of School Administrators

Policymakers and "education engineers" have always been preoccupied looking for the magic bullet to fix schools. According to Crews & Weakley (1995) they do not have to look any further:

Show me a good school and I'll show you a good school leader. When you poke into the inner workings of a successful school, you will find—without fail—a skillful leader who understands how to transform educational practice, not just transact educational business (p. 5).

The flip side is also true. Show me a school that is failing, and I'll show you a school hungry for leadership. If leadership isn't the magic bullet, it's the oil that makes the mechanism fire. Put a strong leader in a troubled school, give that leader flexibility to make the important decisions, then watch the school rise to the top of the heap (p. 5).

In 1992, a special report from the National Association of Secondary School Principals called for "all stakeholders to unite in a rational attack on the common
problems associated with the recruitment, identification, selection, preparation, and development of school administrators” (p.34). Since that call major efforts have resulted in the development of a knowledge and skill base for the preparation of any up and coming school administrator for his/her role (Thompson,1993; Van Berkum et al.,1994).

The following section will look at the current role of the school administrator, current and suggested recruitment procedures for school administrators as well as school administrator selection processes.

**Role of the School Administrator**

The role of the principal in successful schools has transcended the traditional notion of functional management, power, behavior style, and instructional leadership. Research indicates that successful schools have principals who regularly engage in establishing a productive and professional school culture (Beeson & Matthews, 1992; Weindling, 1992; Ogden et al., 1995; Roher et al, 2000). According to Ogden et al., (1995) whether through collaboration, consensus building, personal influence, or modeling, the principal creates a school's vision for success by promoting a school culture where staff, students, and community members have common school goals that become more important than individual self interests (pp. 27-28). Many principals state that they spend a majority of their time on administrative and managerial tasks rather than on those that directly affect curriculum and instruction (Murphy,1989; Daresh & Playko,1992; Murphy, Beck, Crawford, Hodges & McGaughy, 2000). In looking at a typical school administrator, “it is clear that once appointed, the principal is expected to be all things to all people” (Boyer,1983, p.221).

**Position Demands and New Expectations**

It used to be that we thought the principal’s office was a place where you went only if you were sent. If you were sent, good luck! Your parents might still love you, although it would take time to heal the shame. Your teachers would take you back, although that relationship would never be quite the same again. Students would look at you differently, a mixture of awe and pity in their faces. After all, you were someone who had returned from where few had gone (Ashby et al., 1998. p. 3).
Until the mid-1970s, the principal's job in Ontario was clearly, although somewhat more narrowly, defined. Principals performed three roles: building manager, student disciplinarian, and line officer for the superintendent's office (Ashby et al., 1998). Carrying out orders from the superintendent's office was sometimes unpleasant, but seldom difficult. After all, the principal was only doing what he (and it was usually “he”) was told, which was the only choice most school employees thought they had (and the only choice the superintendent knew they had). According to Ashby et al., (1998), “in these good old days, teachers taught, principals managed the buildings, and students were assumed commodities” (p. 5). Principals knew whom the good teachers were, and systematically visited (or ignored if that was more politically expedient) the classrooms of teachers they knew were bad. Principals kept buildings open so that educational opportunities could be broadly provided. If, like the proverbial horse led to water that would not drink, some students chose not to learn, they were often ignored. In time they just faded away.

This is not to say that principals of past decades didn’t do a good job. They did the job that was expected, and they did it well. Today’s principals face more complex expectations forged by a very different student population and a new generation dissatisfied with the educational status quo. At a time when many view the schools as one of the few intact social organizations, students come with very different attitudes, motivations, and needs than students of generations past (Ashby et al., 1998; Pena & Amrein, 1999; Victor, 2001). Past generations of principals needed largely to serve as administrators of a commodity-learning- perceived as valuable and desirable by most students. Today’s principals often need to find ways of inducing students to learn despite their most ardent attempts to escape. Schools and the principals who lead them into the 21st century, must adapt to different roles, different needs, and different strategies. The local role requires global understanding (Boesse, 1989; IEL, 2000; ERS, 2000; George, 2000a; 2000b; Block, 2000; Benson, 2001).

Who is a successful principal according to the new expectations and the current demands? In the article “The Role of the Principals in Successful Schools”, it states that research shows that good principals are vital to successful restructuring (Peterson, 1999), to change and improvement (Fullan, 1995; 1998; 2000a; 2000b), and student learning
The diversity and complexity of the role do make the job exciting and challenging. In addition to the demands of the job, there is role confusion. The expectations of the principal include the roles of: instructional leader, disciplinarian, supervisor, fundraiser, public relations expert and fiscal manager (Hewitt, 1988; Keedy, 1992; Kirby & Bogotch, 1993; NASSP, 1998; Lyons, 1999; Nye, 2000). More accountability and responsibility have been added to the job over the years. It should be noted that principals do not “do it all” but the actions and the context they shape with others (teachers, staff, parents, students) make it possible to teach and learn (Vann, 1994; Dionndabi, 1996; Doud & Keller, 1998; Tanner et al., 1998; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Spence, 2000).

The role of the school administrator is a leadership position of critical importance in the compulsory schooling system of our democratic society (Dufour, 2000; DuFour et al., 1988; Renihan, 1990; 1999; Sackney, 1991;Gidney, 1999). A principal assumes enormous professional, ethical, moral, legal, and supervisory responsibilities and accountability. One of the principal’s key tasks is to build a structure of relationships in the school so that all children have the opportunity to learn. To do this, the principal must have and use professional knowledge and skills to create a school environment in which children achieve their potential. It is the responsibility of school districts to ensure that up and coming effective school administrators are appropriately recruited and selected as they prepare for the school administrator role (Barbour, 1994).

According to the Canadian Association of Principals (1999) and the Educational Research Service (1998), there is an increasing shortage of adequately prepared principals, globally, to face the challenges confronting schools in today’s society. Leadership development programs are criticized for not adequately preparing school administrators for school and societal changes (Anderson,1988a; 1988b; Bradshaw & Buckner, 1994; Clark & Clark, 1996; Begley, 2000). Graduate training in Educational Administration has been severely admonished as having little or no effect on the success of principals and their ability to improve schools (Clark et al., 1996; Bredeson, 1996; Daresh, 1994). There have been extensive calls for reform and increased standards in the preparation of school administrators via the recruitment and selection process outlined by
Knowledge and Skills

School districts are encouraged to recruit and select administrators with expert leadership qualities. In response to the need for a current image of the administrator role, some staff developers and researchers have developed a "leadership profile" resource to support principal preparation that conforms to the key functions and current expectations.

Begley (2000; 2001) identifies several key dimensions of professional practice for principals in School Leadership Profiles. He proposes the use of leadership profiles as a support to the "cognitive apprenticeship" experiences of aspiring and incumbent school administrators. In efforts to respond to the challenges and issues of school administrators, this study encompasses an exploration of the different dimensions of leadership profiles of professional practice as a foundation for expert school leadership practices. The study has produced several regional profiles of effective leadership practices in Canada, United States, Australia, Russia and Hong Kong.

The five key dimensions of school leadership as outlined by Begley (2000; 2001) include the principal as manager; program leader and learning facilitator; school-community facilitator; visionary; and problem-solver. Begley states that there is a lack of consensus among academics and practitioners on what constitutes the ideal school leadership. Although principal preparation programs, or in-service courses intended for incumbent school administrators, can now be grounded in more than just context-bound practices, there are many problems still remaining:

The "rear view mirror" perspective of most formal preparation programs, and the questionable pedagogy and relevance of some university and field-based professional development efforts, continue to compromise the participant perceived effectiveness of such programs. Another important issue, in our view, is the failure of formal programs to accommodate divergent regional needs and learning readiness levels evident among the participants in professional development programs (Begley, 2000, p.2)
Portfolio Development

There is a sweeping interest in the development of administrator portfolios today in order to have aspiring administrators prepare for the recruitment and selection process. It is also encouraged to be used among practicing administrators. It is widely known as a system that meets the needs of educators, schools and districts. The purpose of the portfolio is to assist in the shaping of effective administrators to create stronger schools by using the portfolio as a professional tool and a performance review tool.

In its development, administrators construct their own philosophy of leadership and a vision for teaching and learning. They develop both school and professional goals linked to their own professional development and the needs of their students and teachers. The principals collect "artifacts" throughout their careers on a yearly basis to document their progress, engage in peer-sharing with a friend or mentor, reflect on their insights and growth, and create a rubric to self-assess their progress in meeting their goals. Generally, the administrators are required to share their showcase portfolios in group conferences and an exhibition to celebrate becoming more effective and reflective leaders (Miklos et al., 1988; Miller et al., 1998).

Recruitment And Selection: Attracting, Screening and Identifying

Effective recruitment and selection of school administrators continue to be one of the more challenging human resource tasks in educational organizations. This challenge is due, in part, to the inexact science of attracting, screening, and identifying candidates of good quality to fit the complex leadership needs of schools today (McCarthy, 1999; Pounder & Young, 1996; Pounder & Merrill, 2001).

Prudence is required when recruiting and selecting an administrator (Anderson, 1989; 1991; Cascadder, 1998). Zanella (cited in Gibney, 1987) pointed out that making the wrong choice "may have severe implications that can haunt a central office administrator and a school division for years" (p.1). Furthermore, it is a difficult process to dismiss an incompetent leader to correct problems stemming from mediocrity in administration.

Therefore, if the lack of clarity concerning the most desirable image of a school administrator causes some practical problems for school systems that seek new leaders,
that same issue also has an effect on individuals who wish to pursue leadership careers. When opportunities are presented to school personnel to move towards careers in administration, there is often a negative reaction (Seyfarth, 1999; Pounder et al., 2001). People without school administrative experiences have negative perceptions and views of the role of the school administrator. Many highly qualified, competent, and talented teachers dismiss careers in administration because they do not want to sit in an office all day, hassle teachers, discipline students, work with unhappy parents, or push paper—all activities frequently associated with the stereotypical role of the school administrator. Many people do not consider the fact that alternative images of school leadership are possible. Until some of those alternatives become better accepted and understood, there may always be a problem of individuals prescreening and identifying themselves (self-selection) for administration, despite the realities of the job.

The literature supports the notion that a certain type of principal leader can make a significant impact on schools. Research has shown that successful schools seem to be headed by principals who have a clear vision of where they are going, who are knowledgeable enough about teaching and education to help teachers and students work toward desired ends, and who are able to protect schools from the kinds of demands that make it difficult for schools to operate on a professional basis (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Hall et al., 1989; Hall et al., 1992; Sergiovanni, 1995; Starrat, 1995; Tekeste, 1996; Wilmore, McNeil & Townsend, 1998; Renihan, 1999). Principals in successful schools, then, not only come to their positions with a greater interest in the educational missions of their schools, they also seem to maintain that interest while they are there (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; 1998). Principals in less successful schools seem to perceive their role to be more that of a middle manager while principals in highly successful schools view themselves as educational leaders (Hallinger et al., 1992; Hallinger, 1996).

The social trends and problems of a changing student population imply that districts need to recruit and select administrators with strong problem-solving skills who can unite diverse constituents to address the complex learning and social problems of children (Daresh, 2000; Leithwood et al., 1992; Parkay et al., 1992; Parkay & Currie, 1992). Administrators must be child advocates who can elicit support from others to address many of these complex student issues (Pounder & Young, 1996). In addition the
moral capacity of school principals or their capacity to think through the ethical situations they confront in schools needs to be considered (Begley & Leithwood, 1990; Beck & Murphy, 1994; Strike, Haller & Soltis, 1998; Applbaum, 1999; Begley, 1999a; Begley, 1999b; Willower & Forsyth, 1999). Moreover, Walker & Shakato (1999) assert that a principalship involves an artistic, imaginative dimension through which the imagination is engaged in moral reasoning through the facilitation of moral decision-making processes.

Because of the growing recognition of the importance of the school principal, it is not surprising to find a parallel concern for the recruitment and selection process of school administrators. In the past, it was relatively easy to attract teachers into the ranks of school administrators because educators saw administration as a normal part of career advancement. Traditionally, if teachers wanted to earn more money, achieve higher status, or earn greater respect, they would leave the classroom and move toward a principalship or some other administrative role (Wanous, 1980; Young, Rinehart & Place, 1989; Winter & Dunaway, 1997). Teachers no longer see administration as a way to improve their salaries, prestige, or respect among other colleagues. Consequently, there is an urgent need for school district personnel to deliberately invest time, energy, and money in developing good recruitment practices and policies as a way to promote the entrance of more qualified leaders of education (Musella & Lawton, 1986; Baltzell et al., 1992; Rebore, 1992; Herman, 1994; Coffin & Leithwood, 2000). Communication with candidates becomes critical during the recruitment and selection process and must be consistent in order to be reliable in its treatment of all employees, both present and future.

According to Robinson (2000) job complexity and workload are perceived by school districts in Ontario as the two considerations having had the greatest impact on the number of applicants for administrative positions. These two reasons are closely followed by union grievances, health and welfare and morale of principals and vice principals. In the study on school leadership for Saskatchewan Schools (Renihan, 1999), the most frequently identified reason for teachers not applying for administration roles relates to the perception of the overwhelming workload and the "hassle" that goes with it. Other factors, in order of frequency, determined in this study are: poor remuneration as it relates
to responsibilities and the expectations of the job; location/relocation issues; lack of support; and reluctance to take on parental and community issues.

A process or strategy is necessary to deal effectively with equal opportunity issues, to hire the right people, to minimize the cost, and most importantly, to identify marginal performers before they are hired. Castetter (1992) suggested that, as competition increases, finding qualified, talented personnel to conduct the work of educational systems requires a recruitment process that must be an extensive and aggressive program that is directed toward placing and keeping a qualified and satisfied individual. Good recruitment practices and policies enable school boards to find the best candidate for their schools (Caldwell & Tymko, 1990; Castallo, Fletcher, Rossetti & Sekowski, 1992; Herman, 1994; Stout, 1973).

It is important for human resource personnel to have one person who understands the organization's goals, missions and culture (Castetter, 1992). In order for the personnel office to function effectively in recruitment, the human resource management personnel need working knowledge of the management process and the school environment, and an understanding of the collective agreement and the key players in the bargaining process. However, before any contact with candidates, human resource planning must identify current and future staffing needs. A job vacancy is analyzed to see what the actual job specifications are and what method of recruitment will be most effective. The personnel function, as one of the modules of a total information system, consists of a planned network of forms, files, reports, records and documents (Castetter, 1992; Castallo et al., 1994; Herman, 1994). The personnel function becomes especially important when recruiting or selecting new administrators.

**Common Recruitment Procedures for School Administrators**

Rebore (1992) states there are several common methods of recruiting and selecting, including internal searches, referrals, contacting employment agencies, and advertising vacancies with college and university placement services. Most school districts have two pools of candidates from which to recruit; internal and external (Herman, 1994). If there are enough qualified candidates internally, external recruitment may not be needed. Recruitment activities entail organizing staff, generating applicant
pools, matching individual talents with interests and opportunities, and adjusting and developing personnel (Castetter, 1992, p.109). If an effective recruitment process is in place and qualified candidates found, future personnel and selection problems would be minimized and future high-achievers or innovative leaders would be attracted to the school system.

According to Rebore (1992) recruitment practices are affected by factors in the school division and its community. These factors include size of school district, geographical area, other employment conditions in the community, working conditions, salary levels, fringe benefits, and increase or decrease in student population. It has been demonstrated that well-designed recruiting programs result in greater employee commitment, high productivity, and higher quality of work (Castetter, 1992, p. 112). By recruiting high quality school administrators, schools become more effective and, therefore, the goal of excellence is more attainable (Lezotte & Peterson, 1991; Renihan, 1990; Sackney, 1991). It is especially important to consider how the demands of the position, expectations, and responsibilities of school administrators are evolving in order to select the appropriate administrators.

Selection Procedures for School Administrators

The purpose of selection as outlined by Castetter (1992) is to fill existing vacancies with personnel who meet established qualifications, appear likely to succeed on the job, will find sufficient position satisfaction to remain in the system, will be effective contributors to unit and system goals, and will be sufficiently motivated to achieve a high level of self development (p. 147). The selection process is the key activity wherein decisions are made about which personnel will fill positions that become vacant. Selection requires a position-matching plan designed to link available personnel with the position requirements.

How does one become a principal? Principals at this time must hold, according to Regulation 297 of Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1990, principal's qualifications; or a principal's certificate that is a qualification to be a principal or vice principal. Presently, to apply for principal's qualifications, a candidate must have an undergraduate degree, a teacher's certificate, qualifications in three divisions, one of which must be in the
intermediate division, have completed a Master's degree or two specialist qualifications or one specialist qualification plus half a Master's degree, and at least five years teaching experience for which two must be in Ontario (Slater, 1990, pp. 37-40).

In the past some school boards relied upon the teachers federations to provide leadership training for aspiring administrators. It was a mutually agreeable relationship that provided the best training possible for future leaders and allowed for the selection of principals from within the ranks. This changed with the removal of the principals and vice principals from the federation. There are no longer local leadership components within the teachers federations of Ontario. In addition, many school boards did not have practices in place for the purposes of recruiting administrators. Present practice guidelines deal only with the selection process. The policies deal with some or all of the following areas: advertising of positions, criteria for selection, composition of the selection committee, application procedure, selection process, short lists, preparation for the interview, career planning and projected vacancies and the weight of the interview and summary.

Selection procedures and interviews are usually structured around information relating to the work history of the candidates, their education and training, present social adjustment, mental ability, motivation, and maturity (Tekeste, 1996; Lipham et al., 1985). Some of the selection procedures include resumes, prescreening interviews often done by telephone, employee testing, reference checks and consulting services (Anderson, 1988b; Baltzell et al., 1992; Herman, 1994; Musella et al., 1986; Stout, 1973). Ross (1989) observes that for some school districts, routinely favoring the selection of administrative applicants with experience in curriculum consulting roles is the most promising.

According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (ERS, 1996) the selection of school administrators needs to be based on qualities of leadership rooted in established knowledge and skills that result in dedication to good instructional practice and learning (p. 100). It means that an appointee should already have established his or her credentials or shows unquestioned promise of performing as a leader once in the post (ERS, 1996, p. 101). The leadership dimensions that need nourishing, according to NASSP (1996), include: building and maintaining a vision, direction, and focus for student learning; dedication to good instructional practice and
learning; building and refining skills and knowledge required to lead and manage change; fostering an atmosphere that encourages teachers to take risks to meet the needs of students; central office administrators’ leadership support of the planning, implementation, and long-range momentum of improvement at the school level and; principals should recognize the potential for leadership of students, parents, teachers and others in the community by nurturing and supporting it (pp.100-103).

It is essential then, that school administrators understand the expectations of school districts. Districts are encouraged to fully and clearly articulate the specific demands of the position, and expectations of administrators in their districts or schools before embarking onto specific recruitment and selection procedures (Pounder et al., 2001). Certain recruiting and selection procedures produce the best candidates for particular job vacancies (Anderson, 1988; Castallo et al., 1992; Castetter, 1992; Herman, 1994). Changing expectations have implications for the selection and training of school administrators. This articulation of expectations and training implications become an integral part of the socialization of the administrator (Pounder & Young, 1996).

**Administrator Socialization**

"It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things." Machiavelli (Greene, 1998, p. 396)

A major component of any succession process involves socialization whereby attention is drawn to the leader and the context simultaneously. The socialization of the administrators to the profession or occupation of school administration begins in training or preparation programs (Sussman, 1986; Warren, 1989; Hart, 1993; Whatley, 1994). (Refer to page 36). This section focuses on three concepts. First, there is a general definition of socialization as outlined in the literature. Second, the professional socialization process of administrators is explored, followed by a discussion of organizational socialization process.
What is Socialization?

The term "socialization" is applied to the processes by which an individual selectively acquires the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to perform a social role effectively (Merton, 1963). Feldman (1989) points out that socialization research has tended to focus most closely on the informal ways by which individuals learn about their work settings, and the impact of others on that learning. Training research, in contrast, has been most concerned with the ability of individuals to perform routine work tasks (p. 377). He cites Brim's (1966) definition of socialization as "the manner in which an individual learns that behavior appropriate to his position in a group through interaction with others who hold normative beliefs about what his role should be and who reward or punish him for correct or incorrect actions" (p. 3).

Bennis (1985) asserts that socialization involves a complex set of human relationships interacting in many ways. He continues that within an organization, the socialization includes all the people in it and their relationships to each other and to the outside world. Hence, the behavior of one member can have an impact, either directly or indirectly, on the behavior of others. This means that the social system does not have boundaries. It exchanges goods, ideas, culture, and so forth with the environment around it.

The development and implementation of administrator training programs as a form of professional development for school administrators should help administrators fit into the social system of schools both professionally and organizationally. If training programs are not meeting the needs of school administrators if would seem appropriate that school boards establish better connections between their training programs and their expectations. School administrators need to receive ongoing professional development. There is strong support for training before holding the principal accountable for knowing. These linkages require school boards to examine more closely the most appropriate training models and experiences for aspiring and practicing school leaders (Hart, 1993). School boards need to rethink the content, delivery, and outcomes of administration preparation programs as they currently exist. They also need to ensure that upcoming and practicing school administrators have both professional and organizational socialization opportunities.
In the administrative structure of the school system there are two types of socialization processes that are always at the forefront for administrators: professional socialization and organizational socialization. It may range from both formal and explicit influences such as carefully planned formal training programs or working with a mentor to informal and implicit influences that include unplanned, on-the-job experiences (Hart, 1993).

**Professional Socialization**

Becoming a school administrator is a major step in the professional life of an educator (Pounder et al., 1996; 2001). School administrators are confronted with a complex array of multi-faceted challenges from “learning the ropes” for the day-to-day operation of the school to enhancing the school culture so that it becomes more educative (Leithwood et al., 1999; Parkay et al., 1992). Perhaps the most difficult challenge that the beginning school administrator faces, however, is the need to develop a professional identity - “an image of the self” as a proactive leader who can make a difference (Ronkowski & Iannaccone, 1989).

Professional socialization generally begins in the pre-appointment phase of a school leader’s education career and continues into early post-appointment growth and on-going development. Professional socialization is an interactive process used to gain knowledge, skills, and behaviors needed to participate as a member of a profession. It is a dynamic developmental process through which values and norms of the profession are internalized and a professional identity is gained. This socialization requires dialogue, collaboration, and mentoring by an experienced professional to serve as a guide (Greenfield, 1985b; Kaye, 1995).

According to Weindling & Earley (1995) pre-appointment professional socialization includes: management courses for certification (mandatory and voluntary), first-hand experience of leadership and management tasks; modeling and social learning (learning by observing both good and bad models, help from a notion of what is good and bad leadership); and deliberate mentoring by some existing school leaders who see importance in their role in preparing future leaders.
Begley & Cambell-Evans (1992) adopted Van Gennep’s three-stage model of professional socialization (separation, transition, and incorporation) to explain that individuals progress from being defined by others to being self-defined. According to Van Gennep (1960), at the separation stage people are concerned with comparing themselves with others and how others judge their adequacy. At the transition stage people compare themselves against the standards imposed by the functions of the job and task performance. At the incorporation stage individuals make comparisons between their former and present self (e.g., perceptions of progress made from a previous self toward becoming an instructional leader) (p. 260).

Van Gennep (1960) and Van Maanen (1976) emphasize the importance of *personal* and *cultural* socialization. They assert that culture, in a general sense, provides values, norms and roles that are enforced by positive and negative sanctions. The learning of these values, norms and roles are supported by the agents of socialization (family, peers, school mass media and early life experiences). Merton (1963) suggests that socialization is a process through which culture is learned. Its purpose is to direct social consistency by guiding how a society communicates, evaluates and behaves. The sub-cultural influences can complement or counteract the cultural values and norms (Hagberg, 1984). This would apply to school leaders' ethical behavior as their behavior is always done so within the context of both the overall culture they are part of or any subculture they may belong to. Begley and Cambell-Evans (1992) recognize the influence of internal processes on socialization such as personal and professional values (personal challenge, thirst for knowledge, other people's influence) and the individual's perception of socializing experiences.

According to Hagberg (1984), successful leaders move from lower stages of power to higher stages of power, which are characterized by empowering others. However, such growth comes only through the successful resolution of a crisis of integrity. When a school administrator faces a crisis of integrity, he/she confronts something that goes beyond the challenge of the immediate moment. A crisis of integrity occurs inside the leader and often involves a conflict between two powerful values or principles. For example, the conflict may be between one's core values and the political expectations of the position, or it may involve a conflict of interests or rights. The
leader's response to the crisis will determine to an important degree his or her ability to 
move into the higher stages of ethical leadership that Bennis (1985) describes as essential 
to counter a growing inconsistency to educate our young people.

Organizational Socialization

Hart (1993) asserts that organizational socialization begins upon appointment, and 
is specific to the education context. Each school has a particular context requiring 
understanding and integration of a complex array of people, policies, processes, and 
priorities. Guy (1985) asserts that the need to fit into the immediate work environment 
makes organizational socialization more salient and immediate than the experiences that 
precede it, no matter how carefully organized. Organizational norms consequently tend to 
replace those learned during professional socialization. School administrators in schools 
consequently are interdependent with others who work there. The school administrator 
has formal leadership power but depends on those in the school for the power of the 
group to act (Miklos, 1988).

Schein (1992) offers compelling arguments that each new manager needs to 
understand and analyze the particular organizational culture into which she or he is 
placed, emphasizing that leadership is intertwined with each particular organizational 
culture. An insider (someone appointed from inside the school) brings past experience 
and knowledge to this process, as opposed to someone who is brought in from the 
outside. Socialization to the administrator position in each school is fundamentally 
unique.

Leithwood et al., (1992) have described school administrator socialization in a 
manner consistent with Greenfield (1985a; 1985b). They claim that there are mediating 
influences on principals' socialization such as work setting, culture and relationships with 
peers, superiors, district policies and procedures, formal training, and outcomes. This last 
influence incorporates the image of the role of the school administrator, skills, norms and 
values, and communication networks. The organizational socialization literature (both 
practice and research oriented) provides educational leaders and policy makers with 
guidelines for structuring experiences (McCarthy, 1999; Leithwood et al., 1992). It 
suggests that the profession adopt a longer-term view of the preparation and development
of school leaders that extends not only into the induction period but provides planned socialization experiences each time a new leadership assignment is made (Wanous, 1980; Pounder et al. 1996).

In a study conducted by Leithwood, Steinbach, Ross and Hamilton (1991) on the socialization processes of aspiring administrators the findings indicate that administrators' socialization patterns are helpful in contributing to instructional leadership. The study indicates that formal training programs are necessary for the socializing of administrators. Greenfield (1985b) suggests that such programs are an important factor for developing the technical knowledge and skills that administrators require. Devoting more time and energy to programs that focus on meaningful content in a form consistent with good principles of adult education is one promising suggestion for improving socialization experience. Papke (1989) claims that on-the-job leadership activities are viewed as the most helpful of all socialization activities. School districts need to develop and implement structured leadership development activities and opportunities for school administrators to enhance school leadership and to help meet expectations.

Structured Induction Opportunities: Expectations for School District

"Organizations need leaders if they want to win, and the only the way to get them is for leaders to consciously mentor and prepare them" (Noel M. Tichy, The Leadership Engine)

Universities and school districts can use a variety of bridging strategies to provide aspiring administrators with practical administrative experience and knowledge to help them succeed in the principal-ship prior to their first position. Pre-service training should not, however, be the only assistance that principals receive (Confrey, 1987; Bredeson, 1996; Daresh, 2000; Daresh, 2001). In fact, according to Daresh (2001) it is naïve to believe that pre-service training or even out-of-district in-service programs will provide aspiring administrators with all they need to know about how to be an effective leader in a particular school district. School districts, therefore, must continue training principals and provide newly hired administrators with a variety of supportive induction activities to help them continue their professional growth as school leaders. In short the school
districts need to ensure there are socialization opportunities provided to administrators in order to prepare for their role. Such opportunities (See Appendix D) may include: well-thought-out and comprehensive orientation programs; institute a "Buddy System"; structure beginners' workload; give principals (both new and experienced) feedback; develop a plan for professional growth; and facilitate "reflective" activities: (Lipham et al., 1985; Daresh, 1988; Daresh et al., 1992; Riordan & Hildebrandt, 1995; Daresh, 2000).

Re-socialization: Response to Changing Expectations

Although much has been written about beginning teachers and the accompanying trauma that many vividly recall, little has been written about the beginning principal. Perhaps because, unlike beginning teachers, beginning principals are continuing in their schoolwork, albeit in a new role. However, as teachers make the transition from being a teacher to being a school administrator so does the emergence of new socialization experiences. At the point of preparing for the administrator role, aspiring administrators begin to take on a new and different role as an educator. Consequently, the need to be re-socialized becomes crucial and a new professional identity suddenly is at the fore (Feldman, 1989).

Many teachers, at some point in their career, have thought about the possibility of holding a principalship (Fein, 1990; Pounder et al., 2001). Those who never do it have thought about how they would do things differently if they were in the position. Becoming a school administrator (vice-principal and/or principal) is for many educators the ultimate point in their career. However, there are more demands on and changing expectations for the position now than ever before. It is because of the position demands and ever changing expectations that someone entering into this role will have new socialization experiences both professionally and organizationally.

In addition to the re-socialization of teachers who aspire to become administrators, there is also a need to re-socialize the practicing administrators, both new and experienced (Fein, 1990). The job and working conditions of administrators today are becoming increasingly difficult, complex, and stressful. As Parkay et al., emphasize (1992), "the rise of gangs, the increase of children with diverse needs in the classroom, the shortage of funds, the decrease in community and public support, the compounding
effects of legal threats and decisions, and the never-ending demands for contribution of
time, hours, and energy take their toll" (p.x). With changes in policies and procedures and
school reform descending on schools, diversity flourishing in student composition and
new conceptualization of leadership, the administrators(s) of schools are expected to
provide effective leadership and take on a vast array of added responsibilities (Parkay &
Hall, 1992; Ashby & Krug, 1998; OPC, 2001a; OPC, 2001b).

If school districts wish to retain their administrators in these changing times, they
must assert and provide leadership development as well as the professional development
and training at district level to keep them fresh and abreast of best practices. These
expectations are connected to holding administrators accountable for their roles and
functions as leaders within the school district who, along with their teachers and students,
will be ready for the 21st century.

DeMont & DeMont (1975) assert that since the success of accountability depends
upon its acceptability and usefulness to professionals at each organizational level,
planning and training should include inductive approaches as well as the more typical
deductive approaches. Deductive planning and training involve centralized or system-
wide decisions about implementing accountability and staff training approaches.
Inductive tactics decentralize these decisions and permit individual groups to address
their training needs according to specialized expectations.

Developing and implementing leadership succession plans, prudent recruitment
and selection processes, informal and formal socialization experiences of administrators
are ways in which school districts are currently attempting to respond to the wide range
of expectations and demands linked to accountability.

The final section of this literature review explores: (1) the concept of
accountability; (2) how accountability has been redefined; (3) various approaches to
accountability; (4) and current issues of accountability. The literature asserts that the
accountability process plays a role in the development and implementation of leadership
succession. While being a factor considered in this study towards understanding
succession planning it serves as an impetus that impacts how and why school districts
respond to the changing expectations as well as to the new demands of school
administrators.
"Obey your leaders and submit to them; for they are keeping watch over your souls, as men who will have to give account. Let them do this joyfully, and not sadly, for that would be of no advantage to you." (Paul, Letters to the Hebrews', 17)

There have been substantial initiatives undertaken worldwide to increase educational accountability (Becher, Eraut, & Knight, 1983; Kogan, 1986; Wagner, 1989; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Eisner, 1991; Banfield, 1992; Gaines & Cornett, 1992; Black, 1994; Fagan, 1995; Earl, 1995; Milne, 1995; Milne, 1998; Blase, 1997; Butterworth & Butterworth, 1998; Leithwood, Edge & Jantzi, 1999; Abelman, Elmore, Evans, Kenyan & Marshall, 1999; Adams & Kirst, 1999; AWSP, 2000; IEL, 2001). Much has been written about student accountability, teacher accountability, and school accountability (Ladd, 1996). More limited research is available on administrator accountability (ISLLC, 1996; ERS, 1998). In this section the concept of accountability is examined, approaches to administrator accountability are discussed followed by a brief discussion of some of the issues related to administrator accountability.

What is Accountability?

Proposals for accountability often fail to recognize the basic elements and conditions of this concept or fail to consider the full range of its implications (Adams et al., 1999). To contend that an individual or an institution ought to be accountable immediately brings to mind the following questions: accountable to whom, for what, in what manner and under what circumstances, with what consequences and/or effects? (Wagner, 1989, Leithwood et al.; 1999).

The concept of accountability and its implications are quite complex from both a theoretical and practical standpoint (Wagner, 1989; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000). It refers to “the relationship between an individual who dispenses a service and the recipients of that service” (Seyfarth, 1999, p. 103). Being accountable means, among other things, being obligated or subject to giving an account. In saying that someone is accountable “we could imply that he/she is obligated to give a report, description, explanation, justifying analysis, or some form of exposition of reasons, causes, grounds, or motives for what we have observed” (Leithwood et al., 1999, p. 13). The degree to
which accountability exists in any relationship will involve exploring whether or not the form of accounting selected, and the manner in which the agent is expected to be accountable, are really suitable for the purposes that accountability is meant to serve (Black, 1994; Bolanos, 1994; Brownlee, 1995; Church, 1995; Blase, 1997; Black, 1998).

Earl (1998) defines accountability as "a slippery concept that is both emotional and judgmental----it means being responsible or obligated to report and to justify one's actions to those who are entitled to the information" (p.186). It is not surprising that there are different perspectives on how accountability can be established and demonstrated. Earl (1995, 1998) continues that even though accountability is multi-faceted, two opposing views demonstrate the underlying dialectic:

On the one hand, accountability is seen as answering to a higher power that has the authority and mandate to judge quality, exercise control and order compliance. On the other hand, it is seen as emancipatory. Improvement is predicated on the belief that change is an internal process that cannot be imposed. The power resides in the school or system to reflect on accumulated data and answer to their constituents by communicating findings and a plan for action (1998, p.187).

Establishing a culture that promotes accountability, taking responsibility and being answerable for actions, is one of the most revolutionary—and therefore most likely to be resisted—of the concepts associated with restructuring. Departments of education are relaxing regulatory activities through such actions as waivers, and district level administrators are reducing over-sight efforts, encouraging site-based budgeting and site-based management. Reform efforts have caused accountability to be redefined. However, as opportunities for taking initiatives move to school sites, there is also great expectation that the school sites will be held accountable for results (Murphy & Pimental, 1990; Rothman, 1993; Ladd, 1996; Lewis, 1997; Willms, 1998; CP, 2000; Murphy, Yft & Shipman, 2000; O'Neill, 2001; Glickman, 2001).
Redefining Accountability

"Results are often achieved by impetuosity and daring which could have never been obtained by ordinary methods." Machiavelli (Applewhite et al., 1992, p. 62)

The need for accountability has widespread agreement, but what it means and how it should function are less clear. Further, those who are going to be held accountable are understandably concerned about taking on this obligation, partly because there is little clarity about what it means or how to do it and partly because it requires additional efforts that may lead to the judgement that outcomes are inadequate (Wagner, 1989).

If significant progress can be made "up front" in the early stages of reform efforts activities can be more manageable (Acherman, Donaldson & van der Bogert, 1996). With purposes established and agreed on by partners, districts will be in a much better position to make decisions regarding structures and roles. School districts that are contemplating restructuring should explore the need to implement structural and role changes, including decentralization, site-based management, widespread involvement and participative decision-making (Corbett et al., 1996).

**Developing Structures and Roles: Decentralization:** Centralized systems are based on the belief that a high level of control is needed to assure that minimal fulfillment of expectations will be achieved by those at the service level of the organization. On the contrary, "decentralization requires that you believe in your fellow human beings" (Brown, 1991, p. 108) The assumption behind decentralization is that, compared to those at distant administrative centers, partners at the local level will be more intensely concerned and have a more comprehensive grasp of realities at the school site, which should put them in a better position to make appropriate decisions about the use of scarce resources. Decentralization is also based on the assumption that change is more likely to occur, and to occur more readily, if the emphasis is on local initiative rather than on reporting and hierarchy. Decentralization can be a way of freeing up partners at the school-site level to take more initiative to create effective responses to the educational needs of students (Brown, 1991; Mohrman, Wohlstetter et al., 1994).

**Site-Based Management:** Beyond changing decision-making structures, site-based management is intended to lead to better ways of meeting the needs of students and the communities from which they come (Mohrman et al., 1994; Corbett et al., 1996). The
intent is to open a relatively closed system, so the partners can cooperatively explore delivery of education to meet site-identified goals. They "may plan staffing levels, employ or dismiss the principal, participate in the development of local curricula, and become involved in other important decisions affecting their schools" (Brown, 1991, p.31). To reiterate, Panasonic Foundation (1997) states:

We believe that decisions affecting the learning of children should be made, whenever possible, by those closest to children and be shared among those who must carry out the decisions. Only then can we expect teachers and school administrators to take responsibility for the education of their students (p.67).

For this to become reality, efforts must continue to be made to convince potential partners that their involvement and participation are desired and important. It takes considerable effort to change behaviors and beliefs and provide partners with the necessary skills to work together cooperatively.

Expectations need to be communicated clearly by central office leaders. Doing business differently requires that the new "rules of the game" must be clear and communicated a number of times and through different media. Second-guessing expectations will never work.

In addition, the principal's role has undergone a re-conceptualization. From being the authority figure at the top of the school pyramid, the principal must become the facilitator at the center of a complex web of partners. Principals are now expected to base their influence on "professional expertise and moral imperative rather than line authority. They must learn to lead by empowering rather than by controlling others." (Murphy, 1992, p.125) Many principals continue to need help in making this role change. Some see it as a challenge; others may be cautious but willing to try to change their leadership behaviors. Still, others feel threatened by these changing leadership behavior expectations.

Finally, in site-based management teachers must share in school-wide policy-making and be involved in the implementation of changes. At the same time, structures that encourage involvement and participation in site-based management must continue to be created such as school councils, advisory committees, school improvement teams, and so forth.
Widespread Involvement and Participative Decision-Making. All partners have something of value to offer to restructuring efforts. The payoffs are enormous (Corbett et al., 1996):

- School staffs: most knowledgeable because they are intimately involved in the day-to-day workings of the school. They have important and legitimate concerns that must be included in discussions.
- Students: their participation gives them firsthand opportunities to practice critical thinking and to explore problem-solving with adults. Their unique perspective must become part of the dialogue.
- Parents and other community members: Their input is necessary, both because they have a legitimate role to play and because they must be recruited as partners who will work with the staff to enable students to achieve a meaningful education.
- Local business leaders: They have a sensitivity about basic skills that are required in the economy. They can also partner with schools to identify and secure resources that are needed in support of the educational program.

Because of the relative absence of precedents for participative decision-making, relationships may be tenuous and unsettling until a common agenda is created, norms and rules are developed, and trust is developed. It is one thing to declare that there will be participative decision making and quite another to institutionalize it (Fagan, 1995; Gidney, 1999).

There are of course many occasions of accountability where simply relating facts and events is all that is needed. But it is one thing to report that certain events have occurred and quite a different matter to explain or to justify "why" and "how" they occurred (Lessinger, 1970; Kogan, 1986; Wagner, 1989; Gaines & Cornet, 1992; Ladd, 1996; Leithwood et al., 1999). It is for this reason that rational forms of accounting must be employed and have value in relation to matters where they are needed, for they have the potential to yield this additional insight (Lessinger, 1970; Lessinger & Tyler, 1971). The approaches that accountability may take in schools and school systems, as a whole, need to be better understood as do the consequences of introducing one form as distinct from another need to be understood (Hodgkinson, 1995; Leithwood et al., 1999).
Alternative Approaches to Accountability

A major theme of recent debate in education has been to shift the emphasis from a concern for equity (i.e. distribution—who benefits) to a concern for effectiveness (i.e. what gets done). However, each of these concepts is itself value-laden and capable of many interpretations. Therefore the distribution of policy emphasis between them, as well as the definition of the concepts themselves, depends on how accountability is addressed. Determining Who decides goes a long way in laying the ground for What gets done and Who benefits.

There are several alternative approaches to accountability (Kogan,1986; Wagner,1989; Simkins et al.,1992; Leithwood et al.,1999). Each of these approaches is built on a unique system of beliefs and assumptions about schools and how they can change (see Appendix E). In essence people will accept accountability processes as they understand them and will reject it if it does not fit with their personal frame of reference.

**Market Approach:** This approach increases competition in school choice, opening up boundaries within and across school systems, school privatization plans, charter schools, magnet schools, academies and other specialized educational facilities. Unlike other models or approaches of accountability, this approach is not concerned with the rearrangement of roles and power within the organizational system of education. Rather it is concerned to establish a competitive environment within which schools are compelled to respond to the wishes of their “customers” through the operation of the market forces (Kogan,1986; Wagner,1989; Leithwood et al.,1999). According to this approach, accountability relationships can be established directly with those who use public services without the need for other groups, such as professionals, public representatives or managers, to interpret the needs for them. In this approach, known for its "motivation" element, schools will offer programs that they feel are good for their clients. At the same time, students needs are more effectively met, parents are very supportive of the school, students are likely to be more engaged in their own learning, and teachers are generally more content with their workplace.

**Decentralized Approach:** This approach elicits a community control form of site-based management in the context of typical governance school structures. The devolution of decision-making within these structures encourages an account to be shared
between professionals within the school, parent representatives and the community, as a whole (Wagner, 1989). School councils are prime examples.

**Professional Approach:** The professional model of accountability is based on the assumption that quality in the educational system is best ensured by granting autonomy to teachers, and others who have been trained in and have access to relevant bodies of professional knowledge and whose professional ethics lead them to act always in the interest of their 'client'—the student. It specifies what the teachers, the school and its governance structures, and the district should be accountable for. In other words, the focus here is on the capacity of the organization to implement and sustain accountability measures (Kogan, 1986; Wagner, 1989; Leithwood et al., 1999).

Policies, practices, and incentives are created that promote student welfare, ensure opportunities for individuals to practice capabilities as well as require that knowledge be the basis for practice. The yardstick of quality under this model of accountability is good practice which is defined by the profession and moderated by processes of peer review such as professional networks of information and exchange, advisory teams, external examiners in higher education and so forth (Leithwood et al., 1999). Principals currently have access to this accountability mechanism. Professional accountability is a more promising approach to improving instruction. By helping teachers extend their professional expertise, providing opportunities for teachers to collaborate with colleagues, and helping teachers feel pride in their work, the principal can help bring about improvements in practice and gains in student achievement.

Professional accountability alone is insufficient to ensure that educational provision responds adequately to the complex demands of a modern economy and society (Simkins et al., 1992). Pressures have grown to find other accountability mechanisms which can reduce professional power and increase the influence of other stakeholders in the educational system.

One approach is to subject professionals to *managerial* control. The argument here is that professional autonomy and judgement must be subordinated to broader corporate purposes. This cannot be achieved by the collegial methods of shared responsibility favored by professionals—such methods are more rhetoric than reality anyway (Leithwood et al., 1999). It is necessary to establish clear organizational goals,
agree on means of achieving them, monitor progress, and then support the whole process by a suitable system of incentives. Only in this way can it be ensured that the organization is effective in the accomplishment of its goals and efficient in its use of resources.

The Management Approach: The management approach to accountability involves a variety of procedures for "strategic planning", especially at the school district level, as well as multiple procedures for school improvement planning and monitoring progress (e.g., the accountability reviews carried out by New Zealand's Education Review Office and Educational Quality and Accountability Office in Ontario) (Butterworth & Butterworth, 1998; Leithwood et al., 1999). When this approach is used, generally it is the whole organization that is held accountable but with more responsibility for the senior administrator such as the school principal. The school and its senior administrator are most directly accountable to the next level in the organizational hierarchy, such as the district office supervisor to whom the school administrator reports.

New Managerialism: New managerialism is more of a reform strategy than an approach to accountability. In the last decade in England and Wales, reforms have sought to introduce new forms of accountability which: redistribute power in the policy domain from local representative government towards central government and its agencies and newly constituted governing bodies of institutions; disempower the service (professional) domain within institutions in favor of a reconstituted management domain; and empower consumers directly through marketization and, in the schools sector, enhanced voice within governing bodies. It is argued that developments are changing patterns of organization and management within those institutions which are subject to them through the development of new forms of organizational control which can be characterized as "managerialism" (Pollitt, 1993; Clarke & Newman, 1997; Simkins, 1997; 2000).

According to Peters (1992), the devolution of decision-making is sometimes rooted in a broader reform strategy for public institutions generally referred to as "new managerialism" whereby "it emphasizes decentralization, deregulation and delegation" (p. 269). Peters (1992) state that "while there are variants on this approach to accountability among countries, Hood suggests that they share in common a shift in emphasis from policy formulation to management and institutional design; from process
to output controls; from organizational integration to differentation, and; from statism to subsidiarity. In countries such as New Zealand and Australia where school reform has been substantially influenced by the philosophy of new managerialism, creating more efficient and cost-effective school administrative structures is a second central goal for devolution (Peters, 1992). Typically, this goal is pursued through the implementation of an administrative-control form of site-based management which increases school site administrators’ accountability to the central, district, or board office for the efficient expenditure of resources. The school administrator is clearly who is accountable with administrative-control approaches to site-based management, the account being owed to central administration of the school board or school district.

**Political Accountability:** This approach uses voting to register approval or disapproval of a candidate or ballot initiative. Elected officials who fail to carry out the actions to which they committed themselves during a campaign may find themselves held accountable by voters who remove them from office in the next election. School board elections are an example of political accountability applied to schools (Adams et al., 1999).

**Legal Accountability:** This approach relies on the courts to enforce legal mandates related to schools. For example there are certain procedures that legally must be followed by school personnel in identifying and providing educational services to children with disabilities.

**Bureaucratic Accountability:** This approach is achieved by assigning responsibility for oversight of subordinates to those who hold supervisory positions in a bureaucratic organization. Thus, the superintendent of a district oversees the work of school personnel at lower levels of the school hierarchy, and the principals supervise the work of teachers, counselors, aides, secretaries, and so forth. School administrators currently have access to bureaucratic accountability mechanism. Most administrators discover that bureaucratic accountability has limited uses (Adams et al., 1999). It is exercised through teacher evaluation and authoritative actions to direct the work of teachers, but neither of these tools can be counted on to produce marked improvements in teacher performance. If carried out sensitively over a period of time, evaluation can help
teachers to do a better job, but the results depend as much on the teacher’s desire to improve as on the principal’s actions.

**Moral Accountability:** This approach operates on the premise of personal obligations or sense of duty whereby educators actions are conditioned by conscience and loyalty to the work-based principles and values they deem to be important (Wagner, 1989). According to Adams et al., (1999), “educational policy treats moral dimensions of educational accountability as individual idiosyncrasy, thus not worth addressing. As a result this garners little attention, except as a rhetorical target (p. 471).

No employee of a school system is wholly accountable for students’ performance. A teacher depends on administrators at the school and the district levels to create conditions that facilitate learning, the principal depends on administrative superiors in districts and central governments to provide resources and to enact instructionally sound policies, and so on. If the school district has determined what students are expected to learn and provided the resources that teachers need to teach, and if the principal has maintained conditions in the school that are conducive to learning, then the teacher and the school administrator can reasonably be held accountable for exercising good judgement in the selection and presentation of instructional materials, management of student behavior, and allocation of time and resources.

Accountability cannot be achieved without first instituting clear goals and standards (Ladd, 1996). According to Ladd (1996) there are several issues and concerns of accountability that are currently at the fore for school administrators. If the purposes, intentions and expectations are clearly understood from the outset, the chances for successful accountability systems are enhanced. Conversely, if school administrators do not understand what is expected of them in their role and function as administrators, how can they justifiably be held accountable? (Meyer, 1994) The goals and standards are guides used by administrators to determine the needs of their clientele and how these needs may be met. In the final analysis, any system of accountability rests on the willingness of individuals to accept personal responsibility (Ladd, 1996). Relocating decision-making authority from school district office to the school level is seen as a precondition to awakening that sense of responsibility.
District Office Role in Accountability

The role of central office is gradually shifting from one emphasizing regulating and initiating activities to one emphasizing facilitation, service, and responsiveness. Some current activities continue to be dealt with best at central office level—for example, networking with other government agencies whose functions overlap with the school district; lobbying for resources at the district, state, and federal levels; and negotiating with teachers unions. However, responsibilities for many other activities shift to school sites. As responsibilities gravitate to the school site, so does authority, requiring central office personnel to practice more restraint in their relationships with site personnel. Brown (1991, p. 15) states that central office teaming needs to be implemented as a model for schools, exhibiting less reliance on superintendent decision-making and more team decision-making.

Realistic expectations need to be developed about accountability and the site-level personnel need to understand what these expectations are (Meyer, 1994). Districts need to set specific expectations based on its mission and goal statements and to provide assessment approaches as well as professional development opportunities that help site-based leaders become knowledgeable about accountability methods and how to use them (Nagy, 1995). Setting expectations and providing training and support can enhance the ability of the school-sites to meet demands for accountability. If these activities are done in a supportive way rather than in a controlling manner, it is more likely that accountability will be viewed as a natural part of the process of moving towards goals.

A number of theoretical issues arise in the design of performance-based accountability systems. In general, the key is to separate the goals for students from measuring the performance of the school system.

Issues of Accountability

School administrators are no strangers to accountability; whenever a problem occurs in a school, heads turn automatically toward the office. However, the recent emphasis on high-stakes, standards-driven accountability systems poses some issues for school leaders. Ladd (1996) asserts that fairness is a key issue and an accountability system would be deemed unfair if it typically favored schools serving one type of student
rather than another. There are issues of skills and knowledge as well as issues of authority and support that need to be considered when embarking on a system for principal accountability. According to a study on principal accountability conducted by the AWSP (Association of Washington School Principals, March, 2000) there is strong support for training before holding the principal accountable for knowing in much the same way that principals guide and assist staff members with knowledge and skill before holding them accountable for knowing.

Meyer (1994) argues that if the goal of accountability system is to induce school officials to change their behavior, the accountability measure should reflect primarily the factors under their control and not the factors that are outside their control, such as the socioeconomic backgrounds of students.

A second issue is whether performance-based accountability systems are incompatible with more ambitious and experimental forms of assessment that reformers advocate as essential for encouraging higher-order thinking and problem-solving (Ladd, 1996).

A third issue relates to whether the undesirable side effects of accountability and incentive system can be kept to a tolerable level. For example, school programs should focus on all grades in a school rather than just a selected few, to reduce incentives for school administrators to focus resources on selected grades to the detriment of others (Ladd, 1996; Nagy, 1995). Consequently, a school administrator needs the support and the authority to make decisions of this nature.

A fourth issue is the extent to which the technical complexity of a well-designed accountability system is compatible with political and implementation demands. Many administrators within the system do not understand how their accountability systems work. This lack of understanding can be a problem. People who know the expectations tend to live up to them, especially when results are linked to consequences. It makes administrators within the system suspicious of the system, and makes it difficult for them to make that link between what they're doing in the schools and what is being rewarded. It also means that technocrats who control the system effectively end up making policy decisions (Goldstein, 1993; Rothman, 1993; Meyer, 1994; Nagy, 1995; Ladd, 1996; Willms, 1998; Olson, 2000).
It is clear that administrative accountability systems and incentive systems are not a panacea for the challenge of school reform. The success of such programs in generating change is dependent on the capacity of the state or province to follow through in providing the necessary assistance and support to individual schools, teachers and administrators (Banfield, 1992; Barber, 1994; McEwen, 1995; Ladd, 1996). Clarity of expectations, purposes or intentions of accountability, and accountability procedures are key components of any accountability system.

Principals are in a position to help direct the course of their own accountability rather than have systems imposed upon them. The role of the principal has become different from what it has traditionally been (LeBlanc, 1994; Leithwood & Aitken, 1995; Hallinger, 1996; Hesselbein, Goldsmith & Beckhard, 1996). For example, if the principal is responsible for student achievement, some of the tasks that take time away from the principal fulfilling that role might not be part of the principal’s job description in a performance-based system.

According to the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD, 2000), principals need to receive ongoing professional development, especially in the areas of assessment and evaluation. In order for such professional development to occur issues need to be dealt with such as authority and support concerning principal responsibilities.

Finally, there is an issue of internal-external congruence and conflict on accountability systems. Because policy makers intend performance accountability to promote greater student achievement, the standard for evaluating an accountability system must be that system’s ability to support teaching and learning practices which raise student performance (Adams et al., 1999). The standard necessitates a design linkage, through consensus or appropriate incentives, between external accountability standards and the pre-dispositions of the administrators, teachers, and students who are responsible for meeting those standards (Adams et al., 1999; IEL, 2000).

Adams et al., (1999) assert that research on internal accountability should examine issues of external-internal congruence and conflict. Maybe if internal accountability systems were better known to policy makers and utilized, there may be less need for external interventions. Perhaps also the local internal policies are more
attuned to local democratic concerns that conflict with federal and state and/or provincial interventions and that encourage higher and different student attainment standards. According to Abelman et al., (1999), formal accountability measures are more powerful when they are congruent with individual values and collective expectations. If responsibility, expectations, and accountability measures are not aligned, accountability systems are usually weak.

School administrators need to blend the different signals about accountability in order to formulate coherent local policies. The key task for these administrators is to create common expectations among teachers concerning what they are accountable for in that they need to raise the collective sense of teachers about accountability's specific standards and measures (Adams et al.,1999). Effective administrators can accomplish these tasks through a variety of capacity-building techniques that link internal and external accountability at the site (Newmann,1997). District offices and other policy makers approaching the selection of accountability would do well to consider explicitly the assumptions underlying their instruments of choice.

Advocates of accountability often see it as a simple matter of testing results. But as research indicates (ISLLC,1996; Gaines et al.,1992; Adams et al.,1999), effective accountability is a system that links standards, testing, professional development of administrators and teachers, reporting, and consequences. Without careful alignment of the component parts, testing alone will have little effect. They need to weigh the strengths and weaknesses of selecting a repertoire of tools that share the same basic assumptions about schools and schooling (Newmann,1997; Adams et al.,1999).

In the U.S. a system has been fully developed whereby a comprehensive set of standards for principals are outlined with indicators that support those standards (Green, 2001). The Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC,1996) developed a set of six standards for school administrators, with a focus on knowledge, dispositions and performances which was borrowed from their colleagues INTASC (Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium), to follow as it was apparent that a set of common standards was absent in the arena of school administration. The consortium believed that the standards approach provided the best avenue to allow diverse stakeholders to drive improvement efforts along a variety of fronts. The ISLLC is
responsible for the standards and has linked those standards to on-going professional development and training, licensure, and assessment of school administrators (Fullan & Mascali, 2000; Green, 2001; ISLLC, 1996). According to the ISLLC (1996), a school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by:

- facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
- advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
- ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
- collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
- acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
- understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

A full consortium adopted the set of standards on March 2, 1996. All members believed that the guiding principles should acknowledge that standards must reflect the centrality of student learning and the changing role of the school administrator. They were unanimous in their belief that the central aspects of the role are the same for all school administrators. Currently, in the year 2000-2001, these standards are being used in more than thirty states.

School administrators have a myriad of responsibilities on a daily basis. Such responsibilities include developing, implementing, and monitoring procedures and practices; influencing, establishing, and sustaining their school culture conducive to continuous improvement; leading the development and evaluation of data-driven plans; assisting instructional staff in aligning curriculum; monitoring, assisting and evaluating staff implementation of effective instructional and assessment practices; managing human and financial resources; communicating with colleagues, parents and the community.

To ensure that these and other tasks are carried out effectively, school administrators need the support systems put in place that will allow them to work within the parameters of district policies and best practices to meet standards (Eisner, 1991; Lake, Robin, Hill, O'Toole, & Celio, 1999; Fullan, 1999). At the same time administrators need to involve the whole school in a focused improvement strategy,
aligning resources to support the goals, and seeking outside help when necessary (Lake et al., 1999). In addition to the support, they also need the authority to access district and community resources as well as to make decisions based on effective school practices and maximization of student achievement for all students. Meeting new standards requires sophisticated leadership to maintain a steady focus on improvement while still satisfying the relentless everyday demands of constituents (Levesque, Bradley, Rossi, & Teitelbaum, 1998).

School administrators face ethical dilemmas as a regular part of their daily work (Crowson, 1989) and it seems reasonable that they should be expected to be competent in the skills of moral reasoning. While many school administrators undoubtedly already are competent in this area, the formal consideration of ethics in administrator preparation curricula is needed. As the populations served by public schools become increasingly diverse, school administrators need to become proactive in creating environments for students, teachers, and parents that are supportive and inclusive of differences and that are responsive to the rapidly changing social contexts within which schools must operate.

Leadership succession planning, educational leadership, recruitment and selection processes of leaders, professional and organizational socialization processes and accountability procedures are areas that intertwine in the field of educational administration. Examination of these areas together as they apply to school administration helps to conceptualize the context of leadership succession planning. The integration of these areas should be of interest to stakeholders who deal with leadership recruitment and selection, pre-appointments and post-appointments of school administrators, professional and organizational socialization of new and experienced school administrators as well as the various approaches and issues of accountability procedures. All areas have some impact on the pursuit of improving the quality and new conceptions of leadership in schools. As Fullan (1992, p. 84) states:

We have begun to make the transition from the principal's role in influencing the implementation of specific innovations to the principal's role in leading changes in the school as an organization. The implication is that we have to look deeper and more holistically at the principal and the school as an organization (p.84).
Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework used in this research was an *a priori* conceptual framework of variables derived from the literature. It provided parameters and structure and was used as a meta-organizer which shaped the inquiry and the research questions. (See Figure 1). The framework focused on (1) leadership succession planning, (2) recruitment and selection of school administrators, (3) and school administrator socialization processes. In addition, the framework helped to explore the impetus of accountability as the set of social circumstances in which these three theoretical constructs occur.

Leadership Succession

Leadership succession is an organizational event of tremendous importance to those who work in schools. It is conceptualized as an interactive process through which one is integrated into membership in the organization (Hart, 1992; Hart, 1993). It can be very disruptive, and its results can be ineffective and dysfunctional if the new principal does not become an integrated and respected member of the social system whose leadership has received the affirmation of the school as a whole.

In contrast, when a successor achieves this goal, his/her ability to have a positive impact on the school and its performance is substantially enhanced. As this process develops and unfolds in school settings, an administrator undergoes a group membership "boundary passage" resulting in varying degrees of acceptance and legitimacy by the school's staff and/or faculty and others. According to Hart (1993) the manner in which this transition is negotiated has many ramifications for the successor as well as for teachers and others. While principals and those who work with them find the experiences that come with a succession event salient and disruptive (whether positive or negative), inquiry related to succession and to the interaction of individuals with important groups to which they belong remains diffuse.

To help alleviate problems in leadership succession it is apparent that school districts need to consider well-planned strategies when embarking on the planning of administrator succession.
Recruitment and Selection

Leadership shortages are being experienced by a number of school districts in North America and this trend is predicted to accelerate over the next five years. In addition, the role of principal continues to increase in complexity as public expectations rise, diversity flourishes, and reform agendas descend on schools.

Various researchers (Chubb et al., 1990; Hall et al., 1989; Renihan, 1999; Tekeste, 1996) have identified distinct differences between effective principals and those who simply manage rather than lead schools. Successful schools have principals who have a clear vision of where they are going, who are knowledgeable about teaching and education, and who help teachers, parents and students work together towards common goals. Effective administrators build leadership, cooperation, and shared decision-making skills and problem-solving skills in others. In addition they are child advocates and they demonstrate their moral capacity in dealing with ethical situations.

School districts are encouraged to articulate clearly their expectations of school administrators before deciding on specific recruitment procedures. Castetter (1992) asserts that the recruitment process must be an extensive and aggressive program that focuses on placing and keeping a qualified and satisfied administrator. Consequently, the demands of the position and the responsibilities of the administrative role must be clearly explained. There are many common methods of recruiting administrators that range from internal searches and referrals to external searches through university placement services.

The selection process requires a choice of best candidates to fill the administrative positions. Districts need to select personnel who meet qualifications, appear to likely succeed on the job and can be effective contributors to school and district goals. Recruitment and selection practices are affected by factors that include size of school district, increase or decrease in student population, working conditions, salary levels, benefits, and competition for available candidates. It has been demonstrated that well-designed recruiting programs result in greater employee commitment, high productivity, and higher quality of work (Castetter, 1992, p. 112). By recruiting high quality school administrators, the promise of continuously improving schools can be realized.
Socialization

Socialization involves the processes by which administrators learn the skills, knowledge and dispositions required for them to perform their role in an effective manner (Merton, 1963). Preparation of principals involves both professional and organizational socialization.

Professional socialization involves acquiring knowledge, skills, and behaviors through which values and norms of the profession are internalized and a professional identity is established. Van Gennep (1960) describes a three-stage model of professional socialization (separation, transition, and incorporation). Professional socialization begins before an individual is appointed; organizational socialization becomes key once a specific appointment is made.

Organizational socialization is specific to the educational context. Each school is comprised of a complex array of people, policies, processes, and priorities that principals must adjust to. Organizational norms tend to replace those learned during professional socialization as school administrators are interdependent with others they work with in their immediate environment. Although much has been written about beginning teachers and the accompanying trauma that many vividly recall, little has been written about the beginning principal, perhaps because, unlike beginning teachers, beginning principals are continuing in their schoolwork, albeit in a new role. However, as teachers make the transition from being a teacher to being a school administrator so does the emergence of new socialization experiences. At the point of preparing for the administrator role, aspiring administrators begin to take on a new and different role as an educator. Consequently, the need to be re-socialized becomes crucial and a new professional identity suddenly is at the fore (Feldman, 1989; Fein, 1990).

Socialization experiences are both formal and explicit as well as informal and implicit. These experiences can range from carefully planned training programs to unplanned, on-the-job experiences. Experiences can include workshops, formal courses, job shadowing, principal meetings, peer coaching, and mentoring.

A number of factors influence the socialization process of principals and vary across school districts. These factors include internal processes such as personal and professional values (Begley & Camell-Evans, 1992) work setting, climate, relationships
with peers and superiors, district policies and procedures, formal training, and outcomes of the socialization process (Greenfield, 1985; Leithwood, Steinbach & Begley, 1992).

**Accountability**

In recent years there has been a huge concern about accountability and its redefinition in all aspects of education. Much has been written about student accountability, teacher accountability as well as school accountability. However, there has been little done specifically in the area of how school administrators are meeting the demands of accountability.

There are several approaches to accountability: professional approach, market approach, decentralized approach, professional approach, political approach, legal approach, moral approach and management approach to accountability (Wagner, 1989; Leithwood et al., 1999). The concept of new managerialism is at the fore as well. Each of these approaches is focused on a particular set of beliefs and assumptions about schools and how they can change. People will accept accountability processes as they understand them and will reject them if it does not fit with their personal frame of reference.

Some of the issues in accountability that are currently at the forefront include the perception of fairness; changing behaviors; compatibility of accountability systems; lack of understanding; clarity of expectations, purposes or intentions; efficiency of accountability procedures; and tracking. The organization’s ability to address each of these issues is a key factor in implementing and monitoring effective and efficient administrator accountability.

Accountability systems develop around professionally negotiated standards. For school administrators these standards are district oriented. The key task for school districts is to create common expectations among administrators concerning what they are accountable for and how they will be held accountable. District expectations and standards will need to adjust as national/international accountability systems are developed and politically negotiated standards for school performance and across whole school systems emerge. Congruence and linkages between internal and external accountability standards will need to be continually reviewed.
As policymakers review and refine accountability systems, they will recognize the need to ground their designs in a public and professional consensus that allows ownership on the part of educators, parents, business representatives and communities (Gaines & Cornett, 1992). Explicitly linking accountability and responsibility, and balancing public expectations with supports for practice, will better enable accountability systems to play their intended role in promoting stronger performance (Murnane & Levy, 1996).

School districts must reach a level at which they can assert leadership and rally others on behalf of improvement. They need to invest time, energy and money to provide support and training for school administrators to help refine skills and knowledge required to lead and manage change. When school districts clearly articulate their purpose, intentions and expectations through effective succession planning and recruitment this could lead to effective socialization and better understanding of systems accountability.
**Figure 1 - Conceptual Framework**

*School District Response to Demands for Accountability*

1. **Succession Planning**
   - Changing expectations
   - Career patterns
   - Articulation of purpose, intention
   - District Planning
   - Induction
   - PD (Leadership development and renewal)
   - Contractual considerations
   - Development of job description

2. **Recruitment & Selection**
   - Role of the administrator
   - Position demands
   - Knowledge and skills
   - Portfolio development
   - Attracting, screening, identifying
   - Recruitment activities, methods
   - Selection of candidates for vacancies

3. **Socialization**
   - District expectations
   - Professional: informal/formal influences (Certification, modeling, firsthand experience, social learning, deliberate mentoring)
   - Organizational: informal/formal influences (understanding organizational culture, district policies, procedures, processes, priorities, work setting, relationships, skills, norms, values communication)
   - Structured induction experiences
   - Re-socialization (response to changing expectations)

---

District identifies its leadership requirements and competencies to ensure that quality administrators are in place to achieve its vision, mission and goals. This process is facilitated and encouraged via effective recruitment and selection.

Expectations and socialization (planned and unplanned) link to accountability and understanding of accountability system.

Changing expectations have implications for selection and training of school administrators. This articulation becomes an integral part of socialization.
Summary

Although a frequent occurrence in many kinds of organizations, little systematic inquiry of leadership succession in educational settings existed prior to the mid-eighties. Since the mid-1980s the research has been conducted in specific areas of leadership succession planning. While seemingly adequate research has been conducted in the area of administrator succession it appears to have focused specifically on the dynamics of principals and teachers experiencing the effects of succession. It neglects the actual planning process as well as the role of district office as a support structure within this process. While there are leadership models available in the literature, there does not appear to be any "model" for leadership succession planning in any of the research.

The literature shows extensive research in the field of socialization within the context of educational administration while little research has been done on the recruitment and selection processes of school administrators within the same field. Instead a much larger focus has been on teacher recruitment and selection.

Nevertheless, a relatively recent body of literature has begun to emerge providing insight into the stages and dynamics of the succession planning process in school administration with focus on the stages of succession (MacMillan, 1996; ERS, 1998; McMahan, 2000; Monsour, 2000; IEL, 2000; Johnson, 2001), recruitment and selection procedures of aspiring and practicing administrators (Seyfarth, 1999; Robinson, 2000; IEL, 2000; Pounder & Merrill, 2001), and the various socialization opportunities (Hart, 1996; ERS, 1998; Ashby & Krug, 1999; Daresh, 2000) provided by school district personnel to assist these administrators in their roles and functions. Furthermore, in an era of increased accountability in education it is interesting to note that the literature to date has been scant in the area of school administrator accountability or how district office personnel hold school administrators accountable for their roles and functions as administrators. However, literature is emerging in this area as well, albeit brief (Adams & Kirst, 1999; IEL, 2000; NASSP, NAESP & NMPA, 2001; O'Neill, 2001; White, 2001). There is little literature available that directly links leadership succession planning and accountability.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN

Selection of Methods

Qualitative research, in contrast to quantitative research, is "exploratory, and inductive and strives to understand how all parts work together to form a whole" (Merriam, 1988, p. 16). Consequently, I used qualitative research methods in this study because these methods enabled me to explore social processes with focus on "discovery, insight and understanding from the perspectives of those being studied" (Merriam, 1988, p. 3). My intention and purpose was to study leadership succession planning in two Ontario school districts with focus on the succession planning process, recruitment and selection, and socialization processes of school administrators in a holistic way. I focused on the district office personnel, principals, vice-principals as well as teachers aspiring to become school administrators. The context of both school districts was also a major focus in that it was viewed in consideration of the size and location of the districts, and the specific issues and concerns of the participants in relation to leadership succession planning in an era of "redefined" accountability.

Qualitative research is a way of investigating these assumptions based on the belief that there are multiple realities and that the world is not an objective thing out there but a function of personal interaction and perception (Merriam, 1988; 1998). A qualitative research paradigm was consistent with the nature of the research questions of this study and provided a design and methodology that allowed me to understand and interpret leadership succession planning and its influence on school administrators, as well as provide insight into the conditions in both school districts. This approach was also attractive because qualitative data is known for its "unique aspects of richness, complexity, detail, serendipitousness" (Huberman, 1990, p. 128).
The Case Study Approach

This study adopted a cross-case analysis design. It involved collecting and analyzing data from two school districts. It examined and described the leadership succession planning process currently in place with a focus on recruitment, selection, and socialization of school administrators within the context of accountability of administrators involved in these two school districts' initiatives. It traced and documented the leadership succession plans which were developed in 1998 and currently being implemented in 2000-2001.

Within this qualitative research approach, in order to achieve a better understanding and interpretation of observations and interviews, I used a multi-site validation case study method. The case study approach is an "intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit" (Merriam, 1988; 1998). The case study method was selected because of the nature of the research problem and the questions being asked. This design has proved particularly useful for studying educational innovations, for evaluating programs, and for informing policy (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Huberman, 1990; Miles & Huberman, 1994a; Miles & Huberman, 1994b). This type of approach to research focuses on insights, discoveries, and interpretations of educational phenomena. This study sought to describe a specific phenomenon, leadership succession planning: what it includes, the underlying philosophy and structures that support it, and its impact on the professional development of school administrators. In this study, the unit of analysis was the school districts and the phenomenon was leadership succession planning.

There is little agreement on a definition of a case study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988; 1998). The research study focused on holistic description and explanation. As Yin (1994) observes, case study is a design particularly suited to situations in which it is impossible to separate the phenomenon's variables from their context. Becker & Carper (1968), define the purposes of a case study as two-fold: "to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the groups under study," and "to develop general theoretical statements about regularities in social structure and process." (p. 233)

Merriam (1988; 1998) calls the case study an approach to research using naturalistic qualitative methods such as interviews, observations and document analysis.
Yin (1994) and others indicate how difficult it is to do a case study well (Lancy, 1993). Yin provides a definition of the case study that was suitable for my purposes:

[Case study is an] empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context; when the boundaries between phenomena and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used (p. 23).

A case study method can be descriptive and interpretative or descriptive and evaluative. It can provide rich data for analysis. It can provide information that can be used to affect policy, practice and future research (Merriam, 1988; 1998). According to Merriam (1988; 1998), a “qualitative case study is a particularly useful methodology for addressing problems in which understanding is sought in order to improve practice” (p. 32). Since this study was situated in settings which are familiar to practitioners, it is more likely that the research will have an effect on practice (Lieberman, 1988). Most practitioners would be eager to have results that are useful to them (Sarason, 1971; Confrey, 1987). Based on these principles, these case studies were descriptive and interpretative, and produced a detailed view of school districts by providing prescriptive data about a phenomenon under investigation.

The study was conducted in two different settings. According to Huberman (1990), multi-site study is desirable because “idiosyncratic aspects of the sites can be seen in perspective and self-delusion about conclusions is less likely” (p. 129). Also, Miles and Huberman (1994) claim that a “fundamental reason for cross-case analysis is to deepen understanding and explanation” (p. 173). However, Huberman (1990) claims there are no well-developed methods for doing cross-case analysis and one must recognize that the same behavior in two different contexts could have two different meanings. But by holding them up against each other for examination, it is possible to raise issues which contribute to the analysis. While the two cases in this study were meant to stand alone so as not to judge one district against the other as “good” or “bad”, the analysis was specifically meant to describe similarities and differences and understandings across realities.
Rigour of the Study and Generalizability of the Results

Case study methods "strive for the same degree of reliability and validity as any good research method" (Anderson, 1990, p. 157). In discussing the analysis of qualitative research, Lincoln and Guba (1985) use the terms true value for internal validity, consistency for reliability and transferability for external validity. Internal validity, that is, the question of how the findings match the individual's interpretation, is dependent on the credibility and the trustworthiness of the investigator and the informant because the phenomenon in question is seen through their eyes.

The methods used to collect the data support Lincoln et al.’s, (1985) view of internal validity and are achieved by triangulation through the use of multiple informants, checking interpretations with individuals interviewed or observed, staying on site over a period of time, asking peers to comment on emerging findings, and informing participants of the phases of the research (Merriam, 1988;1998). These factors all serve to corroborate the findings and contribute to their trustworthiness. Whereas qualitative researchers have “to question seriously the internal validity of their work” (Merriam, 1988, p. 203), and take the above mentioned precautions, they do not expect other researchers in a similar or even the same situation to replicate their findings in the sense of independently coming to the same conclusions.

Reliability, that is the replication of the study, would certainly be possible in any qualitative study such as this in that it could be easily conducted in another school district because it was a picture of people and events at a point in time that can be reconstructed. What Lincoln et al., (1985) assert is that the outsider agrees that the findings make sense, that they are consistent and dependable.

External validity or generalization of the study is usually rejected as a goal for qualitative researchers or at least it is given a very low priority (Schofield, 1990, p. 202). Anderson (1990) indicates that in contrast to quantitative studies that rely on statistical data for purposes of generalization, qualitative studies rely on analytical generalization. In this study, cross analysis of the two cases provides some generalizations about the findings in terms of similarities and differences.

Stake (1978 cited in Schofield, 1990, p. 208) argues that it is possible to use a process he calls “naturalistic generalization” to take the findings from one study and
apply them to understanding another similar situation. Lancy (1993) supports this position when he says that:

Stake (1978) offers a different view of generalization as applied to the case study: “Case studies...may be...in harmony with the readers' experience and thus...a natural basis for generalization” (p. 5). Put differently, “...Generalizability is ultimately related to what the reader is trying to learn from the case study (Lancy, 1993, p. 165).

Schofield (1990) summarizes the current stance on generalization and suggests that studies in one situation can be used to speak to or to help form a judgement about other situations (p. 208). What is crucial is that there are thick descriptions of the site studied as well as the site to which one wishes to generalize. Merriam (1988; 1998) takes the practical approach: case studies should be founded on the pragmatic paradigm-judge the results by their ability to extend our understanding (p. 173).

This study does extend our understanding of the issues under investigation by providing insights on the nature of leadership succession plans, recruitment and selection procedures, socialization processes and how these processes are linked with accountability.

The Role of the Researcher

The researcher is a primary instrument for collecting and analyzing the data (Merriam, 1988; 1998). The self is an instrument that engages the subject, interprets it and makes sense of it. The researcher must have a "wide range of skills, knowledge and experience; must struggle with ethical questions, such as the selection of data; must understand and address their own biases; and must attempt to remain neutral." (Burgess, 1982, p. 183)

"At the heart of qualitative approach is the assumption that a piece of qualitative research is very much influenced by the researcher's individual attributes and perspectives" (Schofield, 1990, p. 203). While many researchers may strive for objectivity and find that it is impossible to achieve in qualitative studies, Wolcott (1990) sees subjectivity as the very strength of qualitative approaches and prefers to be subjective rather than attempt a type of detached objectivity (Wolcott, 1990, p.130). Much is to be gained by the researcher being in the middle of the action. The possibility
of neutrality in a descriptive study is highly unlikely according to Soltis (1990). By its very nature, a qualitative study "places the researcher in a face to face relationship with other human beings." (p. 252)

Qualitative researchers, whether in interviewing or in participant observation, are so palpably, inescapably present that they cannot delude themselves that who they are will not make a difference in the outcomes of their study. To be sure, most social research entails interaction- covert researchers are a notable exception-between researcher and researched. All social research is directed to topics that bear directly or indirectly on the life of the researcher. Accordingly, continued attention to subjectivity is rooted in the very nature of any social research that uses qualitative methods (Jansen & Peshkin, 1992, p. 720-721).

The tendency to bias is more likely to occur in evaluative qualitative research because it involves judgment of others (Soltis, 1990, p.252). Since it is difficult to avoid bias of one sort or another, what matters is that the researcher acknowledges the bias and describes his/her personal influence in writing up the report and goes on from there (Wolcott, 1990). Those with greatest maturity in research skill demonstrate their integrity by admitting without reserve that bias is omnipresent and may very well have influenced their study. With this knowledge, we may then appraise the research realistically and judge its merits honestly (Leedy, 1993, p.215).

Regardless of these positions, the researcher must be aware of the potential for bias at each stage of the study. I do not feel that any extraordinary personal or professional bias was present during this study. I have worked in many school districts as an educator (teacher, administrator, consultant) for 20 years in the public education system in Newfoundland and Labrador. I was not familiar with the procedures and practices of leadership succession planning as such procedures or practices do not exist in any of the school districts in which I have been employed. Moreover, I was not predisposed to recognizing and valuing any similar practices in comparison to my own experiences in the two school districts under study. Nevertheless, as an experienced educator, there may have been issues during the formal interviews and informal discussions from which possible biases might have emanated.
**Ethical Considerations**

This study followed the procedures outlined by the University of Toronto in the Ethical Review Process, as well as the guidelines for ethical research set out by Bouma and Atkinson (1997) and by Anderson (1989;1990). Patton (1990;1998) asserts that research procedures can effect lives of the respondents in many ways. It was, therefore, imperative that the researcher remained aware of potential dangers, and adhered to the professional and safe conduct of procedures. Many ethical procedures are instituted for that purpose. Once accepted, this research, while in its proposal stage, was approved by the Ethical Review Departmental Coordinator and the Student Education Ethical Review Committee (SEERC) of University of Toronto.

When conducting qualitative research using observation-participant methods, one must be aware of the possibilities of participant exploitation due to the interactive nature of the process. Glesne et al., (1992) warn of the inclination on the part of the researcher to take on the role of the "reformer" or "advocate" (p. 112). Confidentiality, anonymity, the right to privacy (Anderson, 1990, p.24) and the avoidance of exploitation (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) are key concepts that the researcher must be aware of. In this study, ethical safeguards such as informing the participants of the nature and purpose of the research and assuring them that their identity would not be divulged were carefully followed. Also, I assured the participants of the confidentiality of the substance of the interviews. A personal code of behavior whereby I was careful not to pry into areas that were not pertinent to the study, and a recognition of the seriousness of this sharing of information guided my comportment at all times.

I was prepared, organized and considerate of participants in the study. Interviews were clearly focused and consisted only of questions relating to the research objective (Bouma & Atkinson,1997). Written permission for the study was sought from each school district director and all participants before the study began. Participants were informed about how the study was to proceed, the feedback process, and how the results would be used. Participation was voluntary and all participants had the right to withdraw from the study at any time. Respect for the information shared with some candor but off the record was maintained. Ethical reasoning requires thought, insight, and sensitivity (Tri Council,1997). Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured for all participants.
District Selection and Sampling

For the purpose of this thesis, the two districts in this study were selected to represent multiple situations and two different contexts. Such generalizations as may be possible in a cross-case study are more reliable when the sample includes a range of variation on important explanatory factors (Miles et al., 1984; Miles et al., 1994a; 1994b). This allowed me to identify particular conditions under which certain findings seem to apply and not apply. Accordingly, the sample of administrators aimed for variety in factors such as school location (urban, rural), panel (secondary, elementary), and stages of administrator development (candidate, new and experienced vice-principals and principals). Likewise, the district office personnel who were involved with succession planning and leadership development, either as director, staff development officers or superintendents of curriculum and instruction for various assigned "families" of schools.

In purposive sampling, (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992) one chooses the site(s) that will yield the maximum information regarding the specific topic/issue one is investigating. Hence, one chooses sites which are somehow representative for the phenomenon of interest. The two school districts were selected because they are similar in size and currently have leadership succession plans in place. A purposive sampling approach was used to ensure a representative selection of central office personnel (director, superintendents of education and educational officers in charge of professional/leadership development), candidates and administrators representing both elementary and secondary panels, areas in the school districts (i.e. urban, rural), gender, and stages of leadership development (i.e. candidates, principals and vice-principals both new and experienced) for interviews. Once this criteria was fulfilled a series of generated lists were compiled from which random selection occurred.

Data Collection/Timeline

Data collection methods included interviews, observations, and document analysis. The primary data sources were semi-structured and focus group interviews. Supplementary sources included documents, anecdotal data, and research reflections. In conducting case studies, it is usually recommended that there be multiple sources of data in order to ensure the robustness of the evidence (Merriam, 1998; 1998; Yin, 1989;
This study occurred during the 2000-2001 school year. Data were collected over a period of eight months. There were twenty visits to District A and twenty-four site visits to District B. The site visits included 7 interview visits and thirteen observations in District A and 7 interview visits and seventeen observations in District B.

The data collection involved triangulation within the qualitative methodology paradigm (Mathison, 1988). The use of multiple perspectives involved all three strategies of open-ended, semi-structured individual and focus groups interviewing, observing, and analyzing documents. Data collection focused on providing description from which tentative conclusions and conceptual enrichment for further studies could be drawn. (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984; Strauss, & Corbin, 1994).

Prior to the study, interview questions were pilot-tested with appropriate personnel (e.g., principals, district office personnel). The qualitative data consisted of "direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge" obtained through interviews; "detailed descriptions of people's activities, behaviors, actions" recorded in observations; and "excerpts, quotations, or entire passages" extracted from various types of documents (Patton, 1998, p.10).

For the purposes of this study, data were collected primarily through on-site interviews of the participants mentioned above. Direct observations during on site visits, and documentation such as reports, newsletters, newspaper accounts, meeting agendas, annual reports, materials from workshops and in-services were collected and analyzed to help answer the research questions concerned with description and meaning. On-site investigation of this case study involved observing and talking informally and formally with people, and examining documents and materials that were part of the context (Stake, 1978; Stake, 1995) as well as attending school district meetings, administrator workshops and attending many school administrator training sessions where and when appropriate. As Patton (1998) points out, "multiple sources of information are sought and used because no single source of information can be trusted to provide a comprehensive perspective"(p.244).

The use of a combination of observations, interviewing (both focus group and individual) and document analysis, allowed for the validation and "cross-checking" of findings (Patton, 1998, p.244). A journal of field notes was used to record impressions
and observations during the research. The element of structure from the conceptual framework and the open-ended dimension allowed for the mining of new data and openness to fresh observations and new concepts (Merriam, 1998).

**Semi-structured Interviews.** There were twelve individual interviews conducted in total in both District A and B. These interviews included a principal, district directors, superintendents and educational staff development officers. This approach provided different perspectives on Leadership Succession Planning. Individual interviews were important in obtaining details on the district activities, the sequence of events, and the specifics of Leadership Succession Planning initiatives. An interview protocol was used to guide the interviews. Patton (1990) describes the intent of the interview process as a means of data collection.

Six focus group interviews were conducted with principals, vice-principals and aspiring administrators. Due to unforeseen circumstances (weather) during the focus group interviews for vice-principals and candidates in District B, two of the vice-principals and one aspiring administrator needed to leave early. These particular participants wanted to continue the interview process on paper. Therefore they were given a copy of the interview protocol which they completed and returned to me within one week. Since the data gathered from these three participants were consistent with the data gathered from the focus groups, it added to the reliability and validity of the responses. Hence, this procedure did not contaminate the already gathered data.

Focus group interviews provided the opportunity for candidates and practicing administrators, both new and experienced, to elaborate on their experiences and to share their insights on Leadership Succession Planning in their individual districts. In addition, participants reacted to others responses and contributed their responses. The same four research questions guided focus group interviews. Follow-up questions were asked related to the particular responses provided.

We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe. We cannot observe feelings, thoughts and interaction. We cannot observe behaviors that took place at some previous points in time, we cannot observe situations that preclude the presence of an observer. We cannot observe how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world. We have to ask people questions
about those things. The purpose of interviewing, then is to allow us to enter into another person’s perspectives (Patton, 1990, p. 72).

Woods (1986) and Gibney (1987) suggest that interviews often represent the only way of finding out what perspectives are held by people. The interviewee needs to feel that he/she can trust the interviewer. In conducting interviews, the researcher must establish a strong rapport (Burgess, 1982), demonstrate attentive behavior, including active listening and receptive posture (Anderson, 1990, p.222). These strategies help to create an atmosphere conducive to probing for deeper meaning and new clues (Burgess, 1982, p.107) in order to acquire the highest quality of data. Woods (1986) also goes as far as to suggest that there must be a relationship between the participant and the interviewer which transcends the research, promotes bonds of friendship, and a joint pursuit of a common mission which rises above personal egos. This may have been the case in a few of the interviews I conducted, but certainly not in all of them.

The qualitative use of interviewing using a schedule of fixed questions rests on the interpretative view that social reality is constructed through social interaction rooted in the concepts and use of language (Hughes, 1990). Using the semi-structured interview format, I was able to explain the purpose of the research, clarify individual questions, follow up on incomplete or unclear responses, and probe to follow through on particular areas of interest. The participants therefore were able to provide more detail if they desired as well as provide individual perspectives on each of the issues addressed in the general format. I attempted to conduct the interviews in a relaxed and non-threatening atmosphere and made every attempt to maintain a professional and friendly demeanor.

A weakness of the interview process that could have been pertinent to this study was the possibility that participants did not respond openly, honestly and willingly (Powney & Watts, 1987). However, my frequent visits to these school districts and interaction with the participants casts doubt on this possibility because I had established a level of comfort with most of those interviewed. To many I was a familiar figure at their district in-services and workshops that were held at the Education Centers in District A and District B, as well as at one local hotel in District B. It is also possible that the informants’ views were unrepresentative of others in the district offices and district schools. There may be other administrators who would not share the same views
regarding the questions asked. However, it was my impression, from lengthy periods of
time on both sites that the information I gathered was as accurate and representative as it
could be.

Both purposive and random selection procedures were used in identifying
participants. The individuals (e.g., superintendents, directors, principal, educational
officers) were contacted because of their roles and particular perspectives. The focus
group of administrators and candidates were randomly selected based on a set of criteria
(rural, urban, secondary, elementary, new, experienced, male, female) from a series of
generated lists.

Observations/Fieldnotes. One of the most basic techniques for gathering data is
observation (Bouma et al., 1997). It is considered a major means of collecting data in
determined from interviews in two ways: First, observations take place in the natural field
setting instead of a setting designated for the purpose of interviewing; second,
observational data represent a firsthand encounter with the phenomenon of interest rather
than a secondhand account of the world obtained in an interview” (p. 111). Observation
is a research tool when it serves a formulated research purpose, is planned deliberately,
is recorded systematically, and is subjected to checks and controls on validity and
reliability. Fieldwork, as participant observation is often called, involves going to the
site, program, institution, setting-the field-to observe the phenomenon under study. The
observation is only half the process. Observations must be recorded in as much detail as
possible to form the data-base for analysis. Field notes can come in many forms, but at
the least they include descriptions, direct quotations, and observer comments
(Merriam, 1988; 1998).

I was on site in District A 13 times for observation purposes and 17 times in
District B. Within the 17 observation visits in District B were blocks of two-day stints.
These two-day stints occurred because of administrator workshops that were scheduled
for two consecutive days and which I attended. During each round of data collection I
toured central offices and talked with various personnel. I had informal conversations
with central office personnel, had breakfast and lunch with many administrators and
attended the workshops and/or in-services in its entirety.
I carried my journal for note taking with me at all times. I took notes of artifacts, central office trophy cases, gathered materials used at workshops, noted quotes from internal and external presenters and others in attendance, as well as noted other celebratory displays. I listened to informal announcements made at district offices regarding upcoming meetings or urgent messages. I engaged in note taking while observing the informal discussions or idle "chit-chat" as well as facial expressions as people reacted to each other at tables during workshops and training sessions. These experiences allowed me to better understand the school districts contexts. These unstructured observations and conversations with school administrators and central office personnel provided an opportunity to gain an in-depth understanding of the school districts' culture and history. "A knowledge of the setting and the people in it helps one get a sense of which questions to ask, of whom, when, and in what manner" (Wolcott, 1988. p.199). Having been on site for the collection of data I became known to the participants and was able to develop a pleasant relationship with them.

I frequently took field notes to record information acquired through informal conversations and my personal reflections to provide insight into the culture and context of each school district. I believe that as an observer I acquired insights mentioned by Glesne et al., (1992):

Though being a part of a social setting—you will learn firsthand how the actions of your others correspond to their words, see patterns of behavior; experience the unexpected, as well as the expected, and develop a quality of trust with your others that motivates them to tell you what otherwise they might not (Glesne et al., 1992).

My relationship, as observer to those being observed, was what Gold (1958) refers to as Observer as participant. My observer activities were known to all the groups. I was invited to participate in all workshop and training activities. However, I chose to observe the activities instead as an observer-participant and not as participant-observer. Participation in the group was definitely secondary to my role as information gatherer. Using this method, I was able to gain access to many people and to a wide range of information. However, Merriam (1998) indicates that "the level of information revealed is controlled by the group members being investigated" (p. 101). Adler and Adler (1994, p. 380) differentiate this "peripheral membership role" from the active membership role.
Here the researcher "observes and interacts closely enough with members to establish an insider's identity without participating in those activities constituting the core of the group membership." (p. 380).

**Document Review.** Interviewing and observing are two data collection strategies designed to gather data that specifically address the research question. Documents were a third source of data and provided essential information on District A and B. Documents, however, are usually produced for reasons other than the research at hand and therefore are not subject to the same limitations. The presence of documents does not intrude upon or alter the setting in ways that the presence of the investigator often does. Nor are documents dependent upon the whims of human beings whose cooperation is essential for collecting good data through interviews and observations. Congruence between documents and the research problem depends on the researcher's flexibility in construing the problem and the related questions. According to Merriam (1998, p.133), "such a stance is particularly fitting in qualitative studies, which, by their very nature, are emergent in design and inductive in analysis. Documents of all types can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the research problem".

During each round of data collection, I toured central offices in search for pertinent documents related to district demographics, leadership development, succession planning, recruitment and selection procedures, professional development documents as well as district accountability documents. I collected documents on the schools, the district, and some provincial documents. Table 1 serves as a snapshot of the number of district site/interviews, and observations.
Table 1 - Site Visits and Observations by District (2000-2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site/Interview Visits</th>
<th>Observations/Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments. Semi structured interviews of the participants were conducted as described in Table 2:

Table 2 - Participants by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Superintendents and/or Educational Officers/ (Individual Interviews)</th>
<th>Candidates (Focus Group Interviews)</th>
<th>Principals (Focus Group Interviews)</th>
<th>Vice-Principals (Focus Group Interviews)</th>
<th>Directors (Individual Interviews)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Round One: (October/November/January, 2000-2001) Interviews of the central office personnel in both districts. (See interview protocol: Appendix A)

Round Two: (November/December, 2000- January/February, 2001) Interviews of focus groups of candidates, vice-principals and principals. (See interview protocol: Appendix B)

These various interview schedules provided data for this study from four different points of view: the aspiring school administrators, vice-principals, principals, and central office personnel. The interview schedules were developed according to concepts of leadership succession planning, recruitment and selection of school administrators, socialization processes, and accountability.

The interviews were conducted in the fall of the year 2000 and the winter of the year 2001 because the professional development activities on leadership succession planning as well as leadership development were scheduled during this time period. The focus group interviews with principals and vice-principals were either held on days of professional development (before sessions begun, during lunch, or after sessions were finished for the day) or on the day prior to professional development. In District A one focus group interview was conducted in early morning before a scheduled workshop began; another was conducted during lunch break between sessions on the same day. Both interviews were held at the Education Centre. In District B the two focus group
interviews were held in late evening after school council meetings on two consecutive evenings at a local hotel prior to a scheduled professional development workshop at the same hotel. The focus group interviews with aspiring administrators were held after school hours at the Education Centre in both districts. As the interviews were completed in each time frame, I was able to review them in order to guide the development of the interview schedules for the next round. This enabled me to probe deeper into some issues during other interviews and the time span allowed me to check and recheck the data as it unfolded.

Interviews were carried out on site and were tape-recorded. They lasted between one hour (central office personnel) to two hours (all focus group participants). The interviews were transcribed immediately following each round. An interview guide was developed for each round of questions in order to maintain the focus of the research questions. The questions were framed in an open-ended manner with the participants. They were often asked to elaborate on an experience to illustrate a point more fully. The guide was helpful as some participants required more prompting than others and some occasionally lost their focus. The guide was also helpful in keeping the interviewer from getting lost in the discussion.

Data Analysis/Timeline

Interview data were initially analyzed using the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss et al., 1990) based on the content of the interviews. This method compares incident with incident, identifies categories, tries them out and possibly discards them. Following the suggestions of Glaser and Strauss outlined by Merriam (1988, p.60), constant comparative analysis of the data follows four approximate stages. First, speculative or tentative analysis during data collection may serve to further sharpen certain foci of the study, to reveal major insights, or to stimulate further pursuit of certain aspects of the literature (Merriam,1988; Merriam,1998). As additional data are analyzed, the categories will be refined or added to as each incident with properties of the category is considered or reconsidered. In the third stage, the refined categories reach a highly conceptualized level from which hypotheses are proposed. The final stage of this inductive and flexible process involves actual writing of the theory from coded data.
Glaser et al. (1967) developed the concept that theory should be grounded in the data. It is not imposed in a preordained fashion but rather emanates from the data itself. "Theory should emerge...it should never just be put together" (1967, p.41). The data in this study led towards the development of a slightly different framework from the original framework of leadership succession planning. The framework that emerged from the data is further described in Chapter Seven.

Miles & Huberman (1984) support the use of qualitative data for building theory and for substantiating or extending existing theory and frameworks:

Qualitative data...are the source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts. With qualitative data, one can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations. Then too, qualitative data are more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and to new theoretical integrations; they help researchers go beyond initial preconceptions and frameworks. Finally, the findings from qualitative studies have a quality of "undeniability" (p.15).

Guided by the research questions, all interviews were transcribed. Interview data and other data (e.g., documents, journal notes) were first read and re-read, keeping track of themes, patterns, hunches, and ideas within each case and across cases (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Coding categories were developed by listing themes and concepts which were evident in the data, or suggested by the conceptual framework and the data (Gray et al., 1999). The leadership practices, recruitment and selection practices, socialization experiences and opportunities as well as participants understanding of accountability practices were major themes, as were the conditions in both school districts. "By analyzing the data, the researcher generates a typology of concepts, gives the names or uses "native" labels, and then discusses them one by one" (Glesne et al., p.165).

As all of the data were coded, these categories were refined (i.e., expanded, eliminated, reframed). As needed, typologies or classification schemes were developed to clearly identify themes and concepts (Taylor et al.,1984). Effects matrices and site dynamic matrices offered promising tools for individual case analysis (Miles et al., 1984; Miles et al., 1994; Denzin et al., 1994).

In addition, commonalities and differences across the two cases were developed from an analysis of this data. The cross-case analysis may illuminate the kind of setting to
which a particular theory or sub-theory may apply and indicate, within the limitation of case study generalization, the range of generality of a finding or explanation (Miles et al., 1984; Miles et al., 1994). Data analysis began during data collection and gave direction for follow up in subsequent site visits.

The timeline for the data analysis was ongoing. Following content analysis of data within the conceptual framework, case descriptions were shared with administrative personnel who were part of the initial interviews from each district. There were five administrators from District A and six administrators from District B who volunteered to read their individual cases to check for inaccuracies and to make recommendations. These administrators, selected randomly from the lists of participants who agreed in writing to participate in the follow-up reading process, were representative of both panels, both genders, both urban or rural, and at least one senior administrator, one candidate, one vice-principal and one principal. These participants were invited to provide further input and to make suggestions regarding questions, and events for any follow-up data collection.

I proceeded in the analysis in the following way. After reading all of the transcripts and identifying themes and patterns, I coded individual group response sets (i.e., vice-principals, principals, candidates, and senior administrators). I developed matrices in which I placed response sets. I pursued this system for all of the transcripts, building a separate matrix for each research question and for each perspective (i.e., senior administrator, candidate, vice-principal, principal). I was constantly comparing the data to the framework, revisiting the literature as well as reorganizing and combining subsets of responses until I finally arrived at overarching categories that summed up what I believed the participants' words meant. I tried not to push or force interpretations without enough support and not to take some things for granted. Then I counted the number of responses in each category in order to determine some similarities and differences between the two school districts and to provide data for cross-case analysis. I then combined the data for each school district into one matrix consisting of the broad category in one cell, and the number of responses for each school district in their individual cell, with a cell for the total. I followed the advice of Miles et al., (1994) regarding counting. I found that the procedure helped to verify what was there and kept
me "analytically honest" (p.53). I did not want to be wrong, to inflate something on limited evidence. Counting prevented me from seeing something that I might have wanted to see.

I had initially planned to use grounded theory for the entire analysis but as I worked through the various themes relative to the research questions, theory and constructs from other investigations emerged. "Theory and constructs...provide shells or frameworks that often represent a focus or broad questions for interpretative research" (Keedy, 1992, p. 159). I found that I was able to apply these empirically based concepts in analyzing some of the data. As recommended by Brinberg and McGrath (1982), "the investigator must explore whether there is a plausible, conceptual explanation for the findings" (p.18). And so I did give in to some predefined concepts. I looked to the literature on various constructs and applied these constructs of issues to guide the categories for issues in these two cases as is applicable to leadership succession planning.

**Reporting the Findings**

I created tables for the data display and wrote narrative descriptions that describe responses to each of the research questions. I wanted to display the findings through the use of expressive language, often based on the voices of the participants. I also used tables to illustrate various components of each district's protocols based on the data. Miles et al., (1984) recommend that there be data displays to help analyze one's data and communicate findings:

> Better displays are a major venue to valid qualitative analysis. Displays are designed to assess organized information in an immediately accessible, compact form, so that the analyst can see what is happening and either draw justified conclusions or move on to the next step analysis the display suggests may be useful (pp.21-22).

I presented the data from four points of view: central office personnel, administrator candidates, vice-principals and principals of each school district. In addition a great deal of document analysis was used as were observation data. There were situations however, where it was necessary to combine two of the perspectives due to
lack of evidence from one category of sources. Also, some of the participants interviewed in focus groups had more to say than others.

The findings are reported in sections that correspond to the research questions and they are organized around individual cases of the two school districts.

The Setting

Since the aim of qualitative research is discovery that leads to new insights, events cannot be understood adequately if isolated from their contexts. It is therefore important to recognize the uniqueness of educational settings. The effects of how school district context features support or constrain administrators' work has been examined in the research.

A description of the school district as a workplace allows us to identify certain organizational arrangements, conditions and practices that support or constrain any innovation. "When conducting a case study, investigators saturate themselves in the setting and probe in-depth to identify the variables that relate to their problem" (Van Dalen, 1997, p. 280). Chapters Four and Five are written in narrative form and include a description of the two participating school districts in terms of the characteristics of the location, the demographics of each district and their historical context. Names of the school districts are referred to as A and B and participants in the study are numerically designated in each district profile in an attempt to ensure anonymity.

The following is a brief summary in tabular form of the four research questions and the categories that were part of the theoretical framework. All four research questions are reported according to the given categories based on the constructs within the conceptual framework. The perspectives are those of candidates, vice-principals, principals, and senior administrators. The fourth research question served as the overarching impetus or set of social circumstances for the other three research questions. Its purpose was to help explore and describe how the two school districts use leadership succession planning as a tool to hold school administrators accountable for their roles and functions as administrators.

Table 3 describes the four research questions used in this study. It also lists the constructs/variables derived from the literature that helped frame the research questions.
Table 3 - Framing of the Four Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question 1</th>
<th>Research Question 2</th>
<th>Research Question 3</th>
<th>Research Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Nature of Philosophy and Structure of Leadership Succession Planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Nature of Recruitment and Selection Processes of School Administrators</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Nature of Professional and Organizational Socialization Processes of School Administrators</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Nature of Accountability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Constructs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changing Expectations</td>
<td>- Role of the School Administrator</td>
<td>- District Expectations</td>
<td>- Purposes and Intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Career Patterns</td>
<td>- Position Demands</td>
<td>- Structured Induction Opportunities</td>
<td>- District Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Induction</td>
<td>- Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>- Professional Socialization</td>
<td>- Leadership succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purpose and Intention</td>
<td>- Portfolio Development</td>
<td>- Organizational Socialization</td>
<td>- Portfolio and Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District Planning</td>
<td>- Attracting, Screening and Identifying</td>
<td>- Re-socialization</td>
<td>- Accountability Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professional Development</td>
<td>- Recruitment Procedures for School Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership Development</td>
<td>- Selection Procedures for School Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR
CASE #1: SCHOOL DISTRICT A

Context

District A is a large Canadian school district with a little more than 67,000 students in 98 elementary schools and 19 secondary schools. There are approximately 3,700 teachers (2,400 elementary, 1,300 secondary), and 244 school administrators (183 elementary, 61 secondary) and approximately 6,000 employees in total. District A is a mix between urban and rural, industrial and agricultural, inner-city and suburban. About 80% of the students live in middle-sized urban centers (the largest city has a population of 140,000); the remaining students live in rural areas. District A is increasingly becoming more multicultural with a large contingency of its population from the Caribbean. Approximately 15% of District A students come from visible minorities. The school system is organized into seven geographical areas with schools operating in a “family of schools” (a secondary school and feeder schools) under the supervision of one of the 10 superintendents.

The mission statement of District A indicates they are “committed to serving the community by establishing and communicating clear educational directions. Through progressive policies, measurable goals and collaborative leadership, it provides students with quality instruction and learning opportunities in a caring environment.” That mission statement was created from value statements collected from the district’s teachers, administrators, students, parents, and business community. District A is a partnership of students, educators, parents and community. Through quality instruction, shared accountability and commitment to collaboration, the Board fosters lifelong learning in a diverse and changing society (District Document, 1997). Table 4 indicates the various articulated philosophical educational commitments in District A.
### Table 4 - Educational Commitments
(District Document, November, 1997)

- Maintaining a student focus in decision-making
- Providing equal opportunities for all to learn
- Promoting the interdependence of individuals, groups and services within the community in support of quality of education
- Encouraging students to value, experience and be responsible for personal success
- Reflecting the cultural diversity of our community
- Fostering a climate of respect for self and others
- Providing a safe, supportive environment
- Promoting awareness of global community in which we all live
- Preparing students for the future

In 1996, this district accepted a very prestigious international award as the most innovative school district. District A was recognized for:

continued success achieved through the development of a school system dedicated to the improvement of quality and offering optimal freedom of organization to the individual schools, thus enabling students to discover their full potential (District Newspaper, May, 1999).

The prize money was placed into a special fund. The interest earned from the fund is used to promote staff development. According to the director, District A is recognized for its dedication to quality improvement and organizational freedom.
Demographics

Demographic data presented in Table 5 describes the district. Table 6 describes the gender, current role, stage of administration, panel, and geographical location of the participants. Table 7 contains a list of dates and events observed by the researcher. Table 8 presents a list of district documents that were used to support the data analysis.

Table 5 - District Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 98 Elementary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 19 Secondary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Supervisory Officers (including Director and Executive Assistants)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teaching Staff</td>
<td>• 2,375 Elementary Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,281 Secondary Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 117 Elementary Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 62 Elementary Vice-Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 24 Secondary Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 45 Secondary Vice-Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of employees</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of District</td>
<td>7 areas with 19 families of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td>$375 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 - Participants Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Administrative Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vice-principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>&lt; 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>10-15 (Admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years (Admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>10-15 (Admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>10-15 (Admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years (Admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 5 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>5-10 (Admin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates: 6 (3 male, 3 female, 2 Secondary, 4 Elementary, 4 Urban, 2 Rural)
V-Principals: 5 (2 male, 3 female, 2 Secondary, 3 Elementary, 4 Urban, 1 Rural)
Principals: 5 (3 male, 2 female, 4 Elementary, 1 Secondary, 3 Urban, 2 Rural)
Central Office Personnel: 6 (4 male, 2 female)
Total: Male: 12, Female: 10
Table 7 - Observations and Dates of Administrators Workshops

- District A’s Administrators’ Workshop (August, 2000)
- Area Administrators Meeting (August, 2000).
- Administration Preparation Program: General Overview (December, 2000)
- District Educational Officers: Administrator Preparation Course: Introductory Session to Portfolio Process (January, 2001)
- District Educational Officers: “Change Game/Portfolio – II” (February, 2001)
- Administrator Facilitators: “Leadership Styles –III” (February, 2001)
- Quantum Learning Institute (February, 2001).
- Educational Officers/Supervisory Officers: “Job – Shadowing/Debrief –V” (March, 2001)

Table 8 - Documents Reviewed in District A

- District A School Board (Information Calendar, 2000-2001).
- District A School Board Survey (Fall, 1998).
- District A Digest: Staff Newsletter (February, 1999).
- District Newspaper: Look at us (May, 1999).
- Annual Report (June, 1999).
- A Survey of Board History and Local Issues: Accountability and Assessment of District A (Spring, 1999).
- Annual Report (June, 2000).
- District Newspaper: Look at us (June, 2000).
- Memo to Parents from Director (September, 2000).
- Report To Administrative Council: School Leadership Study(October, 2000).
- Professional Development Documents: Helping You Grow (Leadership opportunities for Fall, 2000).
  - Management Strategies (October, 2000).
• Brain Theory (October, 2000).
• Cooperative Learning (November, 2000).
• Multiple Intelligences Institute (November, 2000).
• Portfolio Assessment (November, 2000).
• Kagan Cooperative Structures (November, 2000).
• Integrating Computers and Instructional Strategies (December, 2000).
• Cooperative Learning Level 1 Institute (December, 2000).
• Building Bridges Between Assessment, Instruction and Learning (December, 2000).

• Welcome to your Child's School: Working Together for a Better Education In District A (Fall, 2000).
• United Way 2000: Caring by Sharing (Fall, 2000).
• Opening doors: A Focus Day On Learning Disabilities For Elementary and Secondary Administrators (December, 2000).
• Facts About the Education and Accountability Office: A Board update (Fall, 2000).
• Facts About School Community Partnerships In District A (Fall, 2000).
• Facts about Assessment/Evaluation of Student Achievement in District A (Fall, 2000).
• Welcome to District A School Board (Fall, 2000).
• Directory of District A's School Administrators (Fall, 2000).
• Lists of Training Sessions Registrants (Fall, 2000).
• Flyers sent to all Potential Administrators in Administration Preparation Program including: (Making time for valuable work by K. Freeston, 1998; In the right context by R. Dufour, 2001; The Vice-principal doing it all by S. Dinnendahl, 1996; Use time for faculty study by C. Murphy, 1999; Becoming a better principal by J. Hewitt, 1988).
• Lists of Leadership quotes used in Training Sessions (Fall, 2000).
• Promotional procedures for Administrators in District A (Fall, 2000).
• Performance Appraisals for Administrators in District A (Fall, 2000).
• Administration Preparation Program Document for District A (December, 2000).
• Training proposals of School Administrators including: Principals Role as Change Agent: Systems Thinking, Systems Changing; Principals Role as Curriculum/Instructional Leader: Principals Role in Establishing a Positive School Culture; Principals Role in Inclusionary Practices (Special education).
• District A Continuing Education Document (January, 2001).
• Professional Review and Development of District A's Administrators (February, 2001).
• Learning Consortium Conference Review: Building Quality Learning Environments (February, 2001).
• Legal Issues in Administration, Professional Principal Series in Partnership with Ministry of Education. Ontario principals' Council Exemplary Leadership in Public Education (April, 2001)
The Nature of Leadership Succession Planning

Rationale: As is prevalent across North America this Canadian School District is faced with the challenge of a leadership crisis - the impending shortage of school leaders caused by the significant numbers of school based administrators who are rapidly approaching retirement age and by the relative few qualified applicants who are seeking to replace them. Key district personnel have left the profession through retirements, or moved to other jobs in response to a large and sudden political and policy shift within the province. Public education in the province of Ontario has undergone changes in practically every area including curriculum, assessment, structure, governance, accountability, and funding. The leadership shortage has resulted in one third of elementary schools in the district with teachers who have been appointed as administrators with no training or qualifications, while the majority of senior administrators are eligible for retirement within the next two years. As one senior administrator states:

We had became aware that with the eighty-five factor being a reality instead of ninety, that we had people who would retire earlier without penalty, and needed to plan actively for their replacement. We have had a philosophy I think within the board that we will provide leadership opportunities, succession planning for our members as a preference to going outside the board. So currently if we are looking at people who applied to us as a vice-principal we would accept them as a teacher, and then have them go through a process to become a vice-principal once they were here.

This is supported by a principal who states:

We were in a situation where we had to hire quite a number of acting vice-principals in the two previous years. And that’s revealed the shortage for administration, due to the implementation of the 85 factor which had quite a dramatic impact on the number of retiring administrators.

Changing Expectations: The purpose of the school leadership study that was developed in District A was to help with the districts’ leadership succession planning. There is the common belief of District A that leadership development must change in order for the district administrators to meet the myriad of challenges that they are currently facing including changes in student population, structures, curriculum, governance and accountability. The district will provide leadership opportunities and
professional development experiences for all aspiring administrators as well as current administrators to ensure professional growth and preparation for the changing role of the school administrator (Transcripts from Senior Administrators, Candidates, Principals and Vice- Principals). One senior administrator commented that “due to government legislation the principal’s role has changed and also the superintendent’s role. In addition the board’s role has changed in terms of compliance that we would need to understand what teachers believe to be the factors that would cause them to consider administration...or not”.

In District A the idea that leadership of change resides in one individual is commonly rejected. Rather, it is believed that leadership comes from different sources in different situations over time. The principal, key teachers, superintendents, parents, trustees, instructional strategies’ facilitators, governments, universities and others all have leadership roles to play if education is to be truly a successful enterprise (District Document, June, 1997). Based on discussions with several principals and vice principals there is a perception that leadership can and does come from multiple sources simultaneously. This is supported in a district document (1997):

As a change agent, the principal must undertake to understand the school culture while valuing teachers and their professional growth. In a system like District A, where opportunities for staff development are plentiful, principals can support the on-going training for teachers. This gives administrators an opportunity to extend what they value while at the same time expressing those values by word, action and deed. By ensuring that teachers and administrators attend training in teams, principals promote the value of collaboration.

District Planning: On November 2, 1998, a report prepared by a supervisory officer within the district was taken to Administrative Council outlining the parameters of a leadership study on the shortage of school leaders in District A. On November 4, 1998, a memo and multiple copies of the survey were distributed to elementary and secondary principals requesting them to identify teachers who may be interested in pursuing an administrative position in the near or distant future. These teachers were then invited by principals to complete a survey and/or attend a focus group session. Surveys were also distributed to the Elementary Acting Vice-principals.
A review of the literature on the shortage of school leaders was conducted as well to see if other jurisdictions were encountering a similar problem. The review indicated that while several areas in the United States and United Kingdom had experienced a lack of interest in school leadership positions, the results were inconclusive (Administrative Report to Administrative Council, 1999). However, there was evidence which supported the complex role of the administrator, and the conflicting expectations that he/she encounters in the position. The support for mentorship, leadership, and other formal preparation programs for new administrators was also highlighted. Consequently, Leadership succession Planning was reborn. One senior administrator comments on the philosophy of succession planning as it relates to district planning:

My belief is that, one, we're in dire straits for new leaders, and two, we need to have a plan to address this. We need to have the best people having a little bit of economics background...and we're in a situation of supply and demand, where the demand far exceeds the supply. And you know, we need to be thinking about where we're going to be in the future.

A candidate indicates the importance of system leaders:

I think for a lot of us the philosophy is for us to change our focus as teachers seeing the broader issues. We have to change our perspectives and our level of thinking. It's a system wide belief that we need to have more interested and qualified people to take on the roles as leaders.

This is further elaborated on by a vice-principal:

It fits in with the life long learning. I think that is a phrase that I hear over and over again, and in our interviews to hire we ask that question, what is the meaning, what does life long learning mean to you? So it's something I think that they see anyone involved in this School Board is assuming to be a life longer learner, and develop professionally in whatever areas you need to develop. Succession planning is preparing us for that.

District documents (1996) indicate that central office personnel has supported the development of its leaders diligently. It started with a clear sense of direction. The System Plan and its strategic direction provide a clear vision of present and future action. The Director of Education identifies in his/her management plan the practical action
items he/she will pursue to give life to the plan. These items that are identified by the director are those items already happening or need to happen. A senior administrator stated “leadership means understanding and knowing the good things that are occurring and then providing the support and confirmation that those initiatives are valuable and worth pursuing”.

**Goal Plan: The Structure of Leadership Succession Planning**

In structuring the district’s succession planning development the leadership survey findings contributed to the design of the leadership model in the following ways:

**Career Patterns:** Since legislated changes had occurred that affected the principal’s role, the superintendent’s role, as well as the boards role, school administrators and senior administrators in District A would need to understand what teachers believed to be the factors that would cause them to consider administration, or not consider administration. As one senior administrator indicated:

> We expect principals to work on developing leaders in their school...In terms of numbers of people who are not qualified who are in this acting interim role and may want to pursue it further or may not. And what an exciting way to get qualified or at least to see if you'd be interested in getting qualified.

As a result a memorandum was developed that went to principals requesting them to identify teachers who may be interested in pursuing a career. They were invited to complete a survey. In addition there were a number of focus sessions where people came to meetings that were held by senior administration to discuss the role, to understand what they saw the role becoming, and the factors that prevented them from becoming an administrator within the board. All administrators and teachers had become aware that with the “eighty-five” factor being a reality instead of ninety, they had people who would retire earlier without penalty and needed to plan actively for their replacement. The “eighty-five “ factor meant that teachers and administrators whose age and number of years teaching equaled 85 (initially it was 90) were eligible for retirement with full pension benefits. The survey and the leadership discussion at the focus group meetings,
really centered on why these people would see administration as a career opportunity for them, and what the deterrents would be (Senior Administrator, Principals, Vice-Principals, Candidates).

The results of the leadership study indicated a strong interest from study participants and current school administrators for necessary further work in the development of school leaders. Table 9 indicates the common themes that were raised in response to District A's leadership study and warranted a need for the district's central office to act immediately. Consequently, leadership succession planning took precedence in preparing potential and practicing school leaders for their roles and functions as school administrators.
Table 9 - Findings From District A's School Leadership Study  
(District Document, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Review of current promotion procedures in District A (portfolio and interview process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Ongoing information sessions on promotion procedures (two or three per year for anyone interested in administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Identification of teachers who have leadership abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Development of a skills profile for school administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Ongoing support and nurturing of potential school administrators by current school administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Inclusion of “leadership” section on new teachers performance appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Introduction of formal mentoring program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Introduction of leadership program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Introduction of job shadowing opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Further discussion around subsidy of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Discussion of “acting” vice-principal positions as a system requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Further discussion around the movement and relocation of school administrators (perhaps a discussion/survey with current administrators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Improvement of communication and support among school and board administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Induction: One of the key elements of succession planning that District A considers important is an effective induction program. Throughout the administration preparation program there are a series of structured induction opportunities whereby administrator candidates engage in reflection, to think about their ethical stances and their commitment to the profession. Mentoring, for example, is seen as a consistent activity from pre-service to in-service and part of the early preparation program. As one senior administrator notes:

We help establish candidates in small groups with experienced mentors, and it may be involved in questioning, it may be involved in problem solving situation analysis...We actually start helping them prepare their portfolio. ...from there we then start working on problem solving models and curriculum implementation models, crisis management models, and we work on practicing those... work on the actual interviewing skills, the actual interview questions...we're running everybody through a series of mock interviews. This is somewhat of an induction of early preparation program.

Leadership Development: Based on the concerns from the survey, the district created a leadership model that would meet the training needs of the current school administrators and those within the system who aspired to be school administrators. The staff development committee met and developed a model, a four stage model of what the district wanted from leaders. From a staff development point of view, they considered two components; (1) early identification as a starting point, and; (2) preparation, for recognizing candidates who have made a commitment to come forward and having them prepared. The committee did the initial promotion work, so once a candidate made the short list for vice-principal or principal, it then established some programs for them, and followed those programs through. For the candidates who were promoted, a leadership effectiveness component across the district was created. This program is a LEAD (Leadership Effectiveness Across District A) program that provides candidates with the “nuts and bolts” of the theory for a year. The same group of candidates were followed and monitored for a year. For the practicing administrators, a renewal program was created that included a number of different components appropriate for that group.

Table 10 indicates the structure for the new leadership model that has been designed in District A. This model was created in response to the disturbing anecdotal
evidence about schools that lack qualified applicants to fill vice-principal and principal vacancies that have become commonplace in Southern Ontario. Table 11 is a further description of the leadership stages and expectations in District A.

**Table 10 - Leadership Model in District A**  
(District Document, 1999)

| Comprehensive Real Life Leadership Model (Adopted by District) |
| "A Leadership Model for the Millennium" |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Additional Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration Preparation Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going Personal Development</td>
<td>Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
<td>Social Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Building Leadership Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Skills</td>
<td>Community Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Skills – day to day operations</td>
<td>Personal Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 - Model Stages of Leadership Development in District A (District Document, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Development</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Personal Skills</th>
<th>Management Skills</th>
<th>Leadership Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Identification</td>
<td>* Specialist&lt;br&gt;* M. Ed&lt;br&gt;* Principal’s 1 &amp; 2&lt;br&gt;* A. Q.</td>
<td>* Communication&lt;br&gt;* Interpersonal&lt;br&gt;* Integrity&lt;br&gt;* Sense of humor&lt;br&gt;* Balance&lt;br&gt;* Wellness self&lt;br&gt;* Listening skills</td>
<td>* Conflict resolution at school level</td>
<td>* Division Chair&lt;br&gt;* DESA&lt;br&gt;* ETFO/OSSTF&lt;br&gt;* Community Work&lt;br&gt;* Innovation&lt;br&gt;* curriculum leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>* administration preparation&lt;br&gt;* mentoring&lt;br&gt;* facilitation skills&lt;br&gt;* curriculum&lt;br&gt;* CRDI&lt;br&gt;* portfolio&lt;br&gt;* interview skills</td>
<td>* maturity&lt;br&gt;* enthusiasm&lt;br&gt;* perceptiveness&lt;br&gt;* empathy&lt;br&gt;* wellness others</td>
<td>* assessment&lt;br&gt;* community partnerships&lt;br&gt;* S.C.C.&lt;br&gt;* Budget&lt;br&gt;* Acts &amp; regulations&lt;br&gt;* Policy &amp; Procedures&lt;br&gt;* Health &amp; Safety&lt;br&gt;* Special Education</td>
<td>* effective schools&lt;br&gt;* current research&lt;br&gt;* team building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Promotion</td>
<td>* LEAD program (V.P &amp; P)&lt;br&gt;* Covey&lt;br&gt;* Conflict resolution&lt;br&gt;* Political skills&lt;br&gt;* School plans</td>
<td>* direction setting&lt;br&gt;* school plans&lt;br&gt;* vision&lt;br&gt;* confidence&lt;br&gt;* counseling</td>
<td>* eye of the storm&lt;br&gt;* appraisal/documentation&lt;br&gt;* community partnerships&lt;br&gt;* collective agreements&lt;br&gt;* hiring/interview skills</td>
<td>* models of instruction&lt;br&gt;* cultivating relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal</td>
<td>* Covey&lt;br&gt;* Political skills</td>
<td>* soft skills&lt;br&gt;* wellness-self &amp; others&lt;br&gt;* counseling</td>
<td>* community partnerships</td>
<td>* building leadership capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* P: Principal<br> V.P.: Vice-Principal

There were two other categories that were contained in the initial conceptual framework as possibly being significant variables in the structure of Leadership Succession Planning. The categories are: Contractual Considerations and Administrator Job Description. As important as these categories may or may not be to succession planning, both of these categories became more apparent under the construct of recruitment and selection, consequently shifting the framework. Therefore both categories will be discussed in the following section.
The Nature of Recruitment and Selection

The process of recruitment and selection of school administrators largely depends on the expectations of the role. In District A the expectations of the principal generally include the roles of: instructional leader, disciplinarian, supervisor, fundraiser, public relations expert and fiscal manager (Boyer, 1983; Ogden & Germinario, 1995; Ashby & Krug, 1998; Seyfarth, 1999; Begley, 2000; 2001). In support of the literature it is agreed that more accountability and responsibility have been added to the job over the years. However, it should be noted that principals do not “do it all” but the actions and the context they shape with others (teachers, staff, parents, students) make it possible to teach and learn (Tanner & Stone, 1998).

Role of the School Administrator: Successful schools have principals who regularly engage in establishing a productive and professional school culture (Beeson & Matthews, 1992; Weindling, 1992; Ogden & Germinario, 1995; Roher et al, 2000). The principal creates a school’s vision for success by promoting a school culture where staff, students, and community members have common school goals that become more important than individual self-interests (Ogden et al., pp. 27-28). Many principals state that they spend a majority of their time on administrative and managerial tasks rather than on those that directly affect curriculum and instruction.

In recruiting and selecting potential administrators to fill administrative vacancies within District A it has become expected that practicing administrators identify potential candidates within each school who demonstrate leadership potential. However, the process does not exclude other candidates who might be interested in becoming administrators. Today’s principals face more complex expectations forged by a very different student population and a new generation dissatisfied with the educational status quo. At a time when many view the schools as one of the few intact social organizations, students come with very different attitudes, motivations, and needs than students of generations past. Today’s principals often need to find ways of inducing students to learn despite their most ardent attempts to escape. Schools and the principals who lead them into the 21st century, must adapt to different roles, different needs, and different strategies. Therefore, when senior administrators and on-site administrators identify potential leaders in District A the local role requires global understanding.
**Attracting, Screening and Identifying Candidate:** In terms of staff development, the leadership development programs are very expensive programs. And while school administrators are charged to participate in them, the staff development department through the board absorbs the cost for the vast majority of this programming. They have just asked for and received additional funding for leadership training for the school year 2001-2002. Therefore, it has been identified as a high priority for attracting more candidates and as one senior administrator indicated, “keeping the administrators we have”.

Since the initial survey results conducted in District A regarding the interest of candidates to pursue administrative positions, there is a review each year of the current promotion procedures to attract candidates. The district has streamlined the portfolio process, conducted on-going information sessions on promotional procedures through staff development and through the superintendents. Principals are expected to identify potential candidates. This process is meant to ensure people's understanding of what's expected. As one senior administrator explains:

In the identification of teachers, one of my common questions when I'm in schools to principals is: ‘beyond your vice-principal if you have one, who are the people who will be the leaders of our future in this school?’ And if I get the, 'well I don't know that yet', I have the discussion about a leaders job is to make themselves dispensable as someone else who can provide the skills.

The recruitment of candidates generally happens either at school level or through a department at district level (area team level). One principal described it as follows:

A vice-principal, principal, or a superintendent would recognize somebody's skills and say, 'you know you look like you have these skills. Have you considered or have you thought about moving in this direction?’ There are people who come in and their very first day of teaching know that somewhere along the line this isn't what they want to do, and start working you know very eagerly towards that role. So sometimes they're not always the people we want.

Another principal adds another component:

Self-selection is probably the biggest formal part of this process. A lot of the other selection occurs informally where somebody would you know
watch the work that they've done, tap them on the shoulder and say, you know you've done a good job with this. You're really you know you appear to have the skills, you know do you have the qualifications? Are you interested in getting the qualifications and maybe mentor them from a far?

This is reinforced by a senior administrator:

Well you can self-select. You can decide you want to apply to be a vice-principal, but you require the signature of your school principal and of your school superintendent or whoever is responsible for that particular area...We have a young relatively inexperienced group system wide, because of a lot of retirements. They would have been through the process themselves in recent years. So, but if you had a principal, because I have a couple, who are very close to retirement, if you had someone that you weren't confident was going to give you the information you needed, you would probably sign up for one of the courses offered, so that you could hear. Because it talks about the courses, actually focus on how you prepare your portfolio, how you prepare for the interviews. It's a very detailed preparation, run by staff development.

There are opportunities for candidates to attend training sessions throughout the recruitment and selection process. All staffs are given this information during the recruitment stage. The Administration Preparation Program is one of the several opportunities that candidates can engage in preparing for the administrative role. This program is offered through staff development and is for potential administrators in both elementary and secondary panels who have expressed interest in pursuit of the role. In addition to this it has become an expectation now for informal discussion about the role of the administrator between supervisory officer and potential administrators as was indicated by this senior administrator:

Often times potential administrators will say, 'can I come and talk to you?' They need my signature and there are those who would, if they had known me for a long time say, 'how do you want to do this? Do you want me to come and see you, are you going to be in the school?' And often times I don't need a meeting with some that I've been working with for a number of years in terms of knowing and understanding their planned career...So I can suggest to them issues that they want to spend some time considering, and maybe even plan typical questions and answers. And that is what these study groups would be doing, and I had those same conversations with people coming forward.
The supervisory officers and the on-site administrators support the candidates as much as they can through informal dialogue regarding the recruitment and selection process. As one senior administrator stated:

We have administrators in both panels who offer kind of mentorship groups, and they get together, study groups and they talk about issues and so on. So it's a real preparation for the interview as well as for getting the portfolio ready. It would seem to me that if you're applying to be an administrator and you understand what the portfolio is asking for, that would be a true indicator of what was being valued by the system.

Table 12 is a sample of the elements of a typical “Administration Preparation Program” in District A. The content is evaluated regularly by the different cohorts of candidates with the staff development department. Changes to the content, or delivery style, are based on reactions and suggestions of “graduates”.
### Table 12 - Sample of Administration Preparation Program in District A  
(District Document, 2000-2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Dates &amp; Times</th>
<th>Supply Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Overview Session** | General Information  
* overview  
* expectations  
* job shadow info. | December 14, 2000  
* Room number  
* 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. | After school |
| **Session I**   | Introductory Session  
* introduction to portfolio/process  
* electronic portfolio  
* job shadowing information packages | January 12, 2001  
* Room Number  
* 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Supply Codes  
Elementary—Code?  
Secondary—Code? |
| **Job Shadowing** | **Job Shadowing**  
* 2 x1/2 days | **to be completed between January 15 & March 1, 2001** | Supply Codes  
Elementary—Code?  
Secondary—Code? |
| **Session II**  | Change Game  
Portfolio Session  
* brainstorming session  
* philosophy statements  
* professional library visit | February 1, 2001  
* Room Number  
* 9:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Supply Codes  
Elementary—Code?  
Secondary—Code? |
| **Session III** | Leadership Styles | February 12, 2001  
* Room Number  
* 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Supply Codes  
Elementary—Code?  
Secondary—Code? |
| **Session IV**  | Interviewing Skills | February 20, 2001  
* Room Number  
* 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. | Supply Codes  
Elementary—Code?  
Secondary—Code? |
| **Session V**   | Job Shadowing/Debrief  | March 1, 2001  
* Room Number  
* 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | Supply Codes  
Elementary—Code?  
Secondary—Code? |
| **Session VI**  | Mock Interviews to be held after March Break for Spring Candidates and in September for Fall Candidates. | | |

**Position Demands:** Among the participants who participated in this study it was agreed that one of the principal’s key tasks is to build a structure of relationships in the school so that all students have the opportunity to learn. As the literature indicates, in order to do this, the principal must have and use professional knowledge and skills to create a school environment in which children achieve their potential (Barbour, 1994; Ashby et al., 1998). In District A it is the responsibility of the school district to ensure that
up and coming effective school administrators are appropriately recruited and selected as they prepare for the school administrator role to meet these demands.

**Knowledge and Skills:** School districts are encouraged to recruit and select administrators with expert leadership qualities. In response to the need for a current image of the administrator role, staff development personnel in District A have developed a "leadership profile" resource to support principal preparation that conforms to the key functions and current expectations.

In accordance with the "leadership profile" outlined in the literature (Begley, 2000; 2001) it is widely believed and supported among the participants of this research in District A that having knowledge and skills, in a broader scheme of the administrator role, include the principal as manager; program leader and learning facilitator; school-community facilitator; visionary; and problem-solver. Embedded in the leadership qualification procedure in District A is the formal qualifications required of the school administrator for knowledge and skill development.

How does one become a principal in Ontario? Principals at this time must hold, according to Regulation 297/298 of Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1990, principal's qualifications; or a principal's certificate that is a qualification to be a principal or vice principal. Presently, to apply for principal's qualifications a candidate must have an undergraduate degree, a teacher's certificate, qualification in three divisions, one of which must be in the intermediate division, have completed a Master's degree or two specialist qualifications or one specialist qualification plus half a Master's degree. In addition, candidates must have at least five years of teaching experience, two of which must be in Ontario.

Table 13 indicates the qualifications for promotional practices as well as provides guidelines currently practiced in District A. Table 14 indicates the additional experiences for administrators.
### Table 13 - Administrator Qualifications For Promotion Practices and Guidelines
(District Document, January, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Formal Qualifications: Candidates must</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vice-Principal | - Hold a valid Ontario Teachers' Certificate  
                   - Have successfully completed all parts of the Ministry of Education and Training Principal’s Courses: Part 1 and 2, prior to application. |
|            | Qualifying Experience:                                                                               |
|            | - Candidates who are teachers in the elementary panel may apply for elementary vice-principal short-listing. |
|            | - Candidates who are teachers in the secondary panel may apply for secondary vice-principal short-listing. |
|            | - Candidates in a seconded position, or on exchange, may apply for vice-principal short-listing to the panel in which they were a teacher immediately before the start of the secondment or exchange. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Formal Qualifications: Candidates must</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Principal  | - Hold a valid Ontario Teacher’s Certificate  
                   - Have successfully completed all parts of the Ministry of Education and Training Principal’s Courses, Part 1 and 2, prior to application. |
|            | Qualifying Experience:                                                                               |
|            | - Candidates who are vice-principals in the elementary panel may apply for elementary principal short-listing. |
|            | - Candidates who are vice-principals in the secondary panel may apply for secondary principal short-listing. |
|            | - Candidates in a seconded position, or on exchange, may apply for principal short-listing to the panel of which they were a member immediately before the start of the secondment or exchange. |
|            | - Candidates must have had experience as a vice-principal or principal. |
Table 14 - Additional Experience for Vice-Principal and Principals
(District Document, January, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certain experiences will increase the probability of promotion of candidates to the position of vice-principal or principal. Examples include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Effective leadership within the school;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement with the development and implementation of effective instructional strategies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement in curricular and co-curricular activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completion of a graduate degree in education or the equivalent;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience as an education officer, administrative officer, consultant, facilitator, or in another related role;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective service on system-wide committee(s);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An exchange or assignment that provided experience in another panel, division, school, or central office;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience in teaching a Ministry of Education and Training of Faculty of education course;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership experience in an environment beyond the school system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership in professional educational organizations such as a federation or an organization related to a subject or specialty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection: Application Process in District A (District Document, 1998)

Internal Candidates. The application and the short-listing process begins with a conference between a candidate and his/her principal, vice-principal (if applicable), and a supervisory officer. The purpose of this conference is to discuss the promotion process and the level of preparedness of the candidate. This conference must occur before the first day in April in the same year the candidate submits a portfolio package. At the conference, there is a growth plan developed jointly by the principal and candidate to assist the candidate in the short-listing process.
Candidates must receive the Statement of Recommendation in writing from a superintendent and principal. Those completing the Statement of Recommendation for internal candidates must be current or recently retired (one year) employees of District A School Board and must have worked directly with the candidate during the last three years. It is the responsibility of the candidate to keep the current principal and superintendent informed of the application if the current principal or superintendent is not involved in the signing of the Statement of Recommendation.

Superintendents and principals will inform all candidates whether they agree to sign a Statement of Recommendation. A candidate who is refused a recommendation by a principal, supervisor, or superintendent is entitled to a written explanation if requested. This is given to the candidate within five working days.

**Portfolio Development.** In District A it is encouraged and expected that all potential school administrators, including practicing administrators, develop an administrator portfolio in order to have themselves prepared for the recruitment and selection process. The portfolio process is widely perceived by aspiring and practicing administrators as well as central office personnel as a strategy for meeting the needs of educators, schools and district. In its development, administrators construct their own philosophy of leadership and a vision for teaching and learning. They develop both school and professional goals linked to their own professional development and the needs of their students and teachers. Table 15 describes the portfolio contents.
Table 15 - Administration Promotion Portfolio Components
(District Document, 2000)

1. There is one submission only for each of the sections of the portfolio package. The submissions should include input from a variety of people who are familiar with the candidate’s work, including those in supervisory positions, colleagues, parents, students, and members of the community at large.

- Demonstrated Leadership and/or Experience in Enhancing Teaching and Learning
- Demonstrated Leadership and/or Experience in Implementing Technology
- Demonstrated Leadership and/or Experience in meeting the Needs of Identified/At Risk Students
- Demonstrated Leadership and/or Experience in Developing and Maintaining School/Community Relations
- Demonstrated Leadership and/or Experience in Fostering a Positive School Climate
- Demonstrated Leadership and/or Experience in Facilitating Professional Growth of Self and Others

2. Letter of Recommendation or Commendation

Candidates may attach a maximum of three letters of recommendation or commendation. Where possible, these letters should reflect training and experience the candidate has gained that are not already described in the portfolio. Letters of recommendation or commendation should be unsolicited and not requested purposefully for the short listing process.

3. A personal belief statement about education.

4. The most recent appraisal.

5. A copy of the most recent Certificate of Qualifications from the Ontario College of Teachers.

6. A chronology of Teaching and Employment Experience and Educational Background.

7. The statement of Recommendation signed by a superintendent of education and principal.

8. Principal Input.

The principal Input is to be completed by the candidates' principal and discussed with the candidate before it is submitted in the portfolio. The candidate's signature indicates only that she/he has participated in the discussion with the principal and is aware of its contents.

Principals are asked to provide information about the candidate's strength in the following areas:

- Curriculum
- Climate
- Communication
- Organization
- Leadership

In addition, area(s) of growth are to be identified, and the principal has the opportunity to provide additional information in a summary statement. The growth plan is to be developed jointly by the principal and the candidate.

9. Guidelines for the candidates supervisor or contact person completing the Assessment section of the portfolio sheets.
External Candidates. It is generally not part of the protocol of District A to promote external candidates to administrative positions within its district. However, when it is necessary, for whatever reason, it is the members of the Administrative Council who decide to seek applications from external candidates. To apply for the position of vice-principal or principal, a candidate working outside District A must send a package as described above to the Superintendent of Education/Operations. Where, in the opinion of the Administrative Council, there is insufficient time for completion of the portfolio, the candidates will submit a resume that reflects the priorities of training or experience outlined in the portfolio package. External candidates submitting a package must have their supervisory officer and principal (or current supervisor) complete the Statement of Recommendation.

The guidelines for the external candidate’s supervisor or contact person completing the Assessment section of the portfolio sheets are as follows: (District Document, 1998-2000).

- Relate comments directly to the candidate’s description as stated in the top section
- Comment on the results that the candidate describes
- Focus comments on the specific area identified and not on the candidate’s general suitability for an administrative position
- Put comments in terms of an assessment of what the candidate has done or learned (i.e. successful or not in the endeavor).
- Make comments brief (point or nugget form is quite acceptable)
- Be honest and factual if you do not agree with the candidate’s comments.

In District A it is an unwritten rule that when there are leadership opportunities provided and succession planning strategies in place for personnel within the district, hiring will take place within the school district as a preference to hiring candidates outside the board. However, due to the recent leadership shortages, there have been a couple of occasions where hiring from outside the district was necessary. This can create issues not only for the board, but also for the new administrator being hired.

Contractual Considerations: Instead of promoting external candidates for administrative roles immediately, there have been occasions when administrators from outside the district have been hired on as teachers and then eventually moved into an administrator role. It has been a recent practice in District A to allow unqualified
candidates (without formal qualifications) to fulfill the role of "interim administrative" positions with conditions attached. Since it is widely believed by the district that succession planning and the development of leadership skills is the responsibility of every leader at every level, it was determined that a skills profile for administrators would be included in a leadership section of the newly revised teacher performance appraisals. The teacher appraisal protocol is currently being revised. The purpose of this newly added section to the teacher appraisal protocol is to develop a formal mentoring program. There is an agreement with the teachers federations on who will be interim vice-principals while they are unqualified and seeking their qualifications. It is agreed that these interim administrators can return to federation membership after one year without penalty if they decide not to continue. According to one senior administrator there are some positive and negative issues related to this as well:

The teacher’s federation and the Ontario College of Teachers have been terrific. The Ontario Principal’s Council has to approve all contracts of acting vice-principals. The only thing that acting vice-principals don’t do that other people do, is they don’t evaluate teachers while they are still technically a part of the federation. So it becomes a larger issue with the principal. The upside of this is we have a recruitment pool of people who are learning what the job is about under a principal while they are being qualified, and then can determine whether they wish to go on or not, and are gaining skills at the same time.

We as I said, have had an excellent relationship with federation. They think it is a great thing, and we do as well. When you ask the question of shortage in regard to leaders across the province, our group who responded to the leadership study indicated that the political situation was the main issue for shortage of administrators, and then increased stress on job leaving the federation too little money for too many hassles, and cost of qualifications. Now in dealing with this we have the last part, cost of qualifications, we have relationships with colleges and faculties to provide courses within our district so that at least the expensive travel put aside, so that people can take the necessary qualifications very close to home.

The Administrative Interview Process. Once the application process for the short lists is completed and the individual portfolios are submitted to their assigned supervisory officers with the required signed documentation, preparation for the interview process begins (District Document, 1998; 2000).
Composition of Interview Team. The Superintendent of Education/Operations is responsible for establishing four interview teams each comprised of five administrators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Principal short listing:</th>
<th>3 Supervisory Officers and 2 Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Vice-Principal short listing:</td>
<td>at least 2 Supervisory Officers and up to 3 Principals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each interview team has at least one female and one male member. The composition of the interview teams are structured to ensure maximum objectivity. The Superintendent of Education/Operations appoints a supervisory officer to act as the leader of each interview team.

Responsibilities. The Superintendent of Education/Operations provides each member of the interview team with the application package of each candidate at least five days before the interview. The leader of each interview team meets with the team members in advance of the interview process to co-ordinate the development of the questions and to determine how decisions are made. Each team member has an equal voice in the process.

Principal interview teams are responsible for interviewing all the recommended candidates for either the elementary principal or secondary principal short list. Vice-principal interview teams are responsible for interviewing all the recommended candidates for either the elementary vice-principal or secondary vice-principal short list.

The Interview. Wherever possible, the Administrative Interview occurs about mid-November. The leader of each interview team notifies the candidates of the date, place, and time of their interview at least two days before it takes place. The interview process is approximately one hour in length and consists of two parts.

The Interview

- A 20 minute planning period during which candidates are asked to organize their thoughts around an assigned topic which is the subject of the first question in the structured interview.
- A 40 minute structured interview based on the criteria defined in the material contained in the application portfolio.
All candidates have the right to a debriefing which generally occurs within one month of the creation of the short list. Prior to the debriefing session the interview team collaborates on a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates and identify opportunities for growth. One of the supervisory officers and one additional member of the interview team meet with each candidate to conduct the debriefing.

**The Short Listing Process.** The short listing process begins with an identification of need for administrators. By October of each year, the Administrative Council identifies the number of administrative vacancies anticipated for the following year for each of:

- Elementary vice-principal
- Secondary vice-principal
- Elementary principal
- Secondary principal

Usually it is the Superintendent of Education/Operations who communicates this information to the leader of each interview team as well as to the system.

**Creating The Short List.** After the interviews have taken place, each interview team prepares its list of recommended candidates for presentation to Administrative Council. When input has been received from Administrative Council, the interview teams reconvene and prepare their final list of recommended candidates. The list is then submitted to Administrative Council and the Board.

**Notification of Results.** When the short lists have been presented to the Board, results are then communicated to the candidates by their respective supervisory officer. The Superintendent of Education/Operations co-ordinates this procedure. Candidates on the short list complete a Career Planning form and submit it to their Superintendent of Education and the Superintendent of Education/Operations. This form is kept on file for consideration by Administrative Council when vacancies are filled.

**Selection From The Short List.** When placing candidates from the relevant short list, system, school, and individual needs are then considered. Successful short listed candidates are placed prior to candidates on any subsequent short list.

**Insufficient Number of Successful Candidates.** If an interview team cannot recommend a sufficient number of candidates to fill the vacancies, the Superintendent of Education/Operations makes a request that Administrative Council develop a plan to deal with the situation. Administrative Council may consider the following:
• A second round of interviews
• Candidates who will be qualified by the time they assume a position
• Acting assignments
• External hiring and or other options

**Job Description:** According to various participants there is no standardized job description for the principal or vice-principal role. One candidate (recently placed) stated, "The job description really depends on the principal. My principal limited the numbers of tasks I was originally assigned to do since I was teaching 60% of my time". Linked with the job description is an element of consultation whereby all candidates are asked to complete a career plan. According to one senior administrator:

A career plan asks several questions. It doesn't ask for specific schools, but asks the question as to whether there's an individual school that they would not want to be placed for any personal reason. For example there may be an ex spouse sitting in that school and I don't want to make them feel uncomfortable. And that's information I would like to have. So we generally I do it first of all on paper, then individual superintendents of area who also consult with the individuals to find out what their career paths are as well, and what they would like.

It has become very important in the District A that personnel, at the school and central office, know and understand what the needs are for their individual schools. Based on a needs assessment, it then becomes equally important that the role, functions and expectations of the principal are clearly defined and articulated at the outset.

At the core of hiring the most capable administrators is the selection process based on the pool announcement. Principal selection begins with the declaration of a vacancy. District A does not specify in the vacancy announcement the particular school where there is an opening since the philosophy encompasses the need for "system-wide administrators". Rather, the announcements call for applications for the various pools in general. The District would more likely attract appropriate candidates if they listed information concerning the special needs and characteristics of a school in the vacancy announcement. Selectors assess and try to match candidate's skills and leadership styles with the particular needs of a school in order to select the right person for the job.

According to various participants in this study, District A needs to include in its pool description the needs to be accomplished in different schools by whoever fills the
position; important characteristics of the existing staff, student’s family background, cultures, extra curricular concerns and feelings about school; information about other executives in the school system.

Despite the process of the recruitment and well-structured selection procedure there were some issues that emerged from the data from various administrators:

There is not enough consultation between senior administrators with school administrators and candidates about where they will be placed (Candidate).

There is some cross-over problems from panel to panel. A Vice-Principal in the secondary should not be able to get a placement as a Principal in Elementary yet it sometimes happens. It never happens vice-versa (Vice-Principal).

The portfolio process takes way too much time and very little of it is raised at the interview even though we are told initially that it will play a huge role in the interview (Vice-Principal).

Sometimes there is way too short notice given to principals about preparing to lose a teacher or the Vice-Principal. One day notice...that’s it. (Principal).

When I left my school to be placed, my job was advertised for three weeks before getting filled. My principal was not at all pleased. He didn’t have time to prepare (Vice-Principal).

There is never any time to experience the new culture in the new school prior to placements (Vice-Principal)

There needs to be something more formal in monitoring the recruitment activities for Candidates. At the moment there isn’t (Senior Administrator).

Table 16 summarizes the Process of the Recruitment and Selection in District A.
Table 16 - Recruitment and Selection Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative council identifies vacancies for following year</td>
<td>• Administrator preparation begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short-listing process (School district needs assessment is conducted for</td>
<td>• Growth plan develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators in October)</td>
<td>• Portfolio unfolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizing staff</td>
<td>• Application process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-site administrators are expected to informally identify potential</td>
<td>• Conference between candidate and his/her principal/vice-principal and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidates (Internal searches/early identification with formal</td>
<td>superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualifications)</td>
<td>• Candidate receives statement of recommendation from principal and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-selection occurs</td>
<td>superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information sessions are held for all interested candidates</td>
<td>• Mid-November the interview process begins (1 hour in length, consists of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role of administrator and district expectations are outlined</td>
<td>parts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pools open for both panels for all internal candidates</td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses are assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview teams prepares list for recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative council gives input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview teams reconvene and finalizes list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates are notified of the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates wait placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsuccessful candidates are given a debriefing and can re-apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient number of successful candidates can result in a second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>round of interviews or acting assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Nature of Socialization

It is widely believed by practicing educators and the public that administrators are capable of having a substantial impact on schools. In addition, this claim is supported by several empirical studies as studies have shown since the 1970s (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousens, 1990). The actual impact that administrators have on schools is largely explained by differences in the nature of their leadership practices at a professional level as well as at an organizational level.

Since my research explored the district's role in leadership succession planning and leadership development for school administrators, it seemed appropriate to examine the various professional and organizational socialization opportunities and experiences that the district office provided for its administrators. It seemed fitting to describe these opportunities and experiences and what impact they have in assisting administrators with their roles and functions. Finally, with the administrator leadership shortage in Ontario at an all-time high, it seemed important to understand the purposes of socialization opportunities and whether or not these opportunities helped to attract a larger percentage of candidates to the role of administrators as well as helped to retain practicing administrators in District A. In other words it became important to examine the impact and/or influence of socialization on administrators.

Socialization, as it applied to my research, involves the processes described by Merton (1963) by which individuals selectively acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions need to perform adequately a social role (in this case aspiring and practicing vice-principals and principals). These processes can range from well-planned, formal training programs, opportunities, and/or experiences to less formal but still planned experiences and opportunities (working with mentors) to largely informal, unplanned, on-the-job experiences.

**District A’s Expectations:** Both school and senior administrators in District A engage in a great deal of networking. These networking projects involve what one senior administrator refers to as “group things where we can learn from each other”. The district office has moved from having four superintendents of curriculum and instruction, who were directly responsible for schools, to currently operating with eight. As a result, the district has changed from four areas to eight areas, so that supervisory officers can be
supportive of the schools, principals and leadership in each area. Consequently, there is a smaller basis per number of administrators per superintendent. In describing what the district expectations include one senior administrator said:

Senior administration is in a leader-servant role. We provide certainly expectations for leadership but we're a service industry. The schools can exist without us. We're only here in as much as we can provide service to kids. And part of that is through having administrators who are curriculum leaders, who can communicate with the public, who can explain test results, who can develop action plans, who can work with teachers to bring out the best results who know about staff development and it's indirect and direct results on student learning, who can model for students what learning and leadership is. And so we have more superintendents being more directly involved with principals in helping them, who are basically a new group.

It has been clearly indicated in District A, through its leadership model, what the expectations are from its school administrators. There was a consultation process with school administrators in its development; therefore, a collaborative effort among various educators resulted it what is referred to among school administrators and senior administrators in the district as "A Comprehensive Leadership Model for the Millennium". There are four components with sub-components contained within this model: Professional Development, Personal Skill Development, Leadership, and Management Skills. The model stages of leadership clearly articulate District A's expectations as these expectations apply to aspiring administrators in their early identification stage, preparation stage and initial promotion. The model also describes a renewal stage for practicing administrators. Professional and Organizational socialization opportunities and experiences are embedded in these expectations (SeeTable 11).

**Professional Socialization:** Professional socialization generally begins in the early stages of a school administrator's career and continues into early post-appointment growth and development. As part of succession planning in District A, it is expected that professional development and administrator in-services become an integral part of the professional preparation. According to one senior administrator upon receiving a letter of invitation to attend the formal training and preparation program administrators are automatically expected to attend:

As soon as you get short-listed, the principal can get appointed, you get a letter and you're invited to come to this training...more then invited...
we’ve asked our superintendent to make it an expectation that new vice-principals will attend their sessions, and the new principals will attend theirs. We sometimes have people who haven’t even taken their coat off in the vice-principal role, and they’re now principal. So they may never have been in the school as an administrator for a whole year for a whole cycle. They tell us they benefit from the training program.

One principal spoke of the importance of having a mentor and coach in preparing for the principal’s role. The others all agreed.

When I first became an elementary principal, two of the biggest mentors I had were principals of the schools where I was the vice-principal. So it was a very informal…they coached me along…They became the people that I called my ‘go to people.’ I also had a number of people in the system who I had worked with, so the vast majority of people were very experienced principals. So I could call on a number of people to go through situations, I wasn’t always calling the same person. Talking about the triangle, the base of the triangle was very experienced, and the peak of the triangle was those of us who were new.

A vice-principal supported the importance of the mentoring notion:

There is some deliberate mentoring happening. I had fabulous mentors. I wouldn’t be as comfortable with my job as I am if it weren’t for my mentor.

A senior administrator placed emphasis on the importance of “interim/acting” positions to gain professional experience as a vice-principal,

When we asked this group of people what we should do as a board to address the shortage, their response was to allow teachers to do an acting role. And in fact we’re doing that now with twenty-nine interim people. We have a mentorship program which we do that, and have principals encourage teachers, inform teachers about the qualifications and how they can obtain them.

Meanwhile, a story was related by the director about the significance of promotion within the district through internal professional development and how that contributes to the effective socialization processes.

A person who was hired from another board spoke to me just recently, and said, at the beginning of the year they resented the fact that they had had a couple of years vice-principal experience in another board, a smaller board in a different part of the province, yet we were requiring them to be a
teacher to go through the process. By the end of the year they believed that it was the best thing for them, and that person is now a vice-principal. The difference is being board culture, expectations, credibility with teachers and the ability to be a curriculum leader within a board when the expectations for leadership differ between boards.

Another vice-principal expressed how he/she felt about the importance of having the opportunity to get some experience back into the school system after being removed from it for a while. He/she explained how this opportunity helped prepare for the placement and the position of vice-principal.

I remembered when I applied I was working...as a consultant, and I had been out of the school level for...years, and when I did my first interview I was not accepted on the first interview, and I took the debriefing. And one of the things they said to me that they would set up the possibility of me going back to a high school on a number of occasions. And I think it was basically going back to the high school so I would become familiar again as to what was going on at the school level. So while I was here I would go back to the secondary school, and I would spend a morning I think two mornings per week over a period of time, and then I went down for the interview. I was prepared more this time around for the job.

One candidate spoke very highly of the Administration Preparation Program while another candidate spoke negatively about certain components of the program.

They do a lot of things though to really help you. Like they have an Admin. Preparation Course for people that are interested, and they go over different qualities they expect, and they go over scenarios that you might have to solve. I found it really helpful. And they set up a mock interview for everyone with a panel of principals.

And then they send you to job shadow to a vice-principal in the role for half a day each. I know for me I went to one school which was rural, and another one which was urban. It was crazy.

There were also varying viewpoints on the Principal’s Qualifications Course. One vice-principal explained how beneficial the course was to him/her while a candidate had a different view.

You also are prepared to take a principals course, and they are most definitely useful. You get the “meat and potatoes” of the whole position. I did it at... It depends where you take it. I took it last year. Part 1, and the
following spring, Part 2, and the instructors happened to be from our board in the group...they're experienced and we discussed procedures and policies that are relevant to our board. We did have people in the course that were from other boards...more difficult for them (Vice-Principal)

I did not have one administrator from the district teaching the principals qualifications course. They were all administrators from the... board. It wasn't as good for me as it could have been but still I learned some important stuff (Candidate)

Concerning the “renewal” processes in place for practicing administrators it was a general consensus that socialization was a definite positive experience. As one principal indicated:

We had a whole weekend, I cannot forget that...where we all came to get the people who were aspiring to be leaders. It's called 'leadership the next step'. Part of it was getting to know other people who wanted to go in the same direction. But also going through some of the main things that one has in front of the administrative teams... a professional development that I never forget. Much like what the Covey training is doing, I did the Covey training and I found that very, very helpful.

Organizational Socialization: Organizational socialization begins upon appointment and is specific to the education context. It is contended in the literature that post-appointment processes dominated by organizational socialization create the interactions that legitimate and validate a new school leader within a school, preparing a way for him/her to exert influence. This powerful period consequently warrants the careful attention of those committed to improving the quality and effects of school leaders. In District A the school leader tries to take charge and bring about school improvement. At the same time the school is changing the school leader. As new members of the organization, the administrators deal with the differences between their pre-arrival beliefs and expectations and actual experiences upon entering the organization. Surprise is the most common response. As new members make sense of their surprises, they come to understand and eventually learn to become integrated within the group.

No matter how good the preparation programs and prior experience, a major transition occurs when these school leaders take on a new formal leadership role that requires tailor-made responses to that particular situation. Consequently, fixation on pre
or post appointment training, formal and informal processes, and the curricula of university work leaves new school leaders wanting. However, with more attention to the induction stage taking precedence in District A the transition from one role to another has become easier. Still there are issues remaining. One vice-principal indicated how he/she became the vice-principal and how the understanding of the organizational norms and values were of importance:

Most of my experience that brought me to the leadership position was at the community base because I worked very much at the community level, and I was working with the board, and all sorts of community issues and running workshops out here, and the rest of it. I was exposed to many of the community and district issues.

Another vice-principal explained how it is an advantage to become a facilitator first and then work into a vice-principal’s role.

There’s a huge advantage of coming to the central office and working in a facilitator role or something personal before you go to admin. A huge advantage. You get to know all the players, you get a more global perspective on things, and I came through the facilitator role through the VP...all the networking hey, like who to call. I guess it’s the big picture of who to call ...as a teacher it’s very hard for you to leave your school to come to a workshop, because it has to be your own time and the rest of it. When you work as a facilitator or a consultant then you’re here you can gear your schedule to make use of all the workshops that do come around. Now I'm at the school level as the administrator, and it’s very difficult to leave the school.

One senior administrator commented:

A huge staff development program just for leadership, and that’s part of the socialization process...all kinds of in-service, and a lot in personal management, a lot in stress management, communication skills, personal resiliency...that gives an opportunity for them to socialize into the role to support themselves in the role, and each other. But it brings them together so they can network and problem solve at that kind of level as well.

Another senior administrator talked about the formal program currently in place for socialization opportunities of administrators:

We run a number of programs to not only develop leadership skills, but we also have those sort of functional day-to-day health and safety operations type courses, problem solving, school community council, legal issues, policies and procedures, the 'sit and get', the one time courses. But we now run a number of different institutes which are more then one shot
deals to try to have the skills learned and developed and practiced in communications and negotiations and in personal resiliency and the seven habits...all those sort of things. These are organizational issues.

Another senior administrator emphasizes the importance of having practicing administrators instructing the candidates for it leads to effective organizational socialization into the role.

For new principals and new vice-principals we have a program, and it goes anywhere from two full days to six days depending. Vice-principals are usually getting two full days, and principals are getting combos of that work up to about six days throughout the year. And they're run by our department. My colleague and I are involved in the planning, but we have principals who are taking on that role, a leadership role instructing. They are instructors and we are facilitators.

The director summed up the professional and organizational processes very succinctly.

First and second year vice-principals, and principals...have a chance to sign up for the new administrator training as well. So not only can you get some staff development training and seminar work, and preparation before hand, a whole series runs after you're in the role. People running it are the people who were in staff development but also who work with us, the area superintendent. We have seconded administrators who are officers here in the board, and different school districts have different support systems. So these admin officers are experienced administrators...They deliver this very practical seminar series to new administrators...tough discipline issues, to dealing with parents, to helping teachers get ready for the parent teacher interviews, to helping teachers with classroom management, to their own leadership to the wellness piece to you name it, it's included in their training. And it spreads out over the first year...to help the new administrator kind of get socialized into their role and into the district and get to understand.

*Structured Induction*: District A continues training principals and provide newly hired administrators with a variety of supportive induction activities to help them continue their professional growth as school leaders. In short the district needs to ensure there are socialization opportunities provided to administrators in order to prepare for their role. In District A such an opportunity is provided in its Administration Preparation Program where candidates are given the following opportunities: to learn about the districts expectations; how to develop a portfolio; job-shadowing information packages; brainstorming sessions for developing philosophy statements; professional library visits;
activities to develop and determine leadership styles; opportunities for practice interviews; job-shadowing debriefing session; and opportunities to conduct mock interviews. These sessions are conducted by practicing principals and vice-principals and facilitated by seconded administrators who are educational officers in central office.

**Re-socialization:** Although much has been written about beginning teachers and the accompanying trauma that many vividly recall, little has been written about the beginning principal. Perhaps because, unlike beginning teachers, beginning principals are continuing in their schoolwork, albeit in a new role. For teachers who have been in the profession for several years, the changing emphases of reform bring challenges of re-socialization. In District A, however, as teachers make the transition from being a teacher to being a school administrator so does the emergence of new socialization experiences. According to the literature, at the point of preparing for the administrator role, aspiring administrators begin to take on a new and different role as an educator. Consequently, the need to be re-socialized becomes crucial and a new professional identity suddenly is at the fore. Nevertheless, for some candidates who had been recently assigned (less than one year) to vice-principal positions in District A, it became clear that many were still thinking in the “teacher mode” and had not yet made the transition to “administrator mode”. When talking informally to several experienced administrators, it was clear that such a transition varies with each candidate and does not automatically happen as soon as a placement occurs. One vice-principal explained “for me it took me a full year to fully understand what I was in for as a vice-principal. I had to change my level of thinking from the classroom to a systems level of thinking”.

Becoming a school administrator (vice-principal and/or principal) is for many educators the ultimate point in their career. However, there are more demands and changing expectations in the position now than ever before. It is because of the position demands and ever changing expectations that someone entering into this role will have new socialization experiences both professionally and organizationally.

In addition to the re-socialization of teachers who aspire to become administrators there is also a need to re-socialize the practicing administrators both new and experienced. The job and working conditions of administrators today are becoming more increasingly difficult, complex, and stressful. With changes in policies and procedures
and school reform descending on schools, diversity flourishing in student composition and new conceptualization of leadership, the administrators(s) of schools are expected to provide effective leadership and take on a vast array of added responsibilities. Table 17 illustrates the greatest and least valued socialization experience among participants in District A. Although not all agreed the results are based on viewpoints that represent the majority. Table 18 illustrates the types of Professional and Organizational Socialization Opportunities in place for school administrators in District A.

### Table 17 - Socialization Experiences of Least and Greatest Value in District A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Value</th>
<th>Least Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>Principals Qualifications Course at OISE (too theoretic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job shadowing</td>
<td>York (too much “sit and get”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership experiences (on-job training)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim roles</td>
<td>University training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although not all agreed the results are based on viewpoints that represent the majority. Table 18 illustrates the types of Professional and Organizational Socialization Opportunities in place for school administrators in District A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|              | • Ontario Teacher's Certificate  
|              | • Undergraduate degree  
|              | • Qualifications in three divisions one which must be intermediate division  
|              | • One of the following: Ministry Training  
|              | Masters degree or two Specialist qualifications  
|              | Masters degree and two Specialists  
|              | • Principals Qualifications Course: Part 1, 2.  
|              | • Job-shadowing  
|              | • Portfolio development  
|              | • Administration Preparation Program (components) |
| Organizational | Formal | Informal |
|               | • Leadership experience  
|               | • Mentoring  
|               | • Management tasks  
|               | • Study groups  
|               | • Dialoguing  
|               | • Breakfast/lunch meetings  
|               | • Networking  
|               | • Conduct staff meetings  
|               | • Conferences  
|               | • Social learning  
|               | • Personal/professional values |
|               | • Information sessions for culture learning  
|               | • Administration Preparation program (components)  
|               | • Principals Qualifications Program (components)  
|               | • Post appointment programs (Covey, Clemmer, Grinder, and so forth)  
|               | • Performance Appraisals |
|               | • Relationship building with other administrators and senior administrators  
|               | • Opportunities to interact with peers  
|               | • Informal sessions for understanding district policies and procedures  
|               | • Structures, practices and performances  
|               | • Relationships with superiors and subordinates |
Leadership Succession Planning in the Context of Accountability

**Purpose and Intention:** In this era of decreasing revenues and increasing uncertainty about the future, accountability is a key concern in District A as it is in many districts on a global scene. Virtually all public institutions have been criticized for failing to meet the needs of the groups they were intended to serve. For administrators in District A it seems that accountability in its education system means that information should be made available to the public, to tax payers and to parents in a form that allows them to have reasonable expectations of the system.

**District Expectations:** The role of central office is gradually shifting from one emphasizing regulating and initiating activities to one emphasizing facilitation, service, and responsiveness. In District A some current activities continue to be dealt with best at central office level—for example, networking with other government agencies whose functions overlap with the school district; lobbying for resources at the district, provincial and federal levels; and negotiating with teachers unions. However, responsibilities for many other activities have shifted to school sites. As responsibilities gravitate to the school site, so does authority, requiring central office personnel to practice more restraint in their relationships with site personnel. Central office teaming needs have been implemented as a model for schools, exhibiting less reliance on superintendent decision-making and more team decision-making.

School and senior administrators in District A are committed to improving public accountability by communicating clear expectations, developing standards, and participating in provincial, national, and international assessments. To do this effectively, they want to continue to improve instruction and learning in combination with:

- A determination to achieve better results
- The use of a variety of research-based instructional strategies
- The maximum use of learning time by students, teachers and administrators
- High expectations
- Parent involvement to reinforce and extend school instruction
- Promoting quality education through teaching and learning
- Promoting "lifelong learning"
- Promoting high levels of communication
- Supporting quality education through equity issues *(District Document, 2000)*
For the purposes of linking this component of the research with leadership succession planning, there needs to be a connection.

**Leadership Succession Planning:** It is widely believed in District A that standard external assessment of student achievement has a positive effect of the quality of education when assessment information is used to provide feedback to students and parents and is taken into consideration when curriculum and instructional decisions are being made. Staff development, including leadership development and administrator preparation programs, a priority with the district board, links assessment with curriculum and instruction to have a positive effect on student achievement (District Document, 2000).

The questions that have challenged educators for years have been how to build self-correcting forums and mechanisms into schools, and how to get assessment data that is relevant, valid, timely and useful. In District A the schools have made good use of its research department. There is a never-ending stream of requests for survey data on themes and issues important to the school. (District Document, 2001). As school growth teams chart their course yearly, they do it with the realization of the value of gathering first hand data to inform their decisions. Many school administrators have used surveys to give staff, students and parents a chance to reflect on the administrative leadership. The Principal Appraisal criteria is often used as a source for the survey.

School Team administrators and central office personnel have recognized that having access to relevant information expands decision alternatives and provides a firmer basis for choosing among these alternatives. The participation of all relevant stakeholders assumes that many heads are capable of making better decisions than one individual.

The System Plan and the director’s plan (mentioned earlier) play an important role in the districts’ views on accountability. Once the director’s management plan is available, superintendents and school administrators reflect on their plans and then identify which priorities they wish to pursue. Again these leaders not only address the System Plan and the director’s plan, but they also take into account the priorities of their areas and schools. At this stage, the plans become much more specific and detailed. The administrator’s plan takes into account system priorities and also include the school-based plans developed at school level. It is important to note that at each level in the
system there is the sense of *being influenced* and *influencing*. If system leaders acknowledge the work of local schools and if local schools acknowledge the collaboratively developed System Plan, then “we develop a concept of coherence and unity around our activities. That is true accountability” (Principal). Of course, it is left to individual schools, teachers, administrators, students and parents to do what is best in their environment. However, it is also understood in District A that “no one is "self-employed. We all work for students to increase their life chances for success. In this complex age it requires all our efforts to meet their needs” (Senior Administrator).

Assisting school administrators is a team of people outside the school: staff development and curriculum departments, instructional strategies facilitators and special education resource personnel. The administrators are accountable for leading and improving schools, but to do so they must rely on, and mobilize, the talents of others. One of the ways this is learned is through succession planning and understanding leadership styles. The effective administrator can no longer have just a managerial approach. Now he/she must assist change by facilitating growth of those in their schools. In a system like District A where opportunities for staff development are plentiful, administrators can support on-going training for teachers. On-going learning keeps teachers in touch with what it means to be a learner. At specific points teachers with skill and knowledge can take a leadership role because others recognize their expertise. This gives administrators the opportunity to extend what they value while at the same time expressing those values by word, action and deed.

The system has the responsibility to mobilize system resources to create a supportive structure thus allowing for teacher and school development. At the same time there has been a conscious attempt to align system expectations, accountability and leadership development. According to one senior administrator:

We expect future candidates for leadership positions to learn about leadership by being involved in activities where they can take a leadership role. There is no substitute for experience. It is the Staff Development Department that facilitates these lifelong opportunities. Promotion to an administrative position is an acknowledgement of life-long learning and support for others.
**Portfolio and Performance Appraisal:** The portfolio process which encompasses part of the performance appraisal for administrators is also crucial if District A is to promote the skills necessary for a collaborative, learning-centered school. In the appraisal document of vice-principals and principals, the key components are in accordance with legislation, board policy and contractual agreements. The components manifest themselves through the following dimensions: interpersonal leader, instructional leader, community leader, principle-centered leader, professional development leader, and manager and operational leader (District Document, 2000). The goals of appraisal clearly support the values, beliefs and direction of the district. Table 19 describes the goals of performance appraisal for administrators in District A.

**Table 19 - Goals of Performance Appraisal for Administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for both principals and vice-principals to improve quality of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>To assess the quality of their leadership in relation to system expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>To foster growth and professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>To ensure that a consistent process of accountability is used throughout the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>To provide a basis for career planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is through the activities planned by Staff Development, in consultation with administrators, that all administrators (aspiring administrators, new and experienced administrators) are provided opportunities, and given experiences to enhance the knowledge and skill development deemed essential by District A to fulfill the role effectively of school administrators. Among the myriad of activities embedded within succession planning, training and leadership development, is the need to better understand the accountability process so each administrator is aware of district’s expectations to its stakeholders.

Despite the clarity of expectations for leadership and how leadership development can enhance the knowledge of what school administrators are being held accountable for,
varying perspectives of the accountability process in District A emerged from the data through interviews.

It is important to note that educators in District A are engaged in continuous inquiry and dissemination. Many research projects are proposed by external researchers. Following approval by the Research Review Committee, these projects are launched. The belief, according to the Assessment and Accountability personnel, is that "to be accountable we must have external agents assess our work. It is our responsibility to analyze that work so as to guide our next steps". The range of research projects is extensive, from detailed work on the impact of Cooperative Learning at the Primary and Secondary levels to specific impacts of Professional Development and Leadership Development. Educators in District A are very proactive in pursuing performance-based measures, and is among the leaders in Ontario at establishing multiple measures of performance. The policy requirements and procedures put in place in District A contain many checks and balances focusing on quality assurance.

Understanding what accountability means led to issues of accountability as were indicated among participants:

**Accountability Issues:** A number of issues arose in the context of accountability. School administrators are no strangers to accountability; whenever a problem occurs in a school, heads turn automatically toward the office. In District A there are issues of skills and knowledge as well as issues of authority and support that need to be considered when embarking on a system for administrator accountability. Throughout the Administration Preparation Program and the renewal program for practicing administrators there is strong support for training before holding the principal accountable for knowing in much the same way that principals guide and assist staff members with knowledge and skill before holding them accountable.

Another issue is the extent to which the technical complexity of a well-designed accountability system is compatible with political and implementation demands. Several administrators within the system do not understand how their accountability systems work. However, most principals and central office administrators do, based on the numbers in this study. The candidates who were part of this study responded to accountability based only on assumptions. This lack of understanding can be a problem.
People who know the expectations tend to live up to them, especially when results are clear and specific and are linked to consequences. It makes administrators within the system suspicious of the system, and makes it difficult for them to make that link between what they’re doing in the schools and what is being rewarded. A common reaction from several participants was “we are accountable to everyone for practically everything”.

Clarity of expectations, purposes or intentions of accountability, and accountability procedures are key components of any accountability system.

According to one senior administrator, “...effective accountability is a system that links standards, testing, professional development of administrators and teachers, reporting, and consequences. Without careful alignment of the component parts, testing alone will have little effect”. They need to weigh the strengths and weaknesses of selecting a repertoire of tools that share the same basic assumptions about schools and schooling. The following are additional reactions to accountability:

Well I think the bottom line is student learning achievement. I mean that's the bottom line, so everything that comes out of our department to help the principals, everything that comes out of the program should be to help administrators to understand accountability (Senior Administrator).

The day-to-day operations in schools are bogging administrators down, and the secondary, with all the strikes that we've had, and the unrest and no contact at the secondary level, that's killing them. And so it's really difficult for people to be the curriculum leader, and do the school plan on accountability (Senior Administrator)

And student learning. When you know the place is falling down around their ears that parents are banging on the door, and you know and breaking them down, and kids are walking out...opportunities for our principals to come to learn the skills, to hone the skills that they really need for that kind of context, because it's very different then it was in the eighties and early nineties. Very different skill set, huge (Senior Administrator)

We have had a culture in District A of being a learning organization. And the principals role as a role model is continued to learn and to be involved in developing skills, not only in the principal but in staff. So the approach that we advise, the thing that we look for in our appraisal is a collaborative leadership ability (Principal).
Succession planning or planning for leadership succession is in actual fact a strategy used by the school district in support of what we're talking about here (Senior Administrator).

I would say administrators know what they're accountable for. And who they're accountable to is sometimes confusing to them because being young principals, many of them really don't know for example what my role might be (Senior Administrator).

New vice-principals are again, as I mentioned earlier, too often a deer in the headlights. They quite often won't use the system in the same way as principals. They go to the principal before they would contact the whole system (Senior Administrator).

I think we're doing a lot of good stuff in leadership development in this board. We're doing enough. I think we'll probably do more (Senior Administrator).

I think we are accountable through the school plan, I think that's the driving force for the whole school (Vice-Principal).

We are also accountable to our school community council. (Vice-Principal).

I think that's what they are starting to lean towards now using the administrator portfolio as a tool for evaluation (Vice-Principal).

We really don't know what we are accountable for as there does not seem to be any common expectations. We are going on assumptions that we are accountable for running of the school and collectively enforcing policies and procedures (Candidate).

I am accountable to parents, students, my superintendent, director, and to the Ministry. But nobody is accountable to us (Candidate).

I think we're accountable for the basic operation of the school (Principal).

Nobody has ever sat with me and told me anything about accountability yet it seems to be a buzz word (Candidate).

I think succession planning is directly linked to accountability as it prepares leaders of the future for school improvement. This will make us more accountable to the stakeholders (Candidate).

Who we're accountable to is probably still one of those gray areas I guess. The big accountability would be litigation and something all imposing like that. But we're accountable, we are challenged more frequently by the public (Principal).
Every phone call is accountability, I feel, because it's never just a phone call that ends. And that's a daily thing (Principal).

Probably at system level, the only thing that - the services are all there (Principal).

**Summary for District A**

Leadership succession planning in District A is in the hands of central office staff development personnel who, in a collaborative effort with all practicing and aspiring school administrators, work together to ensure increased preparation for effective leadership within their schools. The superintendent in charge of Operations oversees leadership succession and leadership development. There are two educational staff development officers who work with the superintendent of operations. Among other responsibilities, they have the responsibility of professional development for the district's succession planning. They facilitate the Administration Preparation Program.

The administrators and senior office personnel in District A varied in level of teaching experience and administrative experience. All candidates in this study have been successful in the selection process and are either waiting for placements to vice-principal positions or have less than three years experience. The vice-principals, where the largest vacancy problem is in both elementary and secondary panels, have less than five years experience. The principals have no less than five years experience to no more than 10-15 years experience as a principal. They also differed in geographical areas (rural, urban, rural/urban) as well as school division (elementary panel, secondary panel, central office). There was also an equal mixture of both male and female participants although this was not used as a variable in the study. All central office personnel in this study are former administrators who have been at central office for less than five years.

As a result of the leadership shortage within District A due to a mass of retirements and the lack of interested candidates wishing to pursue the role of administrator, it is realized that the training of capable leaders must begin long before they are needed. According to various participants in this study, effective training programs are the first steps in hiring capable administrators. This is encouraged through a process of an informal recruitment program, a rigorously planned selection procedure and a well-structured administration preparation program. Professional development
programs for leadership development enhances the professional and personal growth of administrators along with the provision of various socialization opportunities and experiences. However, some of the activities are considered more beneficial than others while some other activities are considered a "waste of time and energy". Nevertheless, these are essential components in what the district refers to as a comprehensive system that trains, obtains, and retains their most capable school leaders.

In District A there is a framework of professional development of administrators that attempts to establish the interrelationships between complex activities and building a shared vision. This framework parallels its efforts with the five dimensions used by Senge (The Fifth Discipline) that converge to create learning organizations: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision, and team learning (District Directions,1998-2001). School district leaders in District A continue to assess their current practices and design flexible processes that support principals, vice-principals and aspiring leaders undergoing succession and generally lead to outcomes that advance the district policies and goals. Among the myriad of opportunities available in the district that require monitoring lies the mentorship program. The district is re-examining their use of mentors and tries to match the design of the mentor program to the outcomes appropriate to each school. They provide systematic support and time for visits, diagnosis, and planning activities by administrators that facilitate their transitions to new schools. In addition, they consciously work to improve the outcomes of a succession beyond the careful search for and appointment of the best administrator for a school. This includes training and support specifically designed to assist principals who are taking charge in a new assignment, recognizing that they face challenges common to major transitions, acknowledging that a unique mix between the principal and the school will give rise to the outcomes of the succession, and preparing the principals for the impact the school will have on them as well as the impact they hope to have on the school.

School and senior administrators in District A are also capitalizing on the expectation for change that succession brings to implement new programs and work toward the improvement of schools. They can seize the opportunity that this major role transition presents to shape and expand the professional orientation, knowledge, and skills and value systems of the administrators who lead their schools.
Succession planning has become essential in District A to ensure that growth keeps pace with the growth of its organization as well as meet the changing expectations of the leadership roles. Their leaders are now required to look beyond individual needs and individual self-direction as it will not suffice in meeting the current demands of accountability.

Currently, senior administrators in District A are compiling a document called "Professional Review and Development of Administrators" in which emphasis is placed on the growth model of staff development in developing a learning organization. This is its fourth review since 1988.
CHAPTER FIVE
CASE # 2: SCHOOL DISTRICT B

Context

District B is one of the largest school districts in Ontario with approximately 61,000 full-time students in 99 elementary schools and 16 secondary schools. There are 3,423 teachers (2,133 elementary, 1,290 secondary) and 196 school administrators (149 Elementary, 47 secondary) and approximately 6,000 employees in total. The majority of schools are in urban areas; 25% of the schools are in small, rural towns. Diversity in the student population is flourishing as recent arrivals flow out to the area from a major nearby city. The school system is organized into five geographical areas and 15 families (a secondary school and feeder schools) with a superintendent responsible for each area.

District B has an adult education center and other facilities as well. The Board provides continuing education programs and services for more than 27,000 registrants of all ages, each year. The district has one of the highest qualified teaching staffs in Ontario, with a national and international reputation for high quality educational programs at all levels (Welcome to your District School Board, 2000).

A comprehensive public education program is delivered through regular day programs, full-time adult education, core French and French Immersion, special education, international language programs, language instruction for new Canadians, continuing education and summer school. District B shares a commitment with the community, as stated in its mission statement:

"Empowering life-long learners who strive for excellence in a changing world".

The mission of District B is empowering life-long learners who strive for excellence in a changing world. This mission is supported by four areas identified by students, community members and staff. They are educational excellence, quality staff, safe and secure environment, and partnerships and shared responsibilities. Individual schools and worksites use the Board’s mission and areas of focus as a guide as they develop their “goal plans” to reflect the unique needs and priorities of each school community (1999 Annual report).
A plethora of changes in provincial policy and legislation has virtually effected all aspects of education including changes in governance, structure, curriculum, assessment, leadership and funding. Like District A this Canadian School District faces a leadership crisis - the impending shortage of school leaders caused by the significant numbers of school based administrators who are rapidly approaching retirement age and by the relatively few qualified applicants who are seeking to replace them. During the 1998-99 school year, a collaborative process comprised of a Steering Committee and school administrators was used to develop a comprehensive "goal plan" as a Board initiative. The following year, during the implementation phase, a number of activities were scheduled which were intended to influence the current and future leadership in the system. Teachers who have an interest in school leadership are being mentored by practicing administrators. The selection process was reviewed to determine whether it was effective and efficient in identifying future leaders (1999 Annual Report).

A number of training and professional development opportunities have been planned and implemented to enhance the knowledge and skills of its current leaders as well as those who aspire to becoming future school administrators. Each formal leadership program is tightly connected to the district’s motto when looking for characteristics of an effective administrator: "Leader, Learner, Manager, Communicator". One such leadership program, "The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People" by Steven Covey, has been well-received by the 160 administrators who have taken the course. A Professional Growth Portfolio (originally termed career portfolio) has been developed by many of the district’s administrators to confirm the personal improvement and development plans of its leaders. It is also thought by the district that if the Ministry of Education decides to require re-certification of its educators in Ontario the portfolio process could be used as a method for personal as well as professional growth and accountability in District B.

The Board is committed to the achievement of its mission and areas of focus through the ongoing development and renewal of its leaders and is confident it will be able to continue to provide strong leaders to meet the challenges and seize the opportunities in the future. To support this direction, they are focusing on the identification, recruitment, PAR selection (Position of Added Responsibility), training
and ongoing professional development of school administrators, who as life long learners, strive for excellence. (Document: Succession Planning and Leadership Development, 1998).

Demographics

Demographic data presented in Table 20 describes the district. Table 21 describes the gender, current role, stage of administration, panel, and geographical location of the participants. Table 22 contains a list of district observations. Table 23 presents a list of district documents that were reviewed.

Table 20 - District Demographic Data District B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>61,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 Elementary Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Secondary Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Supervisory Officers (including Director and Executive Assistants)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,133 Elementary Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,290 Secondary Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Elementary Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Elementary Vice-Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Secondary Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Secondary Vice-Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of employees</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of District</td>
<td>5 areas with 15 families of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td>$365 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 - Participants Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Administrative Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
<td>10-15 (Admin.)&lt; 5 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>10-15 (Admin.)&lt; 5 years (C.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>5-10 (Admin.) 10-15 (C.O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>5-10 (Admin.) 15-20 (C.O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates: 7 (3 male, 4 female, 3 Secondary, 4 Elementary, 6 Urban, 1 Rural)  
V-Principals: 5 (3 male, 2 female, 2 Secondary, 3 Elementary, 4 Urban, 1 Rural)  
Principals: 5 (2 male, 3 female, 4 Elementary, 1 Secondary, 3 Urban, 2 Rural)  
Central Office Personnel: 4 (2 male, 2 female)  
Total: Male: 10, Female: 11
# Table 22 - Observations and Dates of Administrators Workshops in District B

- District B’s Administrators’ Workshop (August, 2000).
- Director: “School Leadership in District B”. (October, 2000)
- Elementary Administrative Pool training Session (November, 2000).
- Supervisory Officer: Managing Change Through Emotional Intelligence (November, 2000)
- School Administrator and Staff: “School Budgeting for Administrators” (November, 2000)
- School Board Steering Committee Workshop: Implementing the Covey Leadership program, “The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People”. (November, 2000)
- Elementary Administrators Training Session (January, 2001)
- Supervisory officer: “The School Administrator as Lifelong Learner” (February, 2001).
- Networking Series (January, 2001)
- Supervisory officer: School Administrator as Lifelong Learner (January, 2001).
- Michael Grinder: “Patterns of Communication” (March, 2001)
Table 23 - Documents Reviewed in District B

- Variables and Indicators for District and School Leadership (1996).
- Steering Committee for Leadership Succession Planning and Development (November, 1998).
- District Information Sheets for School Administrators:
  - Focus Group Update for Succession Planning and Leadership Development (January, 1999)
  - Succession Planning and Leadership Development Focus Group For School Administrators (February, 1999)
  - Vice-Principal Interest Survey (February, 1999)
- Flyers on Succession Planning and Leadership Development: Recruitment, Selection Of School Administrators, Training, Professional development, Career Portfolio (June, 1999).
- "Strive for Excellence" (April, May, June, 2000)—Monthly Publication by School Board.
- District Binder for Training Sessions: 7 Habits of Highly Effective People (Franklin Covey) (November, 2000).
- Personal growth and Well-Being (November, 2000).
- Welcome To Your District School Board: Information Sheet (Fall, 2000).
- School Advisory Councils Document (Fall, 2000).
- Information Package: Elementary and Secondary Schools (Fall, 2000).
- Administrators/Trustees Information Sheet/Profiles (Fall, 2000).
- School Bus Safety: Administration (Fall, 2000).
- Feedback Document from School Administrators on “Seven Habits of Highly Effective people” (November, 2000).
- Special education Advisory Committee Document (Fall, 2000).
- Communicating With Your School Document (Fall, 2000).
- Working Together for Safe and Secure Schools (Fall, 2000).
- Information sheets on Leadership Succession-Leadership Development (April, August, October, 1999: October/November, 2000).
- Directory of District B’s School Administrators (Fall, 2000).
- Procedures for the Selection of Teaching personnel for Positions of Added Responsibility Principal and Vice-Principal (September, 2000).
- Sample of Supervisor’s Summary of Candidate Portfolio (Fall, 2000).
- District A’s performance Review for Administrative Council as System Leaders (Fall, 2000).
- Flyers used in Training sessions for Administrators including: Eleven Commandments for Enthusiasts; Constructive Confrontation Visible Communication: Its All About My Relationships; The Risk of Growing; Attitude: Effectiveness; You remember...: Quantum Learning-Living above and below the line; Systems Thinking; Fear of Transformation; Always Tomorrow; Visible Communication. (Fall, 2000).
- Computer disc containing the Development of PAR Portfolio Folder (January, 2001).
- School Safety: A Comprehensive School and Community Approach. Professional Principal
The Nature of Leadership Succession Planning

Rationale: As is prevalent across North America this Canadian School District is faced with the challenge of a leadership crisis - the impending shortage of school leaders caused by the significant numbers of school based administrators who are rapidly approaching retirement age and by the relatively few qualified applicants who are seeking to replace them. Key district personnel have left as a result of retirement, or moved to other jobs, due to the large and sudden political and policy shift. Public education in the province has undergone changes in practically every area including curriculum, assessment, structure, governance, accountability, and funding. The times continue to be turbulent and uncertain.

In order to meet the challenges of the leadership crisis, it is the belief in District B that a more effective leadership succession planning process must be in place. For administrators in District B, “succession planning is a process by which leadership requirements and competencies are identified to ensure that quality people are in place to achieve its vision, mission, and goals. This is accomplished through the ongoing development and renewal of its leaders” (District Document, 1998). The district strives to place the best candidates in positions of added responsibilities throughout the year. It believes that its PAR (Position of Added Responsibilities) Selection Process chooses the best possible leadership candidates to meet the present and future needs of its students, staffs and communities.

Part of the vision in District B is to ensure that leadership potential is identified in an open and systematic manner and to help teaching personnel in planning their careers. While the individual is responsible for career development, superintendents have an obligation to encourage and promote professional growth. The selection of leaders is considered to be a supportive and professional process that is (District Document, September, 2000):
fair, equitable and consistent
provide candidates with information for their professional development plans
provide a demonstration of a candidate’s competency through his or her track record
includes a variety of assessment methods
enables potential candidates to evaluate their readiness for PAR position
recognizes the role of the supervisor as a mentor and facilitator of leadership opportunities
provides quality information for future appointments

According to a senior administrator leadership succession planning can be summarized by the current district mission statement:

It could be summarized by the mission statement we have, which is quality leaders quality schools. When we got into this initiative, we realized that the school administrator is the key to what happens in the school in terms of student achievement. And because many of the things that have been happening on Ontario, it was difficult to attract to that position the individuals that we think would be appropriate. And so three years ago we viewed this whole area and started this initiative through that process of getting new initiatives up and running. We also developed a mission statement, and a vision and a purpose for it.

A principal added to the philosophy orientation by stating:

I guess the philosophy that we have is simply that we need to have some kind of coherent plan around what we want for our leaders, and then to follow through with that plan as opposed to going at things in an unstructured manner.

When asked about the interest level for planning for succession among candidates in becoming a school administrator, one candidate indicated:

We need more interest in the administrator role at teacher level so we can have more qualified candidates to take on the role as school administrator. Succession planning is a method whereby this is ensured.

Table 24 describes the belief system that administrators in District B support and continue to create. It is based on their mission statement which in turn is a direct result of a survey that was distributed throughout the district to determine how the board could best meet the needs of its school administrators.
Table 24 - Quality Leaders – Quality Schools  
(District Document, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality leaders develop quality schools as demonstrated by the effectiveness of the teaching and learning in the classrooms of District B. Quality leaders demonstrate a passion and commitment to learning, excellence and the community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ The role of school administrator within the board is a rewarding career for educators;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ A leadership profile describes the qualities of an effective school administrator as a learner, leaders, manager, and communicator, and guides recruitment, the selection process, training and ongoing professional development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Prospective school leaders, new administrators, and current administrators continually improve and renew their knowledge and skills by participating in planned ongoing learning opportunities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The role description and responsibilities of school administrators reflect the changing educational environment and the expectations regarding accountability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Administrators, in collaboration with superintendents, regularly review their performance, training, and ongoing professional development, in the context of the System Goal Plan and Leadership Profile;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Administrative Council and the Board value and actively promote a supportive environment for school administrators;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Administrators and Board officials work collaboratively through Board and Ministry of Education and Training policies, procedures, and resources to achieve quality schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changing Expectations:** One event that caused a huge problem in Ontario School Districts was the removal of school administrators from the teachers’ federation (Bill 160). In essence, the introduction of Bill 160, changed their role to some degree. According to one principal, there were “a lot of questions on job security and assistance, liability issues, and how will they be protected. There was a time when, because of that move, a lot of people that were considering being an administrator all of a sudden were through, and didn’t put their names forward because they weren’t sure what the role would look like, and what would be the outcome of that decision”. In August of that same year after the removal of administrators from the teachers union (Bill 160) there were three openings in the elementary vice-principal role. There were four applications. These four applicants were quickly interviewed in August, and three out of the four were
immediately placed. As a result of the urgency to place these three applicants, senior administrators in District B decided it needed to seriously review its recruitment and selection process in order to attract the next candidates.

At that point District B recognized a need to get more actively involved in recruitment, training and professional development – essentially supporting school leaders in a more focused way. According to a senior administrator:

We've always been doing things to support administrators, but we needed more concentrated effort based on what was happening. And it's more than just being out of the teachers federation, but the role is much more demanding now also. There's more expectations in terms of the accountability, of student achievement, the new curriculum that's being implemented, the issues around contract, the agitated educational environment in Ontario. So there are many changes in the roles and responsibilities that also made it necessary to look at how we support our school administrators.

District Planning: In the spring of 1998, the local executive council and administrative council (senior leadership in the board) started to discuss the issue of leadership succession planning. It was agreed that such an important area of concern needed to be placed into one senior administrator's portfolio. And so there was a move from the responsibility as a Curriculum Superintendent to this new portfolio which was called "succession planning and leadership development". Later that spring the senior administrator, now in charge of succession planning, contacted the School Administrators Association president. In District B there are three School Administrators Association: one represents elementary principals and vice-principals, one represents secondary school principals, and one represents secondary school vice-principals. The senior administrator contacted each of the chairs of those respective organizations to ask for a member to sit on the "steering committee" to look at this initiative, and to transform it from "an idea" into "reality". In addition there were four members appointed: two from the Elementary Principals Association because it was a larger group, one from the Secondary School Administrative Principal, and one Secondary School Vice-Principal. Along with those four there were four school administrators who were taking their supervisory officers qualification program and they were required to do a practicum. They asked if they could be involved in the initiative and make that their practicum so they joined the steering
committee. Consequently, there was a steering committee of eight people and chaired by the District Senior Administrator.

**Goal Plan: Structure of Succession Planning - Leadership Development**

In structuring the district's succession planning development, the leadership discussion findings contributed to the design of the leadership model in the following ways:

*Career Patterns:* Since legislation had occurred, there were many changes to the principal's role, the superintendent's role, as well as the board's role in terms of compliance. As a result of those changes, it was widely believed in District B that administrators needed to understand what teachers felt to be the factors that would cause them to consider or not consider a career in school administration. As one senior administrator indicated:

I think really when you look at succession planning, what you're trying to do is encourage people that are relatively at an early stage in their careers, and start looking at those types of positions. And then if you're looking at those types of positions, what are the skills, what is the knowledge what's the background that you need? So that when you're in that position you're effective in the position, and you contribute well in that position. Rather than having people sort of touched on the shoulder and say, "I think you've got all the skills and talents, go do." That was sort of the short-term view that we had previously. Now equally, certainly you want to have mentorships and that's part of it, but it's not "a laying on of hands" concept. It's more of a long-term mentorship with a variety of people that would be involved now. So your principal would be involved, the superintendents would be involved, your parent community would be involved, whoever you choose to get involved in that situation.

As a result a memorandum was developed that went to principals requesting them to identify teachers who may be interested in pursuing a career in administration. In addition, there were a number of focus group sessions where people came to meetings held by senior administration to discuss the role, to understand what they saw the role becoming, and the factors that prevented them from becoming an administrator within the board. All administrators and teachers had become aware that with the eighty-five factor being a reality instead of ninety, they had people who would retire earlier without penalty and needed to plan actively for their replacement. The survey and the leadership
discussion at the focus groups really focused on why these people would see administration as a career opportunity for them, and what the deterrents would be (Senior Administrator, Principals, Vice-Principals, Candidates). Consequently, leadership succession planning took precedence in preparing potential and practicing school leaders for their roles and functions as school administrators.

**Induction:** One of the key elements of succession planning that administrators in District B consider important to its success is an effective induction program. Throughout the administration preparation program there are a series of structured induction opportunities whereby administrator candidates engage in reflection, their ethical stances and their commitment to the profession. This becomes part of their socializing into the role of administrators. Mentoring, for example, is seen as a consistent activity from pre-service to in-service and part of the early preparation program as well as a significant socialization opportunity.

However important the induction program may be in succession planning, the discussion of its importance among participants was more predominantly evident in the socialization component of leadership succession planning. Unlike the initial conceptual framework pre-supposes, the induction issue arose later as part of the socialization experiences.

**Leadership Development:** Table 25 indicates the structure of the leadership profile as well as an explanation of the expectations: Learner, Leader, Manager, Communicator. Table 26 explains the goal plan for succession planning in District B.
**Table 25 - District B's Leadership Profile**  
(*District Document, 1999*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADERSHIP VISION STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality leaders exhibit a passion and commitment to learning, excellence, and the community as demonstrated by the effectiveness of the teaching and learning in the classrooms of District B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISSION STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Leaders Develop Quality Schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leaders in District B demonstrate the following values in their personal and professional lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates and sustains life-long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a reflective practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows and acts upon current research in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts to technological change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies critical, flexible and creative thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes, understands and respects individual differences among people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes the pursuit of excellence in self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Recruiting Quality School Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 All school administrative positions are filled with qualified and capable leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 The Selection Process Identifies Candidates Who Will Be Successful As School Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Candidates participating in the selection process receive timely information and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 26 continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3.0 Effective Training**
Programs That Address the Needs and Requirements of Candidates in the PAR Selection Pool and All Current Administrators |
| **3.1 Administrators have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes as described by the leadership profile, role and responsibilities.** |
| **3.1.1 Identify the essential knowledge, skills and attitudes needed by administrators.** |
| **3.1.2 Align training programs with needs identified by administrators.** |
| **3.1.3 Facilitate, monitor, and review training programs provided for administrators.** |

| **4.0 Developing and Enhancing Leadership Competencies Through A Variety of Ongoing Professional Development Opportunities** |
| **3.1 Administrators demonstrate life-long learning and continuous improvement by applying current leadership theory and educational practices.** |
| **4.1.1 Each superintendent along with their school administrators facilitate professional development activities within their family of schools.** |
| **4.1.2 The Steering Committee works with Administrative Council, S.S.P.A./S.S.V.P.A. to facilitate additional development opportunities for school administrators.** |
| **4.1.3 Implement the Covey Leadership Program, “The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People”.** |

| **5.0 A Career Portfolio For Candidates in the PAR Selection Pool and For All Current Administrators** |
| **5.1 As reflective practitioners, administrators maintain a career portfolio that recognizes and directs their continuous growth and improvement efforts.** |
| **5.1.1 Review the concept of a career portfolio for administrators.** |

* S.S.V.P.A.: Secondary School Vice-Principals Association  
* PAR: Position of Added Responsibility

In the leadership initiative there are two areas that are believed to have helped with the knowledge and skill development of school administrators. As indicated in Table 26 there is a training initiative which examines the day-to-day management issues. There is also a leadership or professional development initiative, and that leadership component is explored from the perspective of how one can influence people, and lead people to deal with change initiatives. These are two separate initiatives within the area of developing school administrators or supporting them in their roles. The training group has put on a number of workshops that basically deal with the day-to-day management issues such as safe and secure schools and balancing budgets. For new administrators, this is the phase where they are made aware of the procedures manuals.

The professional development area looks at the other part of leadership and during the first year the district decided that the foundation course for all administrators would be Steven Covey's "Seven Habits of Highly Effective People". The steering committee
was looking at a number of possibilities when this initiative was first developed. They researched other possible foundation courses they had heard about. Since they did not know yet the direction they were taking, they were surveying the field of possibilities. However, during this time it was discovered that the Elementary Teachers Federation had just invested in a site license for Steven Covey’s “Seven Habits of Highly Effective People” to be introduced in another school district. Consequently, the senior administrator in charge of leadership succession and leadership development and four school administrators took the public workshop session. When asked why they decided to enroll in this workshop, the senior administrator stated:

To assess it, to see if it would fit within our culture and meet the needs of our school administrators. So we took the course, we debriefed on it and felt that it would be effective as a foundation course for our school administrators. Because it talks about the habits you need to be effective in your personal and professional life. So that’s how we made the decision to go with “Steven Covey”. The administrators went to access the course, and two of the administrators are part of the steering committee. Then the decision was supported by the Administrative Council which included the remaining senior administrators.

Within the first two years, District B has conducted three courses and this current year (2000-2001) they are conducting another. At the end of the school year 2000-2001 the district will have exposed approximately one hundred and fifty current school administrators and aspiring administrators who have been selected for the vice-principals’ pool but not placed in an administration position yet, in the foundation course (Senior Administrator, Principals, Vice-principals). These aspiring administrators have the option of attending all the training and professional development events.

The action plan used a collaborative process to develop the actions and goals that were going to be pursued with all the stakeholders. The steering committee went through a process of developing a leadership vision, conducted a “gap” analysis and came up with a number of goals that seemed appropriate based on the five areas that were part of the goal plan. The committee then engaged the superintendents and other leaders in the board office in the same process. There was a focus group session, and current school administrators at the time were invited. There were two half-day sessions with more than sixty percent of current practicing administrators taking part in the focus group. They
provided input and feedback on this whole initiative. It was indicated to the three Administrator Associations that this was their initiative and not the Board's initiative. Through this consultative process if the Administrative Associations were not in agreement with the direction the steering committee was taking, then they needed to indicate that, and the changes that were necessary would be made. Hence, the action plan was developed through a very collaborative process.

With the foundation now established, it took nearly a period of eighteen months to develop the action plan. The steering committee continued to get feedback because the members of the steering committee are part of the association. Therefore they would attend the association meetings and if there were any issues they would bring that back to be tabled at the steering committee meetings. At the end of the eighteen month period, a review was conducted. There were, and still are, five project teams that are comprised of all school administrators. These teams met and reviewed their initiatives. Following the review the steering committee went to each of the three Administrators' Associations and asked for feedback to develop the next year's goal plan. According to a principal on the steering committee: "We've been very inclusive in terms of involving all members of our administrative groups to make sure that we're meeting our/their needs" (Principal).

There were two other categories that were included in the initial conceptual framework as a significant part of the structure of Leadership Succession Planning. As important as it is to succession planning both of these categories arose under the construct of recruitment and selection, consequently shifting the framework. The categories are: *Contractual Considerations* and *Administrator Job Description*. Therefore these categories will be discussed in the following section.

**The Nature of Recruitment and Selection**

Originally, District B's Steering Committee collaborated with administrators in developing a leadership profile (Table 26) and a goal plan for leadership development and succession planning (Table 27). It was approved by the District Director, the Board of Trustees and various other new groups. The recruitment project, headed by an experienced principal within the district, is based on several descriptors from the
leadership profile document: leader, learner, manager, and communicator. When asked to describe the purpose of recruitment one senior administrator stated:

The recruitment process is really a deliberate attempt to give a flavor of what the job would be like as an administrator. A lot of people have said they would not have been interested if this wasn't done.

A vice-principal explained what the drawing features were in the recruitment program that stimulated his/her interest:

Knowing that there is “administration preparation training” at the board level at no personal cost has been really the deciding factor for me to becoming an administrator.

Another vice-principal was happy that the recruitment process was open to anybody interested in pursuing the role of administration:

There is no pre-selection...so when they say recruitment it means this is open to everybody.

Another senior administrator explained his viewpoint on recruitment:

We do everything in our power through the recruitment program to help prepare them for the selection process.

There are five areas currently implemented in the district’s goal plan: Recruitment, PAR Selection, Training, Professional Development, and Career/Professional Growth Portfolio. In each of these five areas, there are “project teams” led by a cross section of elementary and secondary principals and vice-principals. It is overseen by the superintendent responsible for succession planning and leadership development. Each “project team” is responsible for its own activities. According to one Vice-principal, “it has moved away from being superintendent directed...assistant initiated...to administrator owned and lead" (Vice-Principal).

Recruitment: The Teachers who had an interest in educational leadership and were considering a PAR position (Position of Added Responsibilities) in the future were encouraged to join the Steering Committee in this new Board initiative. They became part of a study group consisting of four to six teachers led by a facilitator who is a current administrator. Each group is responsible for its own learning within a broad agenda consisting of an examination of educational issues and case studies. Facilitators helped by suggesting topics and speakers designed to enhance each member’s personal vision of
leadership. In addition, workshops were offered throughout the year. These workshops were opened to all facilitator groups. Through this initiative, participants could gain a better understanding of the application process for the vice-principal pools.

The recruitment process involves a mentoring partnership. Currently there are a number of practicing school administrators who are mentoring or have agreed to and/or are interested in mentoring teachers, who at some point in the future, plan on pursuing the role of a school administrator.

The mentors themselves meet as a group and learn how to be appropriate and effective mentors through discussions and exchanging ideas. They also organize workshops for all the "mentees" who have signed on. In addition, these mentors might do some of the training at that time such as introducing them to the Administrative Services Procedure Manual, or whatever topics arise. The mentors also meet with selected number of potential administrators in a small group, and they deal with issues that arise within that group. The mentors themselves meet and discuss what they will do in their small mentor groups. They try to establish a focus. They also have some choices based on the needs of the people in the group. One of the workshops that was given was the PAR selection process. Its purpose was to ensure awareness of the procedure involved once a candidate is determined ready to apply (Transcripts from Senior Administrator, Vice- Principals, Principals, and Candidates).

PAR Selection: Originally this sub-committee had been responsible for a system wide review of the PAR selection process through input from the district's own system administrators and from several large school boards throughout the province of Ontario. As a result, a new process was piloted in the fall of 1999 and reviewed again in the spring 2000.

The PAR Selection Committee developed a standard template for feedback following the selection process to vice-principal candidates, both elementary and secondary, for use in the current pool selection process. A major task of the committee was to develop a profile of leadership for District B that aligned itself with the system goal plan and was based on Standards of Practice, as developed by the Ontario College of Teachers.
Training: The Leadership Project Team’s goal was to develop and align effective training programs to address the needs and requirements of candidates in the PAR selection pool and all current administrators. To accomplish this, the project team surveyed all administrators and pool appointees regarding their perceived training needs and then identifying the essential knowledge, skills and attitudes required by school administrators. Training opportunities were made available for all administrators, some specifically designed for the elementary panel, some at the secondary level and some joint sessions. Specific training programs were also available to new PAR Pool appointees. The Project Team developed a three year cyclical Training Program by monitoring and addressing the successes and recommendations arising from the first year’s Training Programs.

Professional Development: During the 1999-2000 school year a series of professional development sessions were offered by the Professional Development Project Team. The theme for that professional development year was “Leading and Learning”. The learning opportunities provided for elementary and secondary administrators throughout the year included hearing keynote speakers, participating in networking groups, and improving and renewing administrators’ knowledge and skills as leaders. By participating in these planned ongoing learning opportunities, administrators were able to engage in a review of their personal and professional development needs within the context of current educational realities.

Career Portfolio: The Career Portfolio Project Team had, as its goals for the school year 1999-2000, to review the concept of a Career Portfolio for administrators and then made recommendations to all stakeholder groups regarding the use of a Career Portfolio for District B’s administrators. The project members engaged in an extensive review of current research and available information as well as conducted a comprehensive study of best practices in both educational and private business settings. The district mandate also included the need to define the purpose and meaning of a Career Portfolio and to determine the essential components of such a document. In March, 2000, the project team met and decided to change the portfolio from Career Portfolio to Professional growth Portfolio. In this current year, 2000-2001, a pilot group
of 32 administrators from both elementary and secondary panels have volunteered to experiment with growth portfolios as “guinea pigs” for the project team.

The goals of administrators in District B are reflected and supported through the use of the professional growth portfolio. A professional growth portfolio for all administrators is important because a portfolio provides a platform for reflective practice and directed self-improvement. This process will enhance administrator, teacher and school effectiveness and will ultimately lead to improved student learning. In addition the portfolio facilitates and supports the establishment of mentoring programs as advocated by the Ontario Principal’s Council. It also supports a future direction of the Ontario College of Teachers as a link to the re-certification process and accountability (District Document, Professional Growth Portfolios, 2000). To date the portfolio has been developed and included in the succession planning and leadership development activities. Table 27 indicates the administration promotion portfolio components:
Table 27 - Administration Promotion Portfolio Components in District B
(District Document, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overview: In District B a portfolio is a purposeful collection of the candidates leadership experiences and attributes. It has been designed to reflect the candidates knowledge, skills and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The submission of the portfolio requires the candidate to collate specific examples of his/her experiences, knowledge, skills and values and to reflect on them as they relate to District B’s leadership profile, and specifically to the position to which the candidate is applying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The required information establishes a common, consistent framework that provides each candidate the opportunity to demonstrate the candidate’s knowledge, skills and values with a commitment to life long learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Procedures: Candidates are expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• read and sign the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrate a commitment to life long learning by documenting the depth and breadth of personal experience in a resume format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document a chronology of Teaching and Employment Experience and Educational Background and should include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Employment experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Leadership Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Leadership Activities at the School Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Leadership Activities Beyond their School Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submit three leadership demonstrations that must include a program leadership initiative and a management responsibility. The third leadership activity can be an activity of the candidate’s choice. Candidates must indicate the location and time frame as well as dates for each initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates must describe and highlight their role in each leadership activity, the strategies used and the end result. Candidates must outline the initiative from its vision to its completion using the planned change process: vision, purpose, review, development, implementation, monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A personal goal plan describing a personal vision of leadership, related to the position to which candidate is applying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify three examples which demonstrate personal commitment to professional growth and improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• submit to the Superintendent of Human Resources, by the deadline date and time, and (1) original Portfolio and (5) copies of the Portfolio, each bearing an identification label on the front.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Intended Outcomes:
   - validate information provided in the candidate’s Portfolio
   - gather new information

2. Responsibilities:
   a) Selection Committee will:
      - Set date for site visitation with candidate and supervisor
      - Conduct site visit
         i. Candidate – 30 minutes
         ii. Candidate’s supervisor – 30 minutes
   b) Each candidate will:
      - Alert supervisor of date and time of site visit
      - Arrange location for site-visit meeting
      - Bring a copy of submitted Portfolio to the site-visit meeting

**The Role of the School Administrator:** Successful schools have principals who regularly engage in establishing a productive and professional school culture (Beeson & Matthews, 1992; Weindling, 1992; Ogden et al., 1995; Roher et al., 2000). The principal creates a school’s vision for success by promoting a school culture where staff, students, and community members have common school goals that become more important than individual self-interests (Ogden et al., pp. 27-28). Many principals state that they spend a majority of their time on administrative and managerial tasks rather than on those that directly affect curriculum and instruction.

In recruiting and selecting potential administrators to fill administrative vacancies within District B it has become expected that practicing administrators identify potential candidates within each school who demonstrate leadership potential. However, the process does not exclude other candidates who might be interested in becoming administrators. Today’s principals face more complex expectations forged by a very different student population and a new generation dissatisfied with the educational status quo. At a time when many view the schools as one of the few intact social organizations, students come with very different attitudes, motivations, and needs than students of generations past. Today’s principals often need to find ways of inducing students to learn despite their most ardent attempts to escape. Schools and the principals who lead them
into the 21st century, must adapt to different roles, different needs, and different strategies. Therefore, when senior administrators and on-site administrators identify potential leaders in District B the local role requires global understanding.

*Attracting, Screening and Identifying Candidate:* In terms of staff development, the leadership development programs are very expensive programs. And while school administrators are charged to participate in them, the staff development department through the board absorbs the cost of the vast majority of this. School principals and area supervisory officers are expected and encouraged to identify potential future administrators within the teaching ranks of their schools. However, as one principal asserts: “We have to still work on that area because many of our principals figure they have done their expected task in identifying a potential administrator if they "tap" the shoulder of only one teacher. Some of them don’t do it a second time...”.

For the upcoming school year, 2001-2002, there is a specific budget allocated for succession planning and leadership development in the portfolio of its Supervisory officer. Therefore, it has been identified as a high priority for attracting, screening and identifying more candidates to the applicant pools.

*Position Demands:* A principal assumes enormous professional, ethical, moral, legal, and supervisory responsibilities and accountability. Among the participants who participated in this study it was agreed that one of the principal’s key tasks is to build a structure of relationships in the school so that all students have the opportunity to learn. As the literature indicates, in order to do this, the principal must have and use professional knowledge and skills to create a school environment in which children achieve their potential (Barbour, 1994; Ashby et al., 1998). In District B it is the responsibility of the school district to ensure that up and coming effective school administrators are appropriately recruited, trained, selected and retrained as they prepare for the school administrator role to meet these and other changing demands.

*Knowledge and Skills:* School districts are encouraged to recruit and select administrators with expert leadership qualities. In response to the need for a current image of the administrator role, the staff development personnel in District B have developed a “leadership profile” resource to support principal preparation that conforms to the key functions and current expectations.
In accordance with the "leadership profile" outlined in the literature (Begley, 2000) it is widely believed that having knowledge and skills in a broader scheme of the administrator role include the principal as manager; program leader, and learning facilitator; school-community facilitator; visionary; and problem-solver. Embedded in the leadership qualification procedure in District B are the formal qualifications required of the school administrator for knowledge and skill development.

How does one become a principal in Ontario? Principals at this time must hold, according to Regulation 297/298 of Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1990, principal's qualifications; or a principal's certificate that is a qualification to be a principal or vice principal. Presently, to apply for principal's qualifications a candidate must have an undergraduate degree, a teacher's certificate, five years teaching experience two of which must be in Ontario, qualification in three divisions, one of which must be in the intermediate division, have completed a Master's degree or two specialist qualifications or one specialist qualification plus half a Master's degree.

Selection: Application Process in District B: (District Document, 1999). The mentor recruitment initiative is a pivotal starting point for the PAR Selection process. PAR is an acronym for Positions of Added Responsibility. It is the selection process for the pools. The process has four stages including leadership profile. The leadership profile identifies the characteristics and qualities that the district is looking for in its school administrators. These characteristics are collected under four areas: learner, leader, manager and communicator. Accompanying these four areas are performance indicators. Originally these indicators were in place in a different format. (See Tables 26 and 27). The PAR selection project team took the initiative to review the original format and revised it to its current state. It is now part of the selection process. It has become an integral part of the Administrative Procedures Manual and is accessible to all administrator candidates. During information sessions on the selection process, this leadership profile is always highlighted and referenced in the Procedures Manual.

The first stage is the information session which outlines to all interested members the guidelines for the selection process. Any interested administrator candidates have to submit a portfolio by a certain date. It is available in the technology network so candidates can download it from the file server, complete it, and have it submitted. Part
of the portfolio form is much like a personal resume. However, there is a section included whereby candidates have to identify three leadership initiatives that they've been involved in. One must be a management initiative, one leadership and one of their choice. The candidates must describe the role that he/she has taken in the initiative and how he/she has used the change process to move it from development to implementation. In addition there is a section included whereby the candidate is required to write a personal vision of leadership and then talk about how it applies to his/her life. Finally, the candidate is required to give a description of his/her professional development plan.

Once all the portfolios are submitted the selection team sets up site visits. The team, comprised of two supervisory officers and two administrators but one of each per site visit, visits each site and meet with the candidate in an informal setting. At this time usually a review of the leadership activities is conducted to which the candidate can address. The team then meets with the supervisor which is usually the current principal. The supervisor submits a confidential report on the candidate. This is in response to a candidate based on the four components of the leadership profile: leader, learner, manager and communicator. The team meets for thirty minutes with the candidate to discuss the portfolio. This is followed by thirty minutes with the principal to verify the level of accuracy of the contents.

The third and final stage is a formal interview. The formal interview involves the presence of the entire selection process team. The candidate undergoes an interview for approximately twenty-five minutes. A general protocol is followed using the track record questions: For example, candidates are expected to describe what they have engaged in from a leadership perspective; they are given “in-basket” (unknown or known situations) scenarios where they take approximately twenty minutes outside the interview room to plan a reaction. They then re-enter and are required to share experiences on how they would have/already have managed it. This part of the interview differs for secondary and elementary candidates. At the end of the interviews the selection team meets and the information is brought to the table to determine whether the candidate is suitable to be in the pool. And then the last part is a feedback session through the candidate. Sometimes candidates are not ready for the pool. After a review of strengths and weaknesses as well as the next steps candidates return to their schools and improve or expand on various
sections of the portfolio to try again (Senior Administrator, Vice-principals, Principals). Table 28 outlines the procedural steps for positions of added responsibility as principals and vice-principals.
Table 28 - Procedural Steps for Positions of Added Responsibility In District B Principal and Vice-Principal
(District Document, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>Declares openings for positions of added responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Superintendent of Human Resources</td>
<td>Initiates the formation of the Selection Committee, in conjunction with the chairperson of the Selection Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Qualified Candidates Interested in Making Application</td>
<td>Submits to the Superintendent of Human Resources one original completed portfolio and five copies by the closing date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Superintendent of Human Resources</td>
<td>Forwards to the Chairperson of the Selection Committee:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A listing of the candidates, including certification, education and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Copies of the Portfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Selection Committee</td>
<td>Makes appointment to a “Selected Leadership Pool”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reads all material provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviews procedures to be followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assesses all information against the criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Selects candidate(s) to be recommended to the Selected Leadership Pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forwards recommendations to the Director of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>Makes appointments to positions of Principal and Vice-Principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>Chairperson of Selection Committee</td>
<td>Notifies via telephone, following the Director’s appointments, all candidates for a “Selected Leadership Pool” of the appointments to the “Pool”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides feedback to candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>Makes appointments to positions of Principal and Vice-Principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9</td>
<td>Superintendent of Human Resources</td>
<td>Prepares recommendation to the Board for appointments to positions of Principal and Vice-Principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 10</td>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>Presents to the Board, in camera, the recommendation for appointments to positions of Principal and Vice-Principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 11</td>
<td>Chairperson of selection Committee</td>
<td>Notifies all candidates for positions of Principal and Vice-Principal of the appointments via telephone, following the Board Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 12</td>
<td>Associate Director of Education</td>
<td>Announces the appointments to the system, after approval by the Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three categories of administrators whom this plan of action embodies are:

- current principals and vice-principals in the elementary and secondary school panels
- candidates within the system who have successfully experienced the selection process and await an administrative placement
- candidates within the system who are currently teachers and have not yet expressed interest in an administrative position and/or have who have unsuccessfully applied in the past and still interested.

**Formal Qualifications:** In Ontario there are certain administrative formal qualifications invoked by the Ministry of Education that are necessary in order to apply for the leadership pool as a candidate. How does one become a principal? (Refer to *Knowledge and Skills* section). Table 29 indicates the qualifications for promotional practices as well as provides guidelines currently practiced in District B:

**Table 29 - Administrator Qualifications For Promotion Practices and Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Qualifications: Candidates must:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td>• Hold a valid Ontario Teachers' Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have successfully completed all parts of the Ministry of Education and Training Principal’s Courses: Part 1 and 2, prior to application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualifying Experience:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates who are teachers in the elementary panel may apply for elementary vice-principal short-listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates who are teachers in the secondary panel may apply for secondary vice-principal short-listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates in a seconded position, or on exchange, may apply for vice-principal short-listing to the panel in which they were a teacher immediately before the start of the secondment or exchange.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Formal Qualifications: Candidates must</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hold a valid Ontario Teacher’s Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have successfully completed all parts of the Ministry of Education and Training Principal’s Courses, Part 1 and 2, prior to application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualifying Experience:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates who are vice-principals in the elementary panel may apply for elementary principal short-listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates who are vice-principals in the secondary panel may apply for secondary principal short-listing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates in a seconded position, or on exchange, may apply for principal short-listing to the panel of which they were a member immediately before the start of the secondment or exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates must have had experience as a vice-principal or principal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some views of the selection process follow:

My interest in developing “quality leaders” was part of what got me involved. Before this we had a portfolio process for selection but we had nothing else (Senior Administrator).

I got to meet all the other administrators. I knew lots of people but I didn’t know them as administrators. So when I got into the job I wanted to first of all get up on the current trends, meet more people and network, and do workshops. The things that were offered were excellent opportunities too. This was part of the selection process (Vice-Principal).

The good thing about this process is it’s not a one-shot deal. You’re lucky if you only have to go once. Unless you’re exceptionally good! One of the things that I would like to mention is that when they are placing administrators at a site, in a lot of cases there is a dialogue that takes place between a principal and a leader of the interview team, or in that case it would be a superintendent (Vice-Principal).

We expect all of our administrators to be mentors. So if you have a teacher in your school who’s interested in a PAR position, then provide them with the leadership opportunities so that they can demonstrate what their current level of skill is, as it relates to a potential leader. And then give them honest feedback about how they’re doing. Because eventually you as a principal will be required to fill out a report on that teacher when they engage in the selection process (Senior Administrator).

So there’s that level, now that’s something I would say we still need to work on, and that’s the encouraging and providing the knowledge and skills to all our administrators in terms of being an effective mentor for teachers in their school who aspire towards school administrators position. Then you have the ones that are identified as mentors for the recruitment initiative itself (Senior Administrator).

People have had only just a little bit of opportunity in this last little while to get onboard, and some of them haven’t got that “system perspective” down yet. They talk very narrow school focus. They’re still very much in their classroom—a classroom focus as opposed to the greater focus of the school. So, it’s harder for them to make the transition to vice-principalship (Principal).

**Contractual Considerations:** Instead of promoting external candidates for administrative roles immediately, there have been occasions when administrators from outside the district have been hired on as teachers and then eventually moved into an
administrator role. It has been a recent practice of District B to allow unqualified candidates to fulfill the role of "interim administrative" positions with conditions attached. Since it is widely believed by the district that succession planning and the development of leadership skills is the responsibility of every leader at every level, it was determined that a skills profile for administrators would be included in a leadership section of the newly revised teacher performance appraisals. The teacher appraisal protocol is currently being revised. The purpose of this newly added section to the teacher appraisal protocol is to develop a formal mentoring program, a leadership program which has been brought to discussion for acting vice-principals. It is to be extremely valuable. There is an agreement with the teachers' federations who will be the interim vice-principals while they are unqualified and seeking their qualifications. The Ontario College of Teachers also plays a role here whereby they have to give written permission to District B to allow interim positions to be filled by unqualified candidates. It is agreed that these interim administrators can return to the federation after one year without penalty if they decide not to continue.

**Job Description:** The job description for administrators in District B plays very little importance in determining the level of efficacy of planning a succession. As important as it might be, according to various participants, there is no standardized job description, at least not to their knowledge, for the principal or vice-principal role. From the interviews it appeared that the vice-principal and principal role differ only in the level of authority. In District B it has become very important that the school district administrators know and understand what the needs are for their individual schools and for their roles to be described accordingly. Based on this needs assessment, it then becomes equally important that the role, functions and expectations of the principal are clearly defined and articulated at the outset.

At the core of promoting the most capable administrators is the selection process based on the pool announcement. Principal selection begins with the declaration of a vacancy. In District B there is no specification in the vacancy announcement of the particular school where there is an opening since the philosophy encompasses the need for "system-wide administrators". Rather, the announcements call for applications for the various pools in general. The District would more likely attract appropriate candidates if
they listed information concerning the special needs and characteristics of a school in the vacancy announcement. Selectors assess and try to match candidate's skills and leadership styles with the particular needs of a school in order to select the right person for the job.

According to participants in this study, District B, like District A, needs to include in its pool description the needs to be accomplished in different schools by whoever fills the position; important characteristics of the existing staff, student's family background, cultures, extra curricular concerns and feelings about school; information about other executives in the school system.

Despite the well-structured process of the recruitment and selection procedure there is no formally structured administration preparation program included in the process. Instead, professional development and training needs are based on surveys that project teams distribute to their colleagues. Once a need is identified, the appropriate project team sets up its plan of action and arranges professional development to meet the particular needs. Nevertheless, there were some issues that emerged from the data from various administrators:

To me I see it as a pendulum right now. I see the PD is trained to death on one end, because you do need it...and then a family of schools will turn around and say, "you know we need to have our own professional development. We have to identify our needs within this group." I really feel like I'm being PD'd to death. It's coming at me from so many angles. And nothing is in the school. It's all out of the school. So it's like we are never there (Principal).

People are placed into S.O. roles and have gone in three years. I think the last one was three years, so the most experience up there to train the new people will be three years on the job. At that level it is really scary. I mean the board hasn't done anything to address that. At least we don't think so (Principal).

I worked really hard on my portfolio but very little of it was focused on during the interview process at central office (Candidate).

It would have been helpful for me if I had some time to explore the new school to get an idea of the culture before being placed (Candidate).

People have had only just a little bit of opportunity in this last little while to get onboard, and some of them haven't got that "system perspective" down yet. They talk very narrow school focus. They're still very much in
their classroom...a classroom focus as opposed to the greater focus of the school. So, it's harder for them to make the transition to vice-principalship (Principal).

There needs to be consultation and more time to prepare with candidates before placing them in any school. (Candidate).

There needs to be something in place to formally monitor the recruitment process (Principal).

I think we'll have to put a process in place to promote candidates from outside our own district as well (Principal).

**The Nature of Socialization**

It is widely believed by practicing educators and the public that administrators are capable of having a substantial impact on schools. In addition, this claim is supported by several empirical studies since the 1970s (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1990). Nevertheless, the actual variation of the impact that administrators have on schools is largely explained by differences in the nature of their leadership practices at a professional level as well as an organizational level.

Since my research explored the district’s role in leadership succession planning and leadership development for school administrators, it seemed appropriate to examine the various professional and organizational socialization opportunities and experiences that the district office provided for its administrators. In addition, it seemed fitting to describe, not only the opportunities and experiences, but also the strengths and weaknesses of these opportunities and experiences for assisting administrators with their roles and functions. Finally, with the leadership shortage in Ontario at an all time high, it seemed important to understand the purposes of socialization opportunities and whether or not these opportunities helped to attract a larger percentage of candidates to the role of administrators as well as helped to retain practicing administrators in District B. In other words it became important to examine the impact and/or influence of socialization on administrators.

Socialization, as it applied to my research, involves the processes described by Merton (1963) by which individuals selectively acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions need to perform adequately a social role (in this case aspiring and practicing vice-principals and principals). These processes can range from well-planned, formal
training programs, opportunities, and/or experiences to less formal but still planned experiences and opportunities (working with mentors) to largely informal, unplanned, on the job experiences.

**District Expectations:** In District B it is very clearly indicated through its leadership profile what the expected leadership qualities and characteristics are from its school administrators. There was a consultation process with school administrators, superintendents, district director and school board trustees involved in the design of this profile; therefore, a collaborative effort among various stakeholders based on surveys resulted in what the district currently refers to in its philosophy as “Quality Leaders Develop Quality Schools”. There are four components with sub-components contained within this model: Learner, Leader, Manager, and Communicator. The leadership profile (Table 26) and the Goal Plan for Succession Planning and Leadership Development (Table 27) clearly articulate District B’s expectations as these expectations apply to aspiring administrators in their early identification stage, preparation stage and initial promotion. The model also applies for practicing administrators. Professional and Organizational socialization processes are embedded in these expectations through a series of formal versus informal and implicit versus explicit experiences and opportunities.

The administrators in District B believe in the processes by which individual administrators selectively acquire the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to perform their social roles effectively. There are various informal ways by which individuals learn about their work settings, and the impact of others on that learning. In District B there is a focus on training and administration preparation programs, albeit loosely structured, that enhance the ability of leaders to perform routine work tasks based on their leadership model components.

The development and implementation of administrator training programs as a form of professional development for school administrators is meant to help administrators fit into the social system of their schools and school district both professionally and organizationally. If the training programs are not meeting the needs of school administrators the district re-evaluates the appropriateness of the administration preparation program by re-establishing better connections between their training program
and their expectations. The district school board rethinks and reassesses the content, delivery, and outcomes of administration preparation programs as they currently exist to ensure the needs of the school administrators and aspiring administrators are met. Consequently, in District B there is continuation of structures and programs in place for upcoming and practicing school administrators to have both professional and organizational socialization opportunities.

According to the literature, in the administrative structure of the school system there are two types of socialization processes that are always at the forefront for administrators: professional socialization and organizational socialization. It may range from both formal and explicit influences such as carefully planned formal training programs or working with a mentor to informal and implicit influences that include unplanned, on-the-job experiences (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1990).

**Professional Socialization:** Professional socialization generally begins in the pre-appointment phase of a school leader's education career and continues into early post-appointment growth and on-going development. Professional socialization is an interactive process used to gain knowledge, skills, and behaviors needed to participate as a member of a profession. It is a dynamic developmental process through which values and norms of the profession are internalized and a professional identity is gained. Many administrators recognize the influence of internal processes on socialization such as personal and professional values (personal challenge, thirst for knowledge, other people's influence). As one senior administrator stated:

> I think the other part though is more of the personal development... identifying opportunities that I would like to engage in that would prepare me for any position or enhance the skills as a principal. I took courses in conflict resolution, continued with courses like supervision and evaluation...based on my personal value system.

When discussing opportunities and experiences for professional socialization various viewpoints emerged from the data.

For teachers who want to become administrators, we expect them to be able to demonstrate that they're life long learners...that they've participated on a regular basis in professional development that supports them in their current role...which then will support them in their administration. We're giving them some professional development as it relates to the management and leadership role of the school administrator.
Another senior administrator emphasizes the importance of "mentoring" in socializing the new administrator to his/her new role:

In their mentoring group the mentors bring all the potential administrators together in large group session, so they run that throughout the year... the mentoring initiative starts to give them learning opportunities or to provide them with knowledge and awareness of what it means to be a school administrator.

A principal spoke of the influence of the local school administrator associations:

The principal association and vice-principal association here have organization...each one of these is really is at arms length from the official board structures...more and more they're recognized and have been as official board structures now...that's very definitely a supportive structure for administrators...and kind of networking and emotional support.

One principal stated that having a mentor is not all the time a positive socialization experience but learning can still take place:

I guess the danger sometimes is having a principal that isn't so strong. Sometimes you learn as much from what they don't do than what they do. I was in that situation...I'd have to run things through him but it was 'whatever you know do...oh that sounds good'. I learned lots of things that I would never do. And that's okay because you know there's lots of those situations that come along too, and you think oh lord I hope I never do that.

A vice-principal stated that without a mentor to model and learn from he/she would not have considered the role of vice-principal:

The other thing, I wouldn't think of applying to a principalship without having a mentor...because you would use a current principal or a superintendent who has gone through that experience.

A senior administrator spoke of the advantage and disadvantage of being placed in the same school as vice-principal and principal:

In my preparation for the school principal role it was 'birth by fire'. I was very fortunate to be placed at the school I was eventually going to be principal. I was in the principal pool at the time. The incumbent principal was aware that I was ear marked to take over for him. I had a year to learn all the idiosyncrasies of the staff, to develop an aura of credibility about me so that the staff was not terrified when they placed a new principal in the school. This "hands on" experience was helpful in becoming a principal. And that for me was an excellent opportunity...the danger in that is, someone who's been placed in the school for too long... if I had
been a vice-principal at the school for five years and then become the principal at that school, I might not be what the school needs.

**Organizational Socialization:** Organizational socialization is a form of adult socialization. It begins upon appointment, and is specific to the education context. It teaches administrators the knowledge, values and behaviors required of them in their role within their particular school and/or school district. These values and norms may be very different than those learned as part of the administrator’s professional socialization.

Each school has a particular context requiring understanding and integration of a complex array of people, policies, processes, and priorities. The need to fit into the immediate work environment makes organizational socialization more salient and immediate than the experiences that precede it, no matter how carefully organized. Organizational norms consequently tend to replace those learned during professional socialization. School administrators in schools consequently are interdependent with others who work there. The school administrator has formal leadership power but depends on those in the school for the power of the group to act.

The administrators in District B support the need to understand and analyze the particular organizational culture into which an administrator is placed, emphasizing that leadership is intertwined with each particular organizational culture. An insider (someone appointed from inside the school) is rarely assigned to an administrative position within the same school in District B, even though he or she brings past experience and knowledge to this process, as opposed to someone who is brought in from the outside the district. New administrators are generally promoted to administrative positions in a school other than the school in which he or she is currently assigned. As asserted by many vice-principals, “This is a matter of “rotation” which occurs every three to five years and creates some issues for us since the opportunity to get acquainted with cultures of new schools is insufficient...if the opportunity exists at all”. For the principals in this study the “rotation” factor also created an issue for them. One principal stated “at times when we are in the middle of mentoring a vice-principal or a candidate they are assigned to another school”.


It is believed that there are mediating influences on administrators’ socialization such as work setting, culture and relationships with peers, superiors, district policies and procedures, and formal training. As one senior administrator stated:

Different departments are just now starting to accept responsibility for in-service of principals vice-principals as well as aspiring administrators on what I call the nuts and bolts...like finance, human resources, budget whatever it may be. So that level of PD is happening at the organization level.

A principal explained the importance of being actively involved in board level committees:

I was a principal for quite awhile in several schools. It was having opportunities to be on various board committees that was helpful. So being involved with succession planning... with budget ...in boundary issues,...curriculum, writing curriculum and so forth...all was helpful.

A senior administrator explained the socialization impact of the Covey Institute:

The Covey institute is not mandated although the expense of the course when it's offered publicly is so phenomenally expensive... it's through succession development and through the board who put quite a budget together for succession development...at no cost. It justifies and validates the program. People say hey, "this costs five hundred dollars if I go and take it publicly." So it's something that the board and the director believe in...and that's why it continues to be offered. Is it mandatory? No. Is it suggested strongly? Yes! It keeps everybody abreast of what's happening in effective leadership styles.

In District B the administrators adopt a long-term view of the preparation and development of its school leaders that extends not only into the induction period, but provides planned socialization experiences each time a new leadership assignment is made. This indicates that formal training programs are necessary for the socializing of administrators and that such programs are an important factor for developing the technical knowledge and skills that administrators require. The district office personnel are devoting more time and energy to programs that focus on meaningful content. They have developed and implemented structured leadership development activities and opportunities for school administrators to enhance school leadership and to help meet expectations.
Universities and school districts can use a variety of bridging strategies to provide aspiring administrators with practical administrative experience and knowledge to help them succeed in the principal-ship prior to their first position. District B personnel work in a partnership with local universities. Pre-service training is not, however, the only assistance that administrators in District B receive. In fact, it is naïve to believe that pre-service training or even out-of-district in-service programs can provide aspiring administrators with all they need to know about how to be an effective leader in a particular school district.

**Structured Induction:** Senior administrators in District B continue training principals and provide newly hired administrators with a variety of supportive induction activities to help them continue their professional growth as school leaders. In short the district needs to ensure there are socialization opportunities provided to administrators in order to prepare for their role. In District B such an opportunity is provided in various components of its Administration Preparation Program where candidates are given the following opportunities: to learn about the districts expectations; how to develop a portfolio; brainstorming sessions for developing philosophy statements; activities to develop and determine leadership styles; opportunities for practice interviews; and opportunities to conduct mock interviews with "in-basket" scenarios. These sessions are conducted by practicing principals and vice-principals as well as the superintendent of succession planning and leadership development.

**Resocialization:** Although much has been written about beginning teachers and the accompanying trauma that many vividly recall, little has been written about the beginning principal. Perhaps because, unlike beginning teachers, beginning principals are continuing in their schoolwork, albeit in a new role. For teachers who have been in the profession for several years, the changing emphases of reform bring challenges of re-socialization. In District B, however, as teachers make the transition from being a teacher to being a school administrator so does the emergence of new socialization experiences. According to the literature, at the point of preparing for the administrator role, aspiring administrators begin to take on a new and different role as an educator. Consequently, the need to be re-socialized becomes crucial and a new professional identity suddenly is at the fore. Nevertheless, for some candidates who had been recently assigned (less than one
year) to vice-principal positions in District B it became clear that many were still thinking in the “teacher mode” and had not yet made the transition to “administrator mode”. As in District A, when talking informally to several experienced administrators it was clear that such a transition varies with each candidate and does not automatic happen as soon as a placement occurs.

Becoming a school administrator (vice-principal and/or principal) is for many educators the ultimate point in their career. However, there are more demands and changing expectations in the position now than ever before. It is because of the position demands and ever changing expectations that someone entering into this role will have new socialization experiences both professionally and organizationally.

In addition to the re-socialization of teachers who aspire to become administrators there is also a need to re-socialize the practicing administrators both new and experienced. The job and working conditions of administrators today are becoming more increasingly difficult, complex, and stressful. With changes in policies and procedures and school reform descending on schools, diversity flourishing in student composition and new conceptualization of leadership, the administrators(s) of schools are expected to provide effective leadership and take on a vast array of added responsibilities.

Table 30 indicates the greatest and least valuable socialization experiences among candidates, vice-principals and principals in District B. Although not all participants unanimously agreed on what was considered of greatest and least value to their preparation, the findings in this table are based on the number of frequencies these responses arose. Table 31 indicates the various formal and informal socialization opportunities and experiences provided by the school district for its school administrators.
Table 30 - Socialization Experiences of Least and Greatest Value in District B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatest Value</th>
<th>Least Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mentorship</td>
<td>• Principals Qualifications Course at OISE (too theoretical); York (too much “sit and get”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job shadowing</td>
<td>• University training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership experiences before placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administration preparation program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Networking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Principals Qualifications Course at Queens (very practical); Brock (the very best).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interim roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 31 - Socialization Opportunities for School Administrators in District B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Ontario Teacher’s Certificate  
• Undergraduate degree  
• Qualifications in three divisions one which must be intermediate division  
• One of the following: Ministry Training  
• Masters degree or two Specialist qualifications  
• Half Masters degree and two Specialists  
• Principals Qualifications Course: Part 1, 2.  
• Job-shadowing  
• Portfolio development  
• Administration Preparation Program (components)  
• Learn the art of “facilitating” and “teaching” training courses for administrators  
• Information sessions provided to all candidates university courses |
| • Leadership experience  
• Mentoring  
• Various Federations (SSPA, SSVPA, ESPA.)  
• Management tasks  
• Study groups  
• Dialoguing  
• Learning by observing good and bad models (social learning)  
• First-hand experiences of leadership  
• Formal job orientations  
• Facilitator groups meet with candidates once a month in somebody’s home to plan professional development opportunities and what they want (coffee and doughnuts)  
• Agendas discussed at breakfast meetings (informally)  
• Interactions with mentors and supervisors  
• Candidates form their own networks as potential vice-principals  
• Exposure to other school administrators  
• Conduct staff meetings  
• Conferences  
• Opportunity to explore the role of administrator and to decide if the role is “what one wants”  
• Knowledge base oriented workshops  
• “Families of schools” meetings whereby administrators are asked to identify potential future administrators  
• Potential administrator work with two principals (on-site principal and a facilitator principal) in a ‘Mentor/mentee’ relationship in preparation for the role  
• Social learning  
• Personal/professional values |
**Table 31 cont.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                | • Information sessions for culture learning  
|                | • Administration Preparation program (components)  
|                | • Principals Qualifications Program (components)  
|                | • Post appointment programs (Covey, Clemmer,  
|                | Grinder, and so forth)  
|                | • Procedures discussed on performance appraisals of  
|                | teachers  
|                | • School Council mandates discussed with vice-  
|                | principal or principal  
|                | • Knowledge and skill for doing budgets  
|                | • Promotion procedures discussed with administrators  
|                | • 4 workshops throughout a year based on leader,  
|                | learner, manager and communicator (Candidates  
|                | discuss these workshops with their facilitator groups)  
|                | • Policy and procedures manual at district level is  
|                | discussed (workshop style)  
|                | • Discipline techniques and legal issues, staffing issues  
|                | are discussed (candidates and practicing  
|                | administrators in workshop style)  
|                | • Workshop on “administrative binder” (day-to-day  
|                | operation of the school  
|                | • Taught the “Art of Communication” via workshops  
|                | • Knowledge of contractual agreements  
|                | • Relationship building with other administrators and  
|                | senior administrators  
|                | • Nobody can function as “Lone Rangers”  
|                | • Develop a plan for professional growth  
|                | • Facilitate “reflective” activities  
|                | • Assessment of personal and organizational values  
|                | • Accommodation and integration processes are  
|                | discussed  
|                | • Taught ‘role innovation’  
|                | • The need to re-socialize  
|                | • Administrators are taught how to assess the new  
|                | school’s core values and beliefs and apply them to the  
|                | dynamics and unique challenges they face  
|                | (experienced administrators are their teachers)  
|                | • Interdependence is encouraged along with  
|                | interpersonal relationships and political power  
|                | • Opportunities to interact with peers  
|                | • Informal sessions for understanding district policies  
|                | and procedures  
|                | • Structures, practices and performances  
|                | • Relationships with superiors and subordinates  

* S.S.V.P.A.: Secondary School Vice-Principals Association  
* E.S.P.A.: Elementary School Principals Association
Leadership Succession Planning in Context of Accountability

Purpose and Intention. In this era of decreasing revenues and increasing uncertainty about the future, accountability is a key concern in District B as it is in many districts on a global scene. In District B it is widely believed that in the education system, information must be made available to the public, to taxpayers and to parents in a form that allows them to have reasonable expectations of the system. In the past, administrator accountability has not focused much on the principal's role in improving teaching and learning in District B, as in most school districts. Instead, it has evolved around the administrator's ability as middle managers to satisfy the requirements of those below (mainly teachers), those above (superintendents and school boards) and those largely outside the school system (the community). A new form of administrator accountability focuses on leadership for student learning—a promising advance, provided that accountability systems are fair as well as rigorous. Some new formulations of administrator accountability fall short of fairness, sometimes focusing too narrowly on student scores on a single standardized test and at other times on factors (such as attendance rates) over which administrators have little influence.

District Expectations: As in District A, the administrators in District B feel they are committed to improving public accountability by communicating clear expectations, developing standards, and participating in provincial, national, and international assessments. To do this effectively, administrators in District B believe it is accountable:

• To its students to provide them with the means to master foundation skills and teach acceptable standards
• To its staff to assist them in coping with changing expectations; and
• To its parents and communities to manage its resources carefully and effectively in delivering educational programs and services

For the purposes of linking this component of the dissertation with leadership succession planning, there needs to be an established connection.

The administrators in District B focus intensely on leadership for student learning as a promising advance for school administrator accountability. In assisting its school administrative staff to cope with changing expectations, they are committed to the achievement of its mission and areas of focus through the ongoing development and renewal of its leaders and are confident it will be able to continue to provide strong
leaders to meet the challenges and seize the opportunities in the future. To support this direction, they are focusing on the identification, recruitment, PAR selection (Position of added responsibility), training and ongoing professional development of school administrators, who as life long learners, strive for excellence. (District Document, 1999). If school administrators are to be held accountable in their roles and functions as site-administrators they must be given professional opportunities and provided with experiences that will prepare them for the changing expectations in the role. In other words school administrators need to understand how the accountability process works so they are aware of whom they are accountable to, for what are they being held accountable and understand the process of how they are being held accountable. This is hoped to be achieved through the administration preparation programs and training that are currently in place in District B.

**Leadership Succession Planning:** The Succession Planning/Leadership Development Steering Committee is a team of educators who originally spearheaded this initiative. The committee is comprised of the Superintendent in charge of succession planning, along with nine school administrators, both vice-principals and principals who represent both elementary and secondary panels. The District’s goal plan, created by the Steering Committee in collaboration with administrators in the district for leadership development, encompasses five areas of importance: Recruitment, PAR Selection, Training, Professional Development, and Career Portfolio. Each of these areas have activities for administrator preparation which are facilitated by one or more “project team” members of the Steering Committee.

It is through the activities planned by these project team members that all administrators (aspiring administrators, new and experienced administrators) are provided opportunities and given experiences to enhance the knowledge and skill development in the leadership model in District B to fulfill the role effectively as school administrators. Among the myriad of activities embedded within succession planning, training and leadership development is the need to better understand the accountability process so each administrator is aware of the district’s expectations to its stakeholders.

**Portfolio and Performance Appraisal:** The portfolio process for administrators in District B, which encompasses part of the performance appraisal for administrators, is
also crucial if it is to promote the skills necessary for a collaborative learning centered school. In the appraisal document of vice-principals and principals, the key components are in accordance with legislation, board policy and contractual agreements. The components manifest themselves through the following five dimensions: effective planning and quality instruction; assessment and evaluation; safe and secure schools; effective use of resources, and communication. The goals of appraisal clearly support the values, beliefs and direction of the district which are outlined in the goal plan for leadership development. There is a formal process whereby new vice-principals and newly appointed principals each of the first two years they are in a position. The goal or intention of this policy in District B is to evaluate all experienced principals on a three-year cycle. Presently this creates some problems due to the time constraints. As a senior administrator explained:

We are turning over about twenty vice principal/principals every year. And so our five superintendents by the time they evaluate the new appointees, in those positions have limited time to go in and carry out the evaluations on the other fifteen or twenty they may be responsible for. So that's just the answer, in an ideal world we would be going in on that type of schedule. When we go in and evaluate, we look at them from a perspective of the learner, leader, manager and communicator. So there's some alignment between our selection process, and evaluation.

According to one principal the performance appraisal of administrators allows for some flexibility.

Depending on what the needs are for individual administrators the appraisal procedure allows for area superintendents to adjust the appraisal process to suit the needs of individual administrators, yet staying within the parameters of what the process indicates. Superintendents may exercise flexibility in accordance to the needs of their "family" of schools.

Table 32 outlines the components for the performance appraisal of vice-principals and principals.
### Table 32 - Performance Appraisal of Vice- Principals and Principals
(District Document, 1999).

| Purpose | • to give school administrators an opportunity to examine their philosophy, role and administrative practices in order to make any adjustment necessary to improve performance  
|         | • career needs should be satisfied both in detailing of areas of strength as well as in areas where improvement could be made  
|         | • to provide a relatively current reporting of their performance as an administrator available for personal and system use |
| Criteria | • pinpoints the school administrators responsibilities in both school and system  
|          | • appraisal focuses on the role of the administrator as educational leaders and decision makers in the day-to-day operation of the school  
|          | • The following components are included: *educational leadership, relations with staff, relations with students, relations with community, instructional program, integration, administration, and management of plant* |
| Procedure | • preliminary discussions and preparation  
|          | • all administrators in the same school are appraised at the same time  
|          | • “No surprises” must be a major factor in establishing ground rules  
|          | • appraisal criteria are identified by both parties (Superintendent and administrator)  
|          | • individual needs are identified through a selection “package” criteria  
|          | • timeline for completion of appraisal is established  
|          | • Self-Appraisal is highly recommended and may include: *administrator's objectives, educational philosophy, school organization, areas of concern and concentration, and criteria for appraisal* |
| Participants | • surveys are completed by students, parents and/or teachers for feedback during the appraisal period  
|             | • an oral report is given to the administrator at the conclusion of observations and allows for input into the written assessment  
|             | • a written report is distributed to the principal or vice-principal  
|             | • a written report is distributed to the principal or vice-principal appraised  
|             | • a written report is distributed to the Superintendent and the Manager of Personnel who then places the report in the administrator's Record File  
|             | • normally completed by May 1st |

**Accountability Issues:** Despite the “clarity” of expectations for leadership and how leadership development can enhance the knowledge of what school administrators are being held accountable for, varying perspectives emerged from the data through interviews. Some of these views on accountability are expressed below:
To me it means we need to be checking periodically to make sure that we are fulfilling our mission, which is empowering life long learners who strive for excellence in a changing world. And that if we have plans at the system level or at the school level, are we going back and monitoring those plans to see whether or not we're doing what we said we would do. (Senior Administrator)

Are we making a difference in student learning, and are we doing not only things right, but are we doing the right things? And I think we are less skilled in doing that...however, I think we're getting better at it. (Senior Administrator)

The site plan for every school is revisited as a means of accountability. (Principal)

Professional development and succession planning for administrators are helping administrators to be accountable for their roles...the learner, leader, manager, communicator, and setting what the expectations are around the honesty, openness, integrity, respect and so on and so forth. (Senior Administrator)

I'm responsible for ... schools. Each administrator is expected to draft a site goal plan, that is aligned with a system goal plan...accountability and alignment comes through that process. We now teach this process through our leadership development activities and succession planning. (Senior Administrator)

I would say the, one of the most pressing issues is dealing with the demands of the job, and trying to find some balance between what's required and what's realistic. It's probably the key role in the system, and probably the most demanding. And compounded with the fact that they're not in the Federation anymore, so they don't have that same relationship. (Senior Administrator)

We're accountable to EQAO...we're accountable to the Ministry...we're accountable to the board...we're accountable to our parents...and we're accountable for everything. (Principal)

Your accountability increases when something goes wrong. This is where knowledge, time, and resources and experience are all useful. (Principal)

Don't go there! (Principal)

I've said that to various superintendents, why is it that you can never run any interference for us? The shovels just keep coming down on us. (Principal)

That's not a bad thing to be accountable. It's just that they have to give us that time to learn what it is we're accountable for, so we can instruct it. (Principal)
The new exemplars...we got a crash course in it, and now we're expected to teach it to our staff and have them understand it. I haven't got a hope in ages in doing that. (Principal)

Accountable? At which minute of the day? (Vice-Principal)

Succession planning provides a refresher on procedures, processes, different policies within the board...as well as learning opportunities. Succession planning itself as a form of accountability. For example, you have succession planning... you have all the administrators and aspiring administrators involved in that...plus there's district personnel... they're working together here. And in essence, that's demonstrating a responsibility to the individuals in the system...and in turn the individuals in the system demonstrate responsibility for the system. So it's an ongoing circle. So it's accountability on all ends? (Vice-Principal)

The buck stops here! I have the responsibility for the consequences of what I choose to support and what I am expected to oversee. I am responsible for creating a learning environment that complies with ministry and board policy as well as student, teacher and community needs. (Vice-Principal)

I think the role and expectations of the vice-principal position need to be made clear at the outset. It's hard to accept accountability for a job that entails just about every aspect of the educational system. The difficulty for me is deciding or knowing where I should be focusing my attention and efforts in order to gain expertise as an administrator. It seems random right now (Vice-Principal).

Who knows? There seems to be a great deal of differences in what is expected of us as administrators. Accountability is a big question mark! (Candidate).

We need better understanding of accountability as leaders if we are to be effective leaders. (Candidate).

We are expected to carry out our jobs collectively and meet the collective goals of our district to ensure student success. Leadership succession planning helps us to prepare for that by providing an understanding of the role and the expectations. (Candidate).

Our performance appraisal manuals include a portfolio section and I think that's being used as an accountability tool. (Candidate).

Summary for District B

Leadership succession planning in District B falls under the responsibility of the superintendent who is in charge of leadership development and succession planning.
There is a budget specifically assigned for succession planning and leadership development. The superintendent, along with 5 project teams that consist of a representation of principals and vice-principals in both elementary and secondary panels, share the workload of planning for succession. This committee originates from the original Steering Committee consisting of nine representatives. There are five organized project teams who are responsible for their designated tasks including a Recruitment Team, PAR Selection Team, Training Team, Professional Development Team and Career/Professional Growth Portfolio Team. In addition there are 14 facilitator groups, 5 groups at the secondary panel and 9 groups at the elementary panel. These facilitator groups are responsible for addressing and identifying concerns and issues of administrators, facilitating meetings, group discussions and presentations during the recruitment stage for all candidates.

For this study, the administrators and senior office personnel in District B varied in level of experience as administrators from being recently placed in a school (less than one year) to having 15-20 years experience as an administrator. They also differed in geographical areas (rural, urban) as well as school division (elementary panel and secondary panel) and central office personnel. There was also a relatively equal mixture of both male and female participants although this was not used as a variable in the study.

As a result of the leadership shortage within District B due to a mass of retirements and the lack of interested candidates wishing to pursue the role of administrator, the administrators in District B follow the system’s philosophy of succession planning and leadership development. They believe in the identification, recruitment, selection, training, and ongoing professional development of school administrators who, as life long learners, strive for excellence. This District continues to identify its leadership requirements and competencies to ensure that quality people are in place to achieve its vision, mission and goals. This is enhanced through leadership development and renewal of its leaders.

It is believed in District B that training of capable leaders must begin long before they are needed. According to various participants in this study effective training programs are the first steps in hiring qualified administrators. Although there is not a structured formal administration preparation program in place in District B for
administrators it is certainly encouraged through an informal recruitment program with formal components, a rigorously planned formal selection procedure and well-structured professional development programs for leadership development. This, in turn, enhances the professional and personal growth of administrators along with the provision of various socialization opportunities and experiences. However, some of the activities are considered more beneficial than others while some are considered unimportant.

School district leaders in District B continue to assess their current practices and design flexible processes that support principals, vice-principals and aspiring leaders undergoing succession and generally lead to outcomes that advance the district policies and goals. They provide systematic support and time for visits, diagnosis, and planning activities with site administrators that facilitate their transitions to new schools. In addition, they consciously work to improve the outcomes of a succession beyond the careful search for and appointment of the best administrator for a school. This includes training and support specifically designed to assist aspiring administrators and new and practicing administrators who are taking charge in a new assignment, recognizing that they face challenges common to major transitions, acknowledging that a unique mix between the principal and the school will give rise to the outcomes of the succession, and preparing the principals for the impact the school will have on them as well as the impact they hope to have on the school.

Succession planning has become essential in District B to ensure that growth keeps pace with the growth of its organization and meets the changing expectations of the leadership roles as well as the current demands of accountability.
CHAPTER SIX
CROSS CASE ANALYSIS

Introduction
A case study approach was adopted for this study because it provided the means to understand the phenomenon of leadership succession planning in a holistic way. In the preceding two chapters, each case, Districts A and B were presented individually. Merriam (1988; 1998) suggests that, "an interpretation based on evidence from several cases can be more compelling to a reader than results based on a single substance" (1988, p. 154). A cross analysis aims "to build a general explanation that fits each of the individual cases, even though the cases will vary in their details" (Yin, 1984, p.108-109). Glaser and Strauss (1967) believe that cross case analysis deepens understandings and explanations.

This chapter considers the similarities and differences across the two school districts in terms of the philosophy and structure of their leadership succession plans, the procedures for recruiting and selecting school administrators, the professional and organizational socialization experiences and opportunities for school administrators, as well as the understanding of how both school districts use leadership succession as a means to hold their school administrators accountable for their roles and functions as administrators.

Events cannot be understood adequately if isolated from their contexts. This cross-case analysis permitted the context and its relationship to the findings to become more clear. The findings for each case are displayed in multi-cell matrices that encompass the interpretations of the data for the purposes of comparison. This is immediately followed by a narrative summary. Chapter Seven will attempt to interpret and discuss how the findings of this study relate to and add to the literature.

Context
A description of the school districts (see Table 33) considered in this study illuminates the organizational terrain in which the candidates, vice-principals, principals and central office personnel work. Detailed understanding of each school district helps to
clarify the relationship between where people worked and what they say about their professional roles. In essence the environment in which they work has some determination to the support structures of professional development and administration preparation programs provided for upcoming and practicing school administrators.

**Table 33 - Demographics Across Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of students</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of schools</td>
<td>Elementary: 98</td>
<td>Elementary: 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary: 19</td>
<td>Secondary: 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 118</td>
<td>Total: 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Supervisory offices including Director</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Teaching Staff</td>
<td>Elementary Teachers: 2,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Teachers: 1,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Principals: 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Vice-principals: 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary principals: 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Vice-principals: 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No of employees</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of District</td>
<td>7 areas with 19 families of schools</td>
<td>5 areas with 15 families of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget</td>
<td>$375 million</td>
<td>$365 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several commonalities exist across the two school districts in terms of the context. Both districts serve a similar size student population, both have similar numbers of elementary and secondary schools and school administrators, both have similar size teaching staffs, and both have a similar number of supervisory officers at district office.

A noted difference is the organization of the district. In District A services are provided within seven areas with nineteen “families” of schools and in District B services are provided within five areas with fifteen “families” of schools. There are also differences among the school administrators within both school districts in terms of the panel they represent (elementary and secondary), the geographical location in which the individual schools are located (urban and rural), the experience held as educators (administrator candidates, new and experienced school administrators, and senior
administrators) and the stages of development (candidate, vice-principal, principal). Table 34 illustrates the participants profiles.

### Table 34 - Participants Profiles Across Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Average Years of School Administration Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M: 3</td>
<td>Elem: 4</td>
<td>Urban: 3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 2</td>
<td>Second: 1</td>
<td>Rural: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M: 2</td>
<td>Elem: 3</td>
<td>Urban: 4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 3</td>
<td>Second: 2</td>
<td>Rural: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M: 3</td>
<td>Elem: 4</td>
<td>Urban: 4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 3</td>
<td>Second: 2</td>
<td>Rural: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M: 4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M: 2</td>
<td>Elem: 4</td>
<td>Urban: 3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 3</td>
<td>Second: 1</td>
<td>Rural: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M: 3</td>
<td>Elem: 3</td>
<td>Urban: 4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 2</td>
<td>Second: 2</td>
<td>Rural: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>M: 3</td>
<td>Elem: 4</td>
<td>Urban: 5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 4</td>
<td>Second: 3</td>
<td>Rural: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M: 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both districts began leadership succession planning in 1998 to address a shortage in leadership for school administrators. Both districts used a common development process, both have similar program structures and time frames for implementation.

### The Nature Of Leadership Succession Planning

One of the intentions of this study was to investigate the philosophy and structure of leadership succession plans in two school districts and to determine the nature of these leadership succession plans by describing how each school district assists their upcoming and practicing school administrators in their roles and functions as administrators. There are many commonalities amongst the participants across both districts in terms of their
philosophies of leadership succession planning. Table 35 describes the similarities among participants' views on philosophy of succession planning across the two districts. Table 36 describes the differences across both districts.

**Table 35 - Philosophy of Leadership Succession Planning: Commonalities Across Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A/District B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Principals/Vice-Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel, documents, observations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A coherent plan must be in place to draw more candidates to the administrative role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership Succession Planning is a strategy used to ensure more qualified leaders for the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More time is needed for training and preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Currently, there are too few candidates interested in the administrative role. Yet, there are more expressing an interest on a yearly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both districts believe in promoting from “within” the ranks of their district rather than promoting externally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changing expectations are discussed regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More candidates needed at the elementary level than at the secondary level due to number of elementary schools in districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Districts have a plan in place for succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A survey was conducted initially to elicit input into succession planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Career patterns of aspiring administrators and practicing administrators are similar in both districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is no “formal” evaluation or monitoring process in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership development: School administrators (aspiring and practicing) are aware of the characteristics and qualities of administrators outlined in their district’s leadership models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Principals, vice-principals and candidates in both school districts agree that more consultation on “school placements” is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Senior administrators feel that the consultation process is adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both districts rotate their principals every 3-5 years (a common issue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both districts try to place vice-principals in principal positions in another school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both districts place their candidates in vice-principal positions in another school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both districts’ personnel recognize the importance of leadership succession planning and have made it a district leadership priority via funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36 - Structure of Leadership Succession Planning: Differences Across Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A/District B</th>
<th>(Principals/Vice- Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel, documents, observations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Succession Planning-Leadership Models have certain components that differ between districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruitment strategy in District A is a “one shot” information session conducted by central office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruitment organization in District B is on-going throughout the year and facilitated by a recruitment “project team”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The administration preparation program in District A is well structured whereas in District B the program is loosely structured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation for short-listing candidates in District A is comprehensive and well-structured. The candidates are guided and directed by the educational officers and the training team of administrators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation for short-listing candidates in District B involves the same process as in District B but candidates are left to their own vices to ensure their readiness. They may consult with their site principals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Philosophy and Structure of Leadership Succession Planning in Both Districts: Commonalities and Differences

*Changing Expectations:* Expectations are changing for the role of the school administrators. In this study there were no differences in the philosophies of leadership succession planning across the two districts. The aspiring administrators, vice-principals, principals and senior administrators in both school districts in this study share similar beliefs that if districts are to meet the needs of the recent challenges in administration, mainly the shortage of qualified candidates who apply for the administrative pools, there has to be a coherent leadership succession plan in place that will draw more candidates to the role of school administration. It is a general belief that within this plan there have to be support strategies that will encourage and ensure the professional development and ongoing training programs of qualified leaders for the districts.

Senior administrators in both districts believe that their districts can and do capitalize on the expectation for change that succession brings to implement new programs and work towards the improvement of schools. They believe in seizing the opportunity that this major role transition presents to shape and expand the professional orientation, knowledge and skills, both moral and technical, of the administrators who
lead their schools. The candidates and vice-principals (new and experienced) and newly appointed principals were confused as to what their roles were and thought there should be a clearer job-description developed by the district office. All of the participant administrators, aspiring and practicing, as well as senior administrators believe that the district expectations must be made clear at the outset as to the what the role of school administrator entails.

**Internal Promotion:** Another common belief across the two districts lies within the promotional procedures of administrators. It is accepted that promoting administrators from within each district is a preference for “continuity” rather than recruiting externally. The senior administrators believe that since the investment for training programs costs money and time it would defeat the purpose of the training program if they were to promote from outside the district. They believe that promoting from “inside” ensured knowledge of school and district organizational culture, district policies and goals. Both school districts rarely have the need to promote candidates to administrative positions from outside. Instead they will promote unqualified candidates to “interim” positions under the condition that these candidates complete their administrator qualifications. In addition, both districts have had an occurrence whereby an administrator candidate from outside the district has been initially hired as a teacher and then promoted to a vice-principal within a year.

**District Planning:** One of the most crucial steps in preparing capable school leaders is district planning. Personnel in these two school districts play an increasingly important role in planning and implementing the professional development and training for aspiring and practicing administrators. The participants reported that special programs are designed and implemented to support the interest of aspiring administrators, support the work of beginning school administrators as well as the renewal initiatives for the experienced administrators. The novice school leaders feel they are served well when efforts are made on their behalf at district level, such as the use of mentor-protege program. However, a negative factor related to the mentor-protege component of the training program of administrators is apparent in both school districts. It is “time”. In order to have an effective mentor-protege program and general training for succession purposes, the candidates, vice-principals and principals feel that more time must be
provided as part of the training exercise to address the issues of "who, when, what, and how" things get done in these individual school districts.

**Career Patterns:** The career development patterns among the participants in this study were very similar. Many of the candidates were mid-career before deciding on applying for the vice-principal position within their individual district. Most of the practicing administrators were as well.

With an exception of three candidates who self-selected, all other candidates were asked by their principal or supervisory officer to consider an administrative position. The average number of years of teaching experience among candidates range between 16 and 20 years. Candidates believe that their teaching experience, along with their leadership skills already demonstrated within the schools, will add a great deal of credibility to the administrator role. One candidate with more than 25 years teaching experience, stated that he/she had never considered an administrative role until the principal suggested it.

Among the vice-principals in the study, both new and experienced, the average number of years of teaching experience ranged between 13 and 17 years (mid-career). These vice-principals, like the candidates, were in the mid-point of their careers before deciding on an administrative role. All but one vice-principal, who was self-selected, was asked by their principals or supervisory officers to consider an administrative role. The average number of years experience as a vice-principal ranged from 3.6 to 5.1 years. Among the principals, the average number of years of teaching experience ranged between 12 and 15 years. The average number of years in administration, including vice-principalship, are practically equal: 9.5 years in District A, and 9.7 years in District B.

**Leadership Development:** Participants in this study understood that administrator succession planning is not simply a matter of finding the right person for the administrator's job. They believe that common strategic goals, priorities and initiatives can only be achieved if an effective program for leadership succession is in place. For leadership to be effective it is widely believed among candidates, vice-principals, principals, and senior administrators that all stakeholders in education should have the opportunity to contribute input into the district's leadership model for school administrators. They also emphasized that succession planning becomes essential to
ensure that leadership growth keeps pace with the growth of the school district as well as meeting the changing expectations of the leadership roles.

In discussing the structural similarities and differences of the leadership succession plans across both districts, there are several obvious similarities in the components between both district leadership models and the strategy used in the development of these models. The personnel in both districts follow the same process and had many of the same structures such as characteristics looked for in effective leaders as part of the recruitment component. They follow the same steps in the selection processes, and provide many of the same opportunities for professional and organizational socialization.

The most notable differences lie within the structure of the administration preparation program component. The structure of the administration of the leadership succession program is distinctly different in each district. In District A there is no superintendent in charge of leadership succession planning specifically. However, the Superintendent of Operations is responsible for overseeing it. Moreover, there are two educational officers who are currently seconded school administrators, who have leadership succession planning as part of their portfolios at the central office. They, in turn, report to the Superintendent of Operations.

District A personnel have developed a structured program for administrator candidates applying to the vice-principal pool. This program outlines the various elements of administrator preparation (portfolio development, job-shadowing opportunity, preparation for the interview process, etc). It is facilitated by a team of trainers consisting of two educational officers and five practicing administrators. The training occurs for any potential administrators interested in pursuing the role. Usually the program is offered in the fall and again in the winter. It is a highly structured professional development course whereby all interested candidates meet several times for approximately three months for a full day or half day and focus on specific areas of interest. The candidates, upon completion of the course, have the choice of applying to the next vice-principal pool opening or can wait until the second pool opens. The openings for the pools are in the fall and the spring.
Developing the Portfolio. The portfolio development process is an integral portion of the administration preparation program in both District A and District B. In District A this process is carefully conducted in a technology laboratory at central office and facilitated by the Superintendent of Technology services. The expectations for the content of portfolios are made clear during this process with the coaching of the supervisory officer and the team of administrators. Candidates then work on their own time or with another candidate to exchange ideas in preparation for the vice-principal application pool. Each candidate is given a computer template which he/she can download at home. The template, which is titled “Portfolio Package in Word Perfect” has all instructions for the candidate.

In District B the intended purpose of the portfolio is like that of District A- a collection of candidates leadership experiences and attributes that reflect the candidates skills, knowledge and values. However, there is a “project team” responsible for overseeing the initial development of the “Professional Growth Portfolio”. The portfolio process is done by individual candidates who seek advice from their individual administrators. They have a computer template at their disposal. There is no formal coaching in preparing the portfolio except for what the site principal might contribute and/or other colleagues. Each candidate is responsible for the developing of his/her growth portfolio and often seeks assistance from the site principal. There is no class where all candidates can assemble and receive direction on how to complete the portfolio. There is, however, a computer template available to all candidates to access the directions.

Unlike District A, District B has a superintendent whose portfolio is specifically leadership succession planning and leadership development. This superintendent oversees the plans for leadership development and leadership succession activities with a volunteer steering committee that consists of nine school administrators. Each of the administrators on this team has a sub-team (project team) who is responsible for various professional development activities. However, in District B the administration preparation program is more loosely structured. Professional development activities are offered for administrator candidates when it is deemed necessary. There is no written program that candidates can
follow or attend in preparing for the administrative role. As in District A the openings for application to the vice-principal pools occur in fall and spring.

Central office personnel in District A have a well-structured administration preparation program for candidates whereby candidates are prepared for the selection and short-listing process. It is a written and planned "training course". The preparation program in District B is structured differently. In District B there is no written structure or course for the administration preparation course. Instead, there are five project teams in place. (Recruitment, PAR Selection, Training, Professional Development, and Professional Growth Portfolio) These are formal teams consisting of several practicing school administrators (principals and vice-principals) from both elementary and secondary panels. Each project team is responsible for the professional development activities and opportunities for the districts aspiring administrators, new and experienced vice-principals and principals. The chair of each team is one of the original Steering Committee members. The Superintendent of Leadership Development -Succession Planning oversees all project teams and their planned activities.

In District B the preparation of administrators is done based on a "needs" basis which could explain why there is no formal administration preparation course in place where administrators meet regularly for training.

The Nature of Recruitment and Selection

District A and B employ some common approaches to the recruitment and selection of leaders as well as some contrasting strategies. Table 37 describes the commonalities across districts as these commonalities relate to recruitment and selection processes practiced in both districts. Table 38 describes the differences in these same processes across both districts.
Table 37 - Recruitment and Selection: Commonalities Across Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A/District B</th>
<th>(Principals/Vice-Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel,Documents,Observations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Both districts recruit and select for teaching vice-principals in elementary and non-teaching vice-principals in secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information sessions on recruitment and selection are made available to everybody.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Candidates understand and follow promotional guidelines as outlined in the district for selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal qualifications are followed and expected in accordance with ministry regulation 298 for recruitment and selection requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support structures for training and preparation for selection are in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many inexperienced administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Principals are expected and encouraged to identify potential leaders within schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-selection is practiced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many candidates are tapped on shoulder&quot; by school principals and by supervisory officers to apply to applicant pools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Application processes are the same in both districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants in both districts expressed fear of the interview process due to “rejections”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demand exceeds supply in both districts (less apparent in secondary schools)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio development structure is similar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portfolio process is considered too “time-consuming” and plays insignificant role at the interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ontario College of Teachers and Teachers Federations play a role in contractual agreements for “interim” administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a common issue between both districts: A need to visit schools before placement is expressed among candidates and vice-principals before they are placed. Getting to know and understand the new school culture was important to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Rotation” of administrators is done every three to five years (all candidates are informed of this procedure throughout the selection process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Both districts have an informal feedback process for unsuccessful candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Both district have similar concerns and issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38 - Recruitment and Selection: Differences Across Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Principals/Vice-Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel, documents, observations)</td>
<td>(Principals/Vice-Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel, documents, observations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administration Preparation Program is well-structured.</td>
<td>- Administration Preparation Program is unstructured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recruitment is done by central office personnel during a meeting. There is no formal structured recruitment team.</td>
<td>- There are five project teams in place. (Recruitment, PAR Selection, Training, Professional Development, and Professional Growth Portfolio) These are formal teams consisting of several practicing school administrators (principals and vice-principals) from both elementary and secondary panels. One of the members of each team acts as chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administration Preparation Program is facilitated by two educational officers who create and oversee the training. The training is done by four practicing school administrators. There are two superintendents who participate in the training of candidates as well in preparing them for the administrative role. The program is set up as a course with training time slots over a period of three months. The program is offered in the fall and in the winter.</td>
<td>- There is no set course for the Administration Preparation Program. The preparation of administrators is done based on the “need”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The portfolio development process is carefully conducted in a laboratory at central office. The expectations are made clear for this process. Candidates then work on their own time or with another candidate to exchange ideas.</td>
<td>- The portfolio process is done by individual candidates who seek advice from their individual administrators. There is no formal coaching in preparing the portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is a process in place for external candidates who wish to pursue administrative positions. However, they are hired on as teachers first and eventually can apply to the vice-principal pool.</td>
<td>- There is no process in place for external candidates. If insufficient number of candidates apply to the vice-principal pool they will re-advertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment and Selection of School Administrators: Commonalities and Differences Across Districts

**Role of the School Administrator:** Participants in this study agreed that the role of the school administrator has changed dramatically in scope and complexity. Today's administrators are operating in a new environment; increased accountability at all levels, extensive government reforms, greater community involvement and changed relationships with school boards and teachers. To prepare for and succeed under these new conditions, administrators need to have access to updated skills, techniques and information. Participants in this study agreed that district office personnel must ensure aspiring and practicing administrators at the recruitment stage that professional development and training at district level will be provided to meet these changes. Such activities should be included throughout the selection process (pre-appointment) and continued well into the administrator placements (post-appointment).

Candidates, vice-principals and new principals indicated that if it were not for the in-service education and professional development opportunities within their districts they probably would not have been interested in an administrative role. They agreed that these professional development opportunities certainly helped them to perform their duties more efficiently and effectively. They believe that regardless of the expectations of what the job might be, the in-servicing and professional development of administrators provided positive direction toward their personal and professional growth in performing their tasks. However, one newly appointed vice-principal explained that despite the ongoing professional development and training program for administration in his/her district, he/she was not prepared for his administrative role. He/she emphasized that "nothing can really prepare you for the first year in an administrative role".

Another common issue across these two school districts concerning the role of the administrator was that vice-principals spend a great deal of their time in teaching roles that do not allow them "time" to complete their administrative tasks. In contrast, principals spend a majority of their "time" on administrative and managerial tasks rather than on those that directly affect curriculum and instruction. Due to these challenges in schools, central office personnel provide professional development opportunities for
administrators to enhance their skills in areas such as time management and allocation of workload for administrators. One vice-principal explained that when he/she arrived at his/her new school, the principal had taken into consideration the fact that he/she was a teaching vice-principal for more than 50% of the time. Due to the percentage of time allotted to the principal for teaching, the principal allocated administrative tasks accordingly so as to not interfere with the teaching. This was strongly encouraged and supported by the senior administrators in both districts. However, this is only applicable in the elementary panel since secondary vice-principals do not teach. It was also noted among some principals that the time factor for “job-shadowing” and “mentoring” were elements to be revisited in the districts since these programs require “time” to be implemented effectively. One principal felt that he/she had not been effective as a mentor because the unavailability of time. A vice-principal added “as we begun to get to know each other and understand the mentoring process I received a call from central office that I had been placed in another school and had two weeks to prepare for the transfer”. An elementary principal felt that there was “too much time away from school for professional development and teachers begin to worry about their own professional development time”. At the same time a secondary principal indicated that there was too much time away from his/her school doing “more of the same” yet some of the “time” away from school was “redirecting energy to more important tasks” such as the Michael Grinder’s workshop on “Patterns of Communication”.

It was felt by aspiring administrators, vice-principals and principals that central office personnel need to consider the above-mentioned factors when planning the recruitment and selection process. They agreed that promotional guidelines are followed, with some flexibility, as outlined in each district. These guidelines are important in the selection process. The support structures for training and preparation are also in place during selection in the form of the administration preparation program in both districts. The program is intended to better prepare future administrators and to keep current administrators abreast of what the role of the school administrator involves. It has become part of the districts’ expectations. Candidates and all other administrators need to be aware of these processes.
Another commonality existed in the awareness of the districts' need for "system" administrators as well as the "systematic rotation" of administrators practiced within their districts. All candidates are made aware of these processes during recruitment and selection.

**Attracting, Screening, and Identifying Candidates:** There was a general consensus among the candidates in this study that their views and perceptions of the role of the administrator were negative until they began leadership initiatives in their school. Traditionally, it was relatively easy to attract teachers into the ranks of school administration because they saw administration as a normal part of career advancement. Many highly qualified teachers now dismiss careers in administration for consideration because of these negative perceptions towards the role. Teachers no longer see administration as a way to improve their salaries, prestige, or respect among colleagues. Despite these perceptions, however, senior administrators believed that with the professional development activities currently happening in their districts, more teachers are accepting that there are alternative images of school leadership. Consequently more teachers are involving themselves in school councils and school growth teams. One vice-principal, newly appointed, expressed concern with poor remuneration as it relates to responsibilities and the expectations of the job.

A distinct difference between both districts was the organizational structure of recruitment. In order for effective "attracting, screening and identifying" candidates to occur, all administrators felt that recruitment activities must be well organized. Even though supervisory officers who are responsible for their individual "family" of schools in their own district are responsible for encouraging and identifying candidates for administrative roles the recruitment process should not stop at that point. The recruitment process in District A is loosely structured compared to the well-structured series of activities and events for recruitment in District B. The participants in District A expressed a concern for a more formal and structured process for recruiting candidates as potential administrators. At the time of this study, recruitment was done informally by central office personnel during a meeting. Principals also encouraged candidates to apply for the vice-principal pool. There was no formally structured recruitment team. In District B, however, the recruitment process was more structured. One of the five project teams was
responsible for all recruitment activities and would meet regularly with professional agendas for discussions about current and past experiences as administrators. Any teacher or candidate could attend.

**Position Demands and New Expectations:** The administrator's role today, according to participants in this study, demands meeting more complex expectations forged by a very different student population and a new generation dissatisfied with the status quo of educational effectiveness. Participants feel that district office personnel need to work with all their administrators, aspiring and practicing, new and experienced to ensure that schools are prepared for the new generation of students. They need to adapt to different roles, different needs, and create different strategies to ensure quality education for all students. Senior administrators agree that extensive calls for reform and increased standards in the preparation of school administrators are being included in the present recruitment and selection procedures. All other participants agree too.

**Knowledge and Skills:** Personnel in District A and B are encouraging and implementing the recruitment and selection of administrators with knowledge and skills and other leadership qualities which are outlined in their leadership models. Participants are aware of their district's model for leadership development. The leadership model developed and implemented in District A focuses on administrator qualities such as personal skills, management skills and leadership skills. These skills are developed in various stages of an administrator's career such as in the early identification stage, preparation stage, initial promotion stage and the renewal stage. (See Tables 12). Similar to the administrators in District A, the administrators in District B believe that quality leaders exhibit a passion and commitment to learning as is demonstrated in its leadership model (Chapter 5). It is widely believed among administrators in District B that "quality leaders develop quality schools". Leaders in District B are expected to demonstrate a strong sense of the district's values in their personal and professional lives as well as possess knowledge and understanding in the context of learner, leader, manager, and communicator.

**Selection: Application Process:** There are many similarities in the selection process across the two districts. The candidates, vice-principals, principals and senior administrators are aware of the formal selection process that each of their districts have in
place and understand them. Each district has a selection process in place that includes the development of an administrator portfolio, a similar procedure for internal candidates to follow when applying to the vice-principal pools, a similar administrative interview process, a similar short listing process, a similar procedure for notification of results, and the selection process from the short list is similar. This was corroborated by the district documents on administrator promotional procedures.

**External Candidates:** One distinct difference in the selection process across districts is a formal procedure for external administrator candidates. In District A according to the district document on ‘Promotional Procedures of Administrators’ there is a written process, albeit brief and underdeveloped, for the recruitment and selection of outside candidates into the vice-principal’s role. However, when asked about this process, participants, including the senior administrators, seemed unaware of its existence. Unlike in District A, there is no documented process in place for external candidates in District B. This would explain what one senior administrator stated “if an insufficient number of candidates are successful in the short-listing process we would re-advertise and re-open the vice-principal pool.” However, according to a principal in District B “our district needs to work a little more in the area of external candidates and get something in place”.

**Contractual Considerations:** Contractual considerations play an important role in the selection process of candidates for the vice-principal pool in both districts. As noted earlier, neither District A nor District B has a process for recruiting external candidates for administrative roles immediately. However, there have been occasions when experienced administrators from outside the district have been hired on as teachers first and then eventually moved into an administrator role.

It has been a recent practice in District A and District B to allow unqualified candidates (without formal administrator qualifications) to fulfill the role of “interim administrative” positions with conditions attached. The conditions included the completion of Part 1 and 2 of the Principal’s Qualifications Program while still in the “acting/interim” role. In addition, acting vice-principals were allowed a “grace” period up to one year to “try out” the role of administration. With the approval of the teachers’ federation and the Ontario College of Teachers, the “acting” administrator must decide at
the end of that year to continue in the administrative role or to return to the classroom as teacher without any penalty.

Since it is widely believed by aspiring and practicing school administrators and central office personnel in both districts that succession planning and the development of leadership skills are the responsibility of every leader at every level, it was determined that a skills profile for administrators would be included in a leadership section of the newly revised teacher performance appraisals. The purpose of this newly added section to the teacher appraisal protocol is to develop a formal mentoring program, a leadership program which has been brought to discussion for acting vice-principals. There is an agreement with the teachers' federations on who will be interim vice-principals while they are unqualified and seeking their qualifications. The Ontario College of Teachers play a vital role since they have to approve contracts of all “acting” vice-principals.

According to one senior administrator in District A there are some positive and negative issues related to this as well (repeat from page 128):

The Ontario College of Teachers have to approve all contracts of acting vice-principals. The only thing that acting vice-principals don't do that principals and vice-principals do, is they don't evaluate teachers while they are still technically a part of the federation. So it becomes a larger issue with the principal. The upside of this is we have a recruitment pool of people who are learning what the job is about under a principal while they are getting qualified, and then can determine whether they wish to go on or not, and are gaining skills at the same time.

We have an excellent relationship with federation. They think it is a great thing, and we do as well. When you ask the question of shortage in regard to leaders across the province, our group who responded to the leadership study indicated that the political situation was the main issue for shortage of administrators, and then increased stress on job, leaving the federation, too little money for too many hassles, and cost of qualifications. Now in dealing with this we have ... cost of qualifications, we have relationships with colleges and faculties as well as with the Ontario Principal's Council to provide courses within our district so that at least the expensive travel is put aside so people can take the necessary qualifications very close to home.

A principal in District B made reference to a situation in the recent past whereby an aspiring administrator had completed a full year, plus a few days, as an acting vice-principal and decided that the role of administrator was not for him/her. When the
decision was made to return to the classroom it was refused by the teacher’s federation so the school district office had to place him/her immediately into an administrator’s role.

**Job Description:** A commonality was apparent in area of job description. According to the administrators in this study there was no standardized job description for the vice-principal nor for the principal roles. However, they unanimously agreed that in the Education Act there is a general description of the duties and responsibilities for educators in these roles. Nevertheless, a common concern among the administrators is the lack of input into their job descriptions especially since the districts believe in having “system administrators”. One vice-principal stated that his/her role largely depended on the school principal. Since this vice-principal was teaching 60% of his/her time the principal limited the number of tasks originally assigned to the vice-principal.

Another common concern across both districts was in the area of career planning which can be linked to job description. All candidates are asked to complete a career plan during the selection process as a form of consultation whereby the candidates can state reasons as to why they can not be placed in a particular school, whether it is because of a conflict of interest (i.e., spouse in the same school) or a negative dynamic between the administrators. One vice-principal felt that since the job description of administrators in each school, written or otherwise, involves working with teachers and other administrators sometimes this could create negative dynamics if a spouse is working in that same school.

The recruitment process in District A is loosely structured compared to the structured series of activities and events for recruitment in District B. The selection and short-listing process is structured very similarly in both districts. However, District B uses a different strategy in preparing candidates for the selection and short-listing process as described above.

**The Nature of Socialization**

Both districts have a number of common approaches or strategies to the way they socialize school administrators; they also have specific and different ways they support school administrators. Table 39 describes the commonalities in socialization experiences
and opportunities across the two school districts while Table 40 describes the differences across both districts.

**Table 39 - Socialization: Commonalities Across Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Informal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ontario Teacher's Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undergraduate degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Qualifications in three divisions one which must be intermediate division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One of the following: Ministry Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Masters degree or two Specialist qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Half Masters degree and two Specialists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Principals Qualifications Course: Part 1, 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job-shadowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Portfolio development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administration Preparation Program (components)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learn the art of “facilitating” and “teaching” training courses for administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information sessions provided to all candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| - Leadership experience  |
| - Mentoring  |
| - Various Federations (SSPA, SSVPA, ESPA,)  |
| - Management tasks  |
| - Study groups  |
| - Dialoguing  |
| - Networking  |
| - Breakfast/lunch meetings  |
| - Learning by observing good and bad models (social learning)  |
| - First-hand experiences of leadership  |
| - Formal job orientations  |
| - Facilitator groups meet with candidates once a month in somebody’s home to plan professional development opportunities and what they want (coffee and doughnuts)  |
| - Agendas discussed at breakfast meetings (informally)  |
| - Interactions with mentors and supervisors  |
| - Candidates form their own networks as potential vice-principals  |
| - Exposure to other school administrators  |
| - Conduct staff meetings  |
| - Conferences  |
| - Opportunity to explore the role of administrator and to decide if the role is “what one wants”  |
| - Knowledge-base oriented workshops  |
| - “Families of schools” meetings whereby administrators are asked to identify potential future administrators  |
| - Potential administrator work with two principals (on-site principal and a facilitator principal) in a “mentor/mentee” relationship in preparation for the role  |
| - Social learning  |
| - Personal/professional values  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Table 39 cont.)</th>
<th><strong>Organizational</strong></th>
<th><strong>Informal</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Formal**       | • Information sessions for culture learning  
|                  | • Administration Preparation program (components)  
|                  | • Principals Qualifications Program (components)  
|                  | • Post appointment programs (Covey, Clemmer, Grinder, Fullan)  
|                  | • Procedures discussed on performance appraisals of teachers and administrators  
|                  | • School Council mandates discussed with vice-principal or principal  
|                  | • Performance Appraisals Meetings  
|                  | • Knowledge and skill for doing budgets  
|                  | • Promotion procedures discussed with administrators  
|                  | • 4 workshops throughout a year based on leader, learner, manager and communicator (Candidates discuss these workshops with their facilitator groups)  
|                  | • Policy and procedures manual at district level is discussed (workshop style)  
|                  | • Discipline techniques and legal issues, staffing issues are discussed (candidates and practicing administrators in workshop style)  
|                  | • Workshop on “administrative binder” (day-to-day operation of the school)  
|                  | • Taught the “Art of Communication” via workshops  
|                  | • Knowledge of contractual agreements  
|                  | • Relationship building with other administrators and senior administrators  
|                  | • Opportunities to interact with peers  
|                  | • Nobody can function as “Lone Rangers”  
|                  | • Develop a plan for professional growth  
|                  | • Facilitate “reflective” activities  
|                  | • Assessment of personal and organizational values  
|                  | • Accommodation and integration processes are discussed  
|                  | • Taught ‘role innovation’  
|                  | • The need to re-socialize  
|                  | • Administrators are taught how to assess the new school’s core values and beliefs and apply them to the dynamics and unique challenges they face (experienced administrators are their teachers)  
|                  | • Interdependence is encouraged along with interpersonal relationships and political power  
|                  | • Informal sessions for understanding district policies and procedures  
|                  | • Structures, practices and performances  
|                  | • Relationships with superiors and subordinates |
Table 40 - Socialization: Differences Across District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A</th>
<th>District B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Principals/Vice-Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel, documents, observations)</td>
<td>(Principals/Vice-Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel, documents, observations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All formal professional development activities for aspiring and practicing administrators are organized by one staff development team at central office. The staff development team is also responsible for all other staff development. They report to the superintendent of operations.</td>
<td>• All formal and informal professional development activities for aspiring and practicing administrators are organized by one of the five “project” teams who report to the superintendent of Leadership Succession Planning and Leadership Development. This team is responsible only for Professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The structured Administration Preparation Program allows candidates to meet and exchange ideas regularly. (for example, portfolio development)</td>
<td>• Since there is no formal structure in place for administration preparation course candidates are responsible for finding their own time to exchange ideas among themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socialization Opportunities: Commonalities and Differences Across Districts

**District Expectations:** Central office personnel in School Districts A and B have involved school administrators in various activities intended to secure effective leaders for schools. These activities range from preparation programs, recruitment activities, activities in the selection procedures to ongoing professional development. All aspiring administrators and practicing administrators are expected to participate in the activities that apply to their stage of development. One senior administrator expressed the need “for a variety of intellectual, social, and professional processes through which administrators become effective school leaders”.

**Professional Socialization:** Many commonalities in professional and organizational socialization activities were apparent across these two districts. The informal activity such as “first hand leadership opportunities” and the formal “mentoring” were mentioned as the two experiences that provided the greatest value to their preparation. Many administrators made reference to the “mandatory University courses and components of the Principal’s Qualifications Program” as part of a formal process in their preparation, both of which were thought to have various components that
had little, if any, value for their preparation. This perception was common to both districts.

Another commonality was the intent and purpose of the portfolio. The portfolio is seen by administrators, aspiring and practicing, as a positive factor for personal and professional growth. It gives them the opportunity to reflect on their personal and professional values as well as permitting their own educational philosophies and leadership experiences. Other professional socialization opportunities that are similar in both districts include the “Administration Preparation Program”, the opportunity to learn the art of “facilitating” and “teaching” training courses for administrators, “management tasks at the school level”, “study groups”, “dialoguing”, “networking and interactions with mentors and supervisors”, and “opportunities for exposure to other school administrators”.

The differences across both districts are found in the structures of the professional development teams. In District A all formal professional development activities at district level for aspiring and practicing administrators are organized by one staff development team at central office. The staff development team is also responsible for all other staff development. They report to the superintendent of operations. The structured Administration Preparation Program allows candidates in District A to meet and exchange ideas regularly (for example, portfolio development). In District B, however, all formal and informal professional development activities for aspiring and practicing administrators are organized by one of the five “project” teams who report to the superintendent of Leadership Succession Planning and Leadership Development. This team is responsible only for Professional development. Since there is limited formal structure in place for the administration preparation course in District B candidates are responsible for finding their own time to exchange ideas among themselves.

Organizational Socialization: Many of the organizational socialization activities are common across districts (Table 40). The experience of the “work setting”, “opportunities to build relationships with other administrators”, and the “importance of understanding the organizational culture” are three ideas that are considered very valuable for the administrator preparation. However, when discussing “policies, procedures, processes and priorities within the district” it became apparent that not a
great deal of time is given to these matters by the district senior administrators. However, it is part of the Principal’s Qualifications Program, albeit brief, according to the candidates and vice-principals. The districts have an “Administrative Procedural Manual” which outlines all policies and procedures for administrators, but very little time is actually spent on it during preparation exercises. There are no revealing differences in activities, nor reactions, across districts. However, within each district, senior administrators feel that they spend a great deal of time reviewing the districts policies and procedures with candidates, and practicing administrators. Yet, from the perspective of the candidates and practicing administrators this “time” is inadequate.

The practicing administrators feel positive about the renewal programs where current issues in educational administration are discussed in workshops with invited guests. Since both District A and District B share the costs for many of these workshops these practicing administrators have much the same interests and speak highly of the benefits. Such workshops include Michael Grinder’s “Patterns of Communication” and Steven Covey’s “The Seven Habits of Highly Effective Leaders”, among others. This is also considered part of the induction program for all newly appointed administrators and continues far into the post administrative appointment.

**Structured Induction:** One commonality became apparent regarding induction opportunities. Central office personnel in both District A and District B are training experienced administrators and providing newly hired administrators with a variety of supportive induction activities to help them continue their professional growth as school leaders. In both District A and District B, it is widely felt that the need to ensure professional development opportunities are provided to all administrators in order to prepare for their changing role. In both districts such an opportunity is provided in its Administration Preparation Program, albeit two differently structured programs, where candidates and practicing administrators are given the following opportunities: to learn about the districts expectations; how to develop a portfolio; job-shadowing information packages; brainstorming sessions for developing philosophy statements; activities to develop and determine leadership styles; and opportunities for practice interviews. “Job-shadowing” is seen as being an effective way of providing an opportunity for social learning and “modeling” for candidates. Administrators in both districts feel that more
"job-shadowing" would be an asset. However, due to the cost of supporting this type of professional development for administrative candidates, senior administrators believe that this is an insufficient support strategy as it currently existed but agreed to look into this a little further for future development.

Other organizational socialization opportunities include "components of the administrator training program", "in-box" scenarios during mock interviews where administrator candidates are given "ethical situations" to which they must react. These sessions are conducted by practicing principals and vice-principals in both districts, but are facilitated by seconded administrators who are educational officers in central office in District A. In District B, it is the Superintendent of Succession Planning-Leadership Development who, along with members of the Steering Committee and the "project teams", facilitate the organization of these activities.

The professional development activities that are shared in cost by District A and District B include the renewal series as mentioned earlier. According to all administrators, including senior administrators, this means that both District A and District B share the cost of the services for having these guests in their two districts. For example, Michael Grinder conducted a three-four day workshop in District A and then went immediately to District B to conduct the same three-four day workshop. Both districts split the cost for his services. The practicing administrators and senior administrators feel positive about these renewal programs where current issues in educational administration are discussed in workshops with invited guests. Such dialogue includes issues around leadership and leadership succession.

**Resocialization:** In Districts A and B, one commonality across districts focusses on teacher to administrator transitions. For some candidates who have been recently assigned (less than one year) to vice-principal positions in District A and B it became clear that many were still thinking in the "teacher mode" and had not yet made the transition to "administrator mode". During interviews with senior administrators it was common across the districts that "many of our candidates and new vice-principals are still thinking in the 'teacher' mode instead of the 'administrator' mode...they need more time to make the adjustment". When talking informally to several experienced administrators
it was clear that such a transition varies with each candidate and does not automatically happen as soon as a placement occurs.

In addition to the re-socialization of teachers who aspire to become administrators there is also a need to re-socialize the practicing administrators both new and experienced. As one experienced principal indicated, "The best professional development for me is listening to our invited guests, like Michael Grinder and his talk on 'Patterns of Communication'. I always leave with the realization that there is so much more to learn...we need to keep abreast of what's going on out there in school administration".

Leadership Succession Planning in the Context of Accountability

Table 41 describes the general commonalities across both districts on the issue of accountability as it relates to leadership succession planning. There were no differences across the districts.

Table 41 - Succession Planning and Accountability: Commonalities Across Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District A/District B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Principals/Vice-Principals/Candidates/Central Office Personnel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of participants felt that leadership succession planning was a way of ensuring accountability of school administrators and senior administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals and senior administrators understood the accountability system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of candidates and vice-principals were uncertain as to what they were accountable for or who they were accountable to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only senior administrators felt certain about the clarity of &quot;role expectations&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants felt that accountability meant following policies, procedures and mandates to justify “operation” of the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability ensures student success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Leadership=Effective Instruction=Student Success=Effective Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal process in place to evaluate leadership succession planning (only informal process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Instructional leadership leads to meeting curriculum demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator performance appraisal process is part of the succession planning and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School &quot;site&quot; plan is a tool in accountability process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants felt there was a need for more accountability features in &quot;training program&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Accountability: lacks clarity &quot;to whom?&quot;, expectations are random, roles and responsibilities are random, lacks regular feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership Succession Planning in the Context of Accountability: Commonalities

*Purpose and Intention:* Across the two districts in this study, one commonality that is evident among participants is their understanding of what the purpose and intention is of their district's leadership succession planning. Participants made reference to the importance of succession planning as a means to ensure quality instructional leadership preparation that could lead to student success. The senior administrators feel that by embarking on rigorous recruitment and selection procedures, offering a semi-structured induction program, and professional development opportunities for all administrators in their districts could certainly enhance instructional leadership within their schools. This is perceived by practicing administrators as an example of accountability of central office personnel to school administrators. At the same time school administrators feel they are being held accountable by district office personnel to participate in the leadership succession planning activities. Despite the need and importance for succession planning in each district, according to participants, neither District A nor District B has any formal evaluation of the program in place.

Another commonality among all participants in this study across both districts is their shared understanding of the purpose of educational accountability. They believe that accountability is the best way to ensure the best course of action to support student learning and to justify the operation of schools. Furthermore, they believe that accountability in education systems means that information must be made available to the public, to tax payers and to parents in a form that allows them to have reasonable expectations of the system.

*District Expectations:* In assisting school administrative staffs to cope with changing expectations, central office personnel in District A and District B are committed to the achievement of their districts initiatives through the ongoing development and renewal of their school administrators. Many activities have shifted to their school sites. As these responsibilities have gravitated to the school sites, so has the authority, which has required central office staff to practice more restraint in their relationships with site personnel. One senior administrator stated that “we are more of a service provider to our schools”.
According to senior administrators and practicing school administrators, if school administrators are to be held accountable in their roles and functions as site administrators, they must be given professional opportunities and experiences that can ensure general understanding of accountability to prepare them for the changing expectations in their roles. Leadership development and succession planning involve professional development for school administrators in both districts whereby accountability is briefly discussed but considered insufficient by administrators.

Another commonality that exists between districts is the lack of understanding of how the accountability system works. Senior administrators feel that the candidates, vice-principals and principals know how the accountability system works in their individual districts. The experienced principals feel they understand how the system works. However, when asked to describe the accountability process the candidates, vice-principals and newly appointed principals have some general understanding but are uncertain to whom they are accountable and for what they are accountable, as well as the process of how they are held accountable. A common statement across districts was “We are accountable for everything that happens in the school”. A vice-principal adds, “I’m not sure what I’m accountable for but I do know that if I do something wrong it’s not long before I know about it”. The participants did express concern that this issue of accountability should be discussed in more detail in the Principal’s Qualifications Program or the District Administration Preparation Program.

**Leadership Succession Planning:** The process of developing and implementing leadership succession plans in both District A and District B is due to the shortage of qualified candidates to fill the role of school administrators. Senior administrators and many school administrators in this study feel that the professional development opportunities which result from administrator training in succession planning have been directly linked to accountability. Even though more accountability features should be included in the training program a general feeling emerged from participants that effective leadership training would indeed lead to effective schools. This in turn would have a positive impact on instructional leadership and student outcomes. All administrators agree that there has been a conscious attempt to align system expectations, accountability and leadership development.
**Portfolio and Performance Appraisal:** Another commonality that exists across the districts is the combination of the administrator portfolio and the performance appraisal protocol as a tool for evaluation. The performance appraisal protocol for vice-principals and principals contain key components that are in accordance with legislation, board policies, and contractual agreements. A noted difference between both districts is seen in the dimensions of the key components. In District A these components manifest themselves through a series of dimensions which focus on expectations including interpersonal leader, instructional leader, community leader, principle-centered leader, professional development leader, manager, and operational leader. In District B the components are aligned with the district’s initiatives. They include the dimensions of leader, learner, manager, and communicator. The portfolio development is included as part of the selection process in both districts. It has become an integral part of the “site-plans” for each practicing principal and used as a tool for accountability by both the school administrators and the area superintendent. The aspiring administrators, vice-principals and principals in District B explained how the portfolio process that is currently used in candidate selection as well as for those practicing administrators who have one developed, not only can enhance personal and professional growth but could also assist in the re-certification process and accountability which were on the educational agenda for the province at the time of this study.

**Accountability Issues:** A number of concerns and issues emerged from formal and informal discussions with participants. Most participants across District A and District B agree on the purpose of accountability within in their systems- to ensure the best course of action to support student learning and justify the operation of schools. Moreover, all agree that a more succinct component on accountability should be added to the District’s Administration Training Program and within the Principal’s Qualifications Program.

However, the perspectives vary among focus groups across districts on whom they are being held accountable to, and how they are being held accountable. A number of candidates and newly appointed vice-principals feel they are accountable to “everybody for everything done at school level”, while other candidates and newly appointed vice-principals remain uncertain as to whom they are held accountable.
Experienced vice-principals and principals feel they are held accountable to their student populations, their communities, their area superintendents, their district director of education, the school board of trustees and the government. Senior administrators agree with the experienced vice-principals and principals and added that all candidates and newly appointed vice-principals "should" know to whom they are accountable.

All participants feel that the leadership succession planning-leadership development program should provide the opportunity for a clear understanding of individual district's accountability system. In the area of how the district office personnel is holding administrators accountable in their roles and functions as administrators, the experienced principals and senior administrators are the only two groups who feel they understand the process. Yet, the expression "I suppose..." is frequently used among them.

Many of the candidates and vice-principals are uncertain. All principals feel they are held accountable through their "site plans" and performance appraisal protocols which are reviewed annually with their area superintendents. The principals explained how there is not enough time to evaluate their own vice-principals, nor many of their teaching staffs, due to their individual workloads. In District B one principal felt that he/she was saturated with professional development. His/her concern is that there is too time spent away from the school for professional development activities which results in a great deal of time away from the site. Other principals agree. The principals in District A felt that their professional development activities were "just enough" but agree that sometimes there is too much time spent away from their schools.

Another issue among all participants, except for the senior administrators, is the lack of regular feedback on what their roles are as administrators. They feel that if they are to be "held accountable for doing something they must first be held accountable for knowing how to do it". With an exception of senior administrators in both districts, all other administrators and candidates feel there is a continuous lack of consistency in expectations from the district office. Moreover, many participants agreed that accountability lacks in clarity which leads to a lack of understanding of how the accountability process works.

Participants agreed that leadership development and leadership succession planning should include a component on accountability so administrators have a clear
understanding of the districts expectations, and they can exercise this understanding accordingly within their individual school districts. As a recommendation, one vice-principal in District A suggested that district office personnel should distribute a questionnaire to former students who graduated from their system to obtain feedback on how the system helped them succeed or failed them.

In the area of "effective accountability", participants feel they have a general understanding of what such a system should include. For them, it is a system that links standards, testing, professional development of administrators and teachers, reporting, and some form of consequences not only for failures but for successes as well. Without careful alignment of the component parts, testing alone will have little effect. School districts need to weigh the strengths and weaknesses of selecting a repertoire of tools that share the same basic assumptions about schools and schooling. The district office personnel in District A and District B, despite their attempts to ensure accountability at all levels, need to include a rigorous component of accountability into their professional development activities for their administrators. The participants agree that this should be an integral part of their leadership development and succession planning.

**Summary**

The two cases described in this chapter allow the reader a heuristic view of the process for leadership succession planning in two school districts as this process unfolded over a period of three years. Four central research questions structure the description of leadership succession planning. These events and their accompanying themes are described as dynamic processes. What follows is a summary of the two school districts succession plans as described through the thematic framework of leadership succession planning, recruitment and selection, socialization and accountability.

**The Leadership Succession Dynamic-General Findings**

Each of the two school districts in this study began the development and implementation process of succession planning due to a shortage of qualified candidates applying to the school administrator pools. Amid the daily demands of the administrative role and the changing expectations which confront school district personnel at school
sites and central offices, the succession planning practices that these two districts utilized in preparing candidates, vice-principals and principals for their roles and functions were spent articulating and advancing their philosophies and structures of successful leadership development (Research Question 1).

Changing expectations and the demands of the administrator's position have caused administrator succession planning to no longer be simply a matter of finding the right person for the administrator's job. In District A and B it was apparent to senior administrators that they needed to consider effective strategies when embarking on the planning of effective training programs for their aspiring and practicing administrators.

There is a comprehensive leadership model in each district which outlines the qualities of what is considered to make up an effective school leader in each district. The leadership model was a result of collaboration of central office personnel, school administrators, teachers, administrator association, teacher federations and various stakeholders in their communities. It is the belief in District A and B that in order to ensure leadership growth keeps pace with the growth of its “organization”, leadership succession planning becomes essential. In addition, it is widely believed in both districts that such a planning process requires systematically identifying, assessing, and developing leadership talent for future strategic tasks. Such goals can be achieved if an effective program for leadership succession is in place.

While the philosophies of leadership succession planning are very similar in nature in both District A and District B, there are apparent differences in components within the structures. The same process is followed in both districts but is structurally designed differently. While the same components are addressed in the training program a noted difference is in the design of the component for the Administration Preparation Program for candidates.

**Recruitment and Selection Dynamic-General Findings**

Districts A and B have organized a recruitment strategy for aspiring and practicing administrators (Research Question 2). Though the purpose of recruitment is clearly the same there are some distinct differences across both districts in the strategy being used. In District A the Administrative Council identify vacancies each year
(Chapter 4). This is followed by the district’s needs assessment and the organization of staff. On-site school administrators are expected to informally identify potential candidates who have formal qualifications and encourage these candidates to become applicants for the pool. Area superintendents are expected to be available for discussions should candidates have issues and concerns that relate to their administrative interests. There is some self-selection that occurs as well. There are information sessions held in early fall for all interested candidates where the role of the administrators and district expectations are outlined. Immediately following, the application pools for both elementary and secondary panels are opened for all internal candidates. This terminates the recruitment process until the following year.

In District B, while the recruitment process is similar there is one significant difference that lies within the strategy. In District B there is a “project team” who is responsible for the recruitment of candidates and other administrators. This team strategically plans information sessions for interested candidates, training and professional development support (coaching, job shadowing, mentoring, school leadership opportunities) leadership profiles, and incentives. Currently, they are addressing the possibility of recruiting candidates from other districts.

While the selection process (Research Question 2) is very similar in nature a notable difference is that District B has a PAR (Position of Added Responsibility) Selection “project team” in place who initially arranged and revised the vision and leadership profile of the successful school administrator to reflect the emerging role and responsibilities in the context of “learner, leader, manager, and communicator”. Their role also involves describing, in the leadership profile, the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for successful administrators as learners, leaders, managers and communicators for each stage of the administrative leadership: PAR applicant, Vice-principal and Principal (Chapter 5).

The Dynamic of Socialization-General Findings

The central office personnel in Districts A and B have developed and implemented many socialization activities and/or opportunities for their aspiring and practicing administrators to engage in while preparing for and renewing their roles
Research Question 3). In both districts there are facilitator teams, albeit differently structured, to guide and direct some of these opportunities. These activities range from pre-appointment professional socialization such as first-hand leadership experiences, deliberate mentoring opportunities, job-shadowing experiences, regular study group meetings to networking opportunities— all of which are components of administration preparation in each school district and are offered at district level for all candidates in both the elementary and secondary panels.

This pre-appointment professional socialization in an administrator's preparation stops once the candidate becomes appointed. The initial promotion of the newly appointed vice-principal at the post-appointment stage takes on another series of professional development activities— one of organizational socialization orientation. The school district leaders in District A and B believe in the necessity for ongoing training and professional development for the newly appointed vice-principals, as well as experienced vice-principals, new principals and experienced principals. The activities range from formal learning and reflective practice experiences such as assembling for invited guests lecturers (Clemmer, Fullan, Grinder, Covey) to informal networking of administration study groups. These experiences provide useful interactions and teach new knowledge, enhance skill development, re-establish values and behaviors required of the administrators within their particular roles. The administrators in both districts stated how the "relationship building" opportunities with superiors, subordinates and the general membership of the district social system are very different than those carefully structured professional socialization activities before appointment.

The one difference between District A and District B is found within the organizational structure of the administration preparation program which provides the socialization opportunities for aspiring administrators. In District A there is one team of facilitators responsible for the training of candidates whereas in District B there are five teams responsible for various activities that involve socialization activities. The teams are recruitment, selection, training, professional development, and professional growth portfolio.
The Accountability Dynamic-General Findings

In this study, while all senior administrators and several practicing school administrators across both districts could make a clear connection between leadership succession planning and accountability, several candidates, vice-principals and principals were uncertain of the connection. However, they did feel that leadership succession planning, not only is a method of ensuring a larger contingency of qualified candidates to the administrative role, but also a means of helping administrators to be more accountable in their roles. Participants spoke of accountability mostly in general terms.

There are no differences in the general accountability systems of administrators across District A and District B as it relates to leadership succession planning and leadership development. There are several commonalities. There is a common belief that leadership succession planning is a way of ensuring accountability of school administrators and senior administrators (Research Question 4). It provides direction for school district offices for holding their school administrators accountable for their roles and functions as administrators by assisting them in their roles through professional development activities. Consequently it becomes apparent in the belief system of both districts that succession planning leads to effective leadership which in turn leads to effective instruction, student success, and effective schools.

In both districts leadership succession planning focuses on the enhancement of leadership skills for all aspiring leaders as well as all practicing administrators. This is done in the recruitment and selection stages by way of socialization experiences and opportunities that can help administrators meet the challenging demands of accountability. However, administrators cannot be expected to “know” unless appropriate knowledge and skills are made available to them. One vice-principal indicated that despite the expectations being made clear at the outset of promotional possibilities these same expectations are inconsistent and not followed through by district office administration. The majority of candidates and vice-principals remain uncertain as to what they are accountable for or who they are accountable to. Only senior administrators feel certain about the clarity of “role expectations”.

It is widely believed among participants that accountability means following district and school policies, procedures and mandates to justify the “operation of the
school” and to ensure student success. However, neither district has any type of formal process in place to evaluate leadership succession planning (only oral feedback informally). However, in each district the administrator performance appraisal process and the “site plan” for each school administrator are integral parts of the succession planning and accountability. All participants feel there is a need for more accountability features in their “training program”.

Finally, if an effective accountability program is to work in these districts, the issues of accountability must first be dealt with effectively. According to the many administrators these issues include lack of clarity “to whom?” and “how?” accountability is directed, random expectations and understanding, roles and responsibilities are inconsistent and random, and feedback on succession planning effectiveness lacks monitoring and/or assessment.

The key task for district office administrators is to create common expectations and standards among school administrators concerning what they are accountable for. The district office personnel need to raise the collective sense of administrators about accountability’s specific standards and measures. In particular, candidates and vice-principals feel the district office personnel need to set clear school performance standards and a reasonable reporting system within their systems. They also feel the need for supporting staff development opportunities for administrators and teachers “within” schools and collaborative opportunities to formulate performance goals and ways to implement them more effectively.

It is widely believed in both districts that school systems must be held accountable for results--policies, resources and structures--rather than only individuals. To the vast majority of the participants in this study this meant that school districts must eliminate barriers that prevent individuals from developing the “will” and “skill” to take responsibility for improving student learning. As various administrators, both at school and central office, made reference to...if a student is having difficulty learning, chances are that instructional methods, socio-emotional issues or other causes are getting in the way. If a teacher is having difficulty teaching, or an administrator is having a problem with time management, chances are university preparation, hiring practices, lack of mentoring, school and/or district policies or other causes are getting in the way. As one
vice-principal said, "Accountability is not just being held accountable for things...it's about being willing to change".
CHAPTER SEVEN
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the study of leadership succession planning in two Ontario school districts. The findings are discussed and related to the literature. Then conclusions or lessons learned and a new framework/leadership model for leadership succession planning are presented. Finally, implications for practitioners, policy makers, and future research are proposed.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and analyze the practices and strategies of leadership succession planning of two school districts in Ontario. Two large urban school systems were selected for this study. Both districts have developed and implemented various strategies of leadership succession planning for the preparation of aspiring administrators as well as ongoing support structures for new and practicing administrators. The two districts were similar in size and began succession planning for administrators at approximately the same time due to the impending shortage of qualified candidates for administrative roles as a result of the current rate of retirements.

Four research questions guided this study:

1. What is the philosophy and structure of the school district’s leadership succession plan?
2. How does the school district recruit and select school administrators?
3. What are the professional and organizational socialization processes for school administrators in the district?
4. How are school administrators held accountable?

A purposive sample selection process was used to ensure a cross section of educators for the study. Criteria for inclusion included administrative candidates (administrative candidates, new and practicing vice-principals, new and practicing principals, and senior administrators at the district offices), geography (urban, rural), and
gender. Data collection methods included individual interviews, focus group interviews, observations and document review. Twenty-two participants in District A were selected from the purposive sample of individuals who were currently enrolled in the administration preparation program (candidate), have already completed the administration preparation program (a vice-principal, a principal), or represented central office personnel. Twenty-one participants were selected from District B based on the same criteria.

Data analysis began during data collection and gave direction for follow up in subsequent site visits. There were 18 interviews which were guided by the research questions. After the interviews were transcribed the data from the interviews and other data (documents, journals) were read and re-read, keeping track of themes, patterns, hunches, and ideas across cases. All data were coded by listing themes and concepts which were evident in the data, or suggested in the conceptual framework.

Summary of Major Findings

The findings of this study revealed a picture of the leadership succession planning processes and structures that two school districts currently had in place for the preparation of candidates to school administrator positions. Moreover, it described the renewal processes for practicing school vice-principals and principals that helped them prepare for their changing roles.

The Nature of Leadership Succession Planning

However effective or appropriate succession planning activities seem from a central office perspective, a significant number of candidates and newly appointed administrators in this study felt unprepared for the first year in the administrative role. Role expectations were confusing and unclear. Participants felt that the district expectations must be made clear at the outset as to what the role of the administrator entails. Participants felt that in order to carry out effective training programs such as “mentoring”, more “time” is needed to address the issue of “role expectation”.
The career development patterns of participants in both districts were similar. Most had achieved a mid-career stage before deciding on an administrator position. It is a common practice in both districts for practicing administrators and area superintendents to identify and encourage potential candidates to apply for administrative pools.

In both districts there were promotional policies in place for internal candidates only. It was widely believed that promoting internally is favored over "external" appointments because of familiarization with school district culture. External candidates were perceived not to have the knowledge of the school district's culture. Nevertheless, in District A there were guidelines in place, though rarely practiced, for recruiting externally. District B did not have any policy in place.

The policy on "systematic rotation" of practicing administrators created some unique problems for many of the participants in this study. Although both systems had been practising a "system level" approach to succession for administrator rotation for some years, both have done so in the absence of much consultation with school administrators or school communities to determine what professional and educational benefits for administrators, teachers and others can be accounted for by a series of three- to five-year term appointments. Nevertheless, both districts have continued to rotate administrators with the belief that school communities profit from administrators who have had leadership experiences in a variety of school settings. Central office administrators in District A and District B believed that a policy requiring the rotation of administrators kept administrators alert and helped in the transplantation of change initiatives from one school to another.

The major differences in succession planning between District A and District B were found within the structure of the administration preparation program for candidates. In District A there was a structured administration preparation program in place where candidates assembled over a three month period and prepared for the short-listing process for the vice-principal pool. This was done twice a year. In District B, the administration preparation program was loosely structured and operated on a "needs" basis.

Both districts had invested emotional and financial support in preparing aspiring and practicing administrators for the changing roles. Both districts had a "renewal" process in place for practicing administrators whereby professional activities were
planned to keep them abreast of current issues in leadership development. District A had educational officers in charge of budgeting for leadership development and succession planning. This was overseen by the superintendent of operations. District B had an area superintendent whose portfolio was specifically leadership succession planning and leadership development. The district personnel had allocated a budget accordingly.

**Recruitment and Selection of School Administrators**

In both District A and District B consideration had been given to how the position demands, expectations, and responsibilities of school administrators had changed as influences on the adoption of what the senior administrators referred to as “appropriate” recruitment and selection processes.

Many administrative candidates were at a stage in their careers where they were comfortable in their instructional practices and wanted to have influence on a broader scale. Yet, others were less experienced as classroom teachers but had been recognized by their principals or area superintendents as potential school administrators. Two candidates, who had more than 25 years of teaching experience, decided only recently (several months prior to this study) to pursue the role of vice-principal with the encouragement of their principals. Prior to that, neither had thought about a career in administration although they both had served in some leadership role within their schools.

While personnel in District A continued to seek ways to improve their recruitment practices, District B personnel had a structured procedure in place. In District B there was a “project” team in place that was responsible for arranging all recruitment activities. There was also a PAR (Position of Added Responsibility) Selection “project” team in place in District B that was responsible for all activities for helping aspiring administrators to prepare for the short-listing process. Also, there was a Professional Growth Portfolio “project” team that introduced the portfolio development process to the candidates as these candidates prepared for the short-listing process. This team also used the professional growth portfolio in the renewal process for practicing administrators. In District A, the portfolio development process was an integral component of the administration preparation program.
Senior administrators and practicing principals in both districts indicated that before any contact was made with candidates, there was a need to review current staffing and plan future staffing needs. After the needs were determined, the recruitment and selection process began.

In District A and District B only internal candidates were recruited, trained and promoted throughout the ranks of teaching and administration. There was no written policy on external recruitment in District B. However, in District A there was a brief written protocol in place, but it was rarely followed. Usually, in District A and B, the tendency was to re-advertise rather than recruit and select external candidates.

The selection process of school administrators for both districts were similar and were generally structured around the work history and leadership experiences of the candidates, their formal education and training, motivation, and maturity. The central office personnel in these two districts agreed that teaching experience was essential. The candidates in this study were required to have qualities of leadership rooted in established knowledge and skills that resulted in dedication to good instructional practice and learning. The senior administrators felt there was absolutely no need whatsoever to go outside of education for potential administrators.

There were issues of “time” and “contractual considerations” that participants in both districts felt needed to be considered when planning the recruitment and selection process. More time for “mentoring” was needed to help candidates prepare for the selection process as well as more time needed for practicing administrators to prepare to release their “mentee” to take on a new position. A few days to prepare was not considered adequate.

In both districts it had been a recent practice to permit unqualified aspiring administrators to take positions as “interim” vice-principals. There were stipulations attached to these agreements which involved consultation between the district office and The Teachers Federations as well as the Ontario College of Teachers. These two organizations had to give approval accordingly.

Participants felt that there was inadequate consultation by the district office personnel on the issue of “placements”. There was generally insufficient time to get prepared for new placements or to fill vacancies of candidates who had been placed.
Professional and Organizational Socialization of Administrators

The development and implementation of professional development programs for aspiring and practicing school administrators in District A and District B helped administrators to fit into the social system of schools both professionally and organizationally. Both districts offered similar professional development and training activities to aspiring and practicing administrators that ranged from formal activities such as “training programs”, “deliberate mentoring” and “job-shadowing” to informal activities such as “administrator in-services”, “dialoguing”, “networking”, “study groups”, “relationship building with subordinates and super-ordinates”, “learning about work settings” and “discussions on policies, procedures and priorities”.

Administrators in District A felt they had “just enough” professional development time while some principals in District B felt they were “PD’ed to death” and that “too much time away from school” had caused a concern for them and their teaching staffs. They felt that often administrators were spending so much time away from their schools that teachers felt they were lacking their own professional development on-site.

Newly appointed administrators made reference to the importance of opportunities to discuss entry strategies with other colleagues through professional development opportunities. One experienced principal who had been recently transferred indicated that he/she generally had positive “entry” experiences. Newly appointed principals with less experience indicated they had no “entry” strategy in place and are uncertain what to expect.

In District A and District B central office personnel were aware of the career patterns of teachers and dynamics of administration and used this knowledge to plan development activities. In both districts it was the “mentoring-protege” and “on-the-job” experiences that participants considered to be the most valuable in preparing them for the administrator role. However, the same participants felt that there was inadequate time for the mentoring process to be fully successful. Principals and vice-principals felt that sometimes when the relationship began to develop with their “mentee” (candidate and vice-principal or vice-principal and principal or candidate and principal) one of them would be notified that he/she was placed in a new school within days without any prior
consultation. Consequently, they felt that effective as the "mentoring" program may be there should be ample notification on upcoming placements.

Many formal university courses and various components of the Principal's Qualification Program were considered of little value to the administrator role. Although there was not a full consensus among participants these two socializing influences were noted by many participants as having little effect or impact on how well they performed their tasks as school administrators. However, there were some participants who felt that the Principal's Qualifications Program was very helpful depending on the venue where the program was offered.

Leadership Succession Planning in the Context of Accountability

Across the two districts in this study, one commonality that was evident among participants was their understanding of what is the purpose and intention of their district's leadership succession planning. Participants made reference to the importance of succession planning as a means to ensure quality instructional leadership preparation that could lead to student success. At the same time school administrators felt they were being held accountable by district office personnel to participate in the leadership succession planning activities. Despite the need and importance for succession planning in each district neither District A nor District B had any formal evaluation of the program in place.

Another commonality among all participants in this study across both districts was their shared understanding of the purpose of educational accountability. They believed that accountability was the best way to ensure the best course of action to support student learning and to justify the operation of schools. Furthermore, they believed that accountability in education systems meant that information must be made available to the public, to taxpayers and to parents in a form that allows them to have reasonable expectations of the system.

According to senior administrators and practicing school administrators, if school administrators were to be held accountable in their roles and functions as site administrators they must be given professional opportunities and experiences that can
ensure general understanding of accountability to prepare them for the changing expectations in their roles.

Another commonality that existed across both districts was the lack of understanding of how the accountability system worked. A common statement across districts was “We are accountable for everything that happens in the school”. A vice-principal added, “I’m not sure what I’m accountable for but I do know that if I do something wrong it’s not long before I know about it”. The participants did express concern that accountability as an educational issue was not discussed in more detail in either the Principal’s Qualification’s Program or the District Administration Preparation Program.

Senior administrators and many school administrators in this study felt that the professional development opportunities which resulted from administrator training in succession planning were directly linked to accountability. All administrators agreed that there was a conscious attempt to align system expectations, accountability and leadership development.

Portfolio development was included as part of the succession planning in both districts. It had become an integral part of the “site-plans” for each practicing principal and used as a tool for accountability by both the school administrators and the area superintendent. The participants in District B explained how the portfolio process not only could enhance personal and professional growth but could also assist in the recertification process and accountability which were on the province’s educational agenda at the time of this study (2000 - 2001).

However, the perspectives varied among focus groups across districts on who they were held accountable to, and how they were held accountable. A number of candidates and newly appointed vice-principals felt they were accountable to “everybody for everything done at school level”, while other candidates and newly appointed vice-principals remained uncertain as to whom they were held accountable. Experienced vice-principals and principals felt they were held accountable to their student populations, their communities, their area superintendents, their district director of education, the school board of trustees and the government. Senior administrators agreed with the
experienced vice-principals and principals and added that all candidates and newly appointed vice-principals "should" know to whom they are accountable.

All participants felt that the leadership succession planning-leadership development program should provide the opportunity for a clear understanding of individual district's accountability system. When asked about how the district was holding school administrators accountable in their roles and functions as administrators the principals and senior administrators were the only two groups who seemed to understand the process. Many of the candidates and vice-principals were uncertain. All principals felt they were held accountable through their "site plans" and performance appraisal protocols which were reviewed annually with their area superintendents. The principals explained how there was not enough time to evaluate their own vice-principals, nor many of their teaching staffs, due to their individual workloads.

Another issue among all participants, except for the senior administrators, was the lack of regular feedback on what their roles were as school administrators. They felt that if they were to be "held accountable for doing something they must first be held accountable for knowing how to do it". Moreover, most participants agreed that clarity was lacking on accountability matters which lead to a lack of understanding of how the accountability process worked.

When asked about "effective accountability" participants had a general understanding of what such a system should include. For them, it meant a system that linked standards, testing, professional development of administrators and teachers, reporting, and some form of consequences not only for failures but for successes as well. Without careful alignment of the component parts, testing alone was thought to have little effect.

Discussion

Research asserts that the most crucial element in preparing capable school leaders is individual school districts (Smith & Piele, 1989). In both District A and District B there was a budget allocated specifically for leadership development and leadership succession planning. Consistent to previous research (Baltzell & Dentler, 1983; Weindling & Earley, 1987; Crowe, 1987; Fauske & Ogawa, 1987; Ogawa, 1991; Leithwood, Steinbach &
Begley, 1992; Beeson & Matthews, 1992) if school districts are willing to make such an investment, and frequently they are not, it would likely lead to having a qualified pool of candidates from which to choose when an opening occurs within the pools. Leadership succession planning in District A and District B was considered a priority at central office. There was a slow but climbing interest among teachers to seek out roles in school administration. A common reaction among the candidates and practicing administrators towards pursuing the administrator role was positive due to what many participants refer to as promising administration preparation programs and professional development.

Contrary to the literature on secondary school candidates (ERS, 1998; Pounder & Merrill, 2001), both districts in this study had an adequate number of secondary candidates to fill vice-principal vacancies in the secondary panel. This was largely due to the small number of secondary schools in each district. In addition most times there was an adequate number of principal candidates to fill principal vacancies in the elementary panels. However, both school districts seldom had adequate numbers of qualified candidates to fill the vice-principal vacancies in the elementary panel largely due to the low interest among teachers in administrative roles, and high number of elementary schools in each district.

Much of the literature on leadership succession found that administrators who were new to a school preferred to adopt a “wait and see” approach before introducing change initiatives of a substantive nature to the school (Cosgrove, 1986; MacMillan, 1996; Parkay & Hall, 1992; Weindling & Earley, 1987). They did so in order to form a cognitive map which included knowledge of the students, staff and parent community, school routines and structures, and key physical and human resources. Moreover, newly assigned administrators in this study seemed to prefer the opportunity, however planned or random, intentioned or incidental, of diagnosing the culture of the school to which they have were sent.

The newly assigned administrators, both vice-principals and principals, in District A and District B were seldom given the opportunity to get familiar with their newly assigned schools simply because, prior to a new placement, there was uncertainty as to which school in the district a new assignment was made. Despite senior administrators knowing which vice-principals and principals would be retiring or leaving the district at
the end of each school year there was no planned opportunity for predecessors and successors to have discussions because of the uncertainty of which administrator would be placed and at which school. In support of previous research (Duke, Isaacson, Sagor, & Schmuck, 1984; Daresh, 1986; Daresh, 1997; Johnson & Licata, 1993; Smylie, 1995; HGC, 1998; Seyfarth, 1999) newly assigned administrators, including candidates, vice-principals and principals, were frequently placed in new schools without adequate prior knowledge of the new school culture resulting in unclear expectations and role confusion.

As the literature supports, central office administrators in District A and District B believed that a policy requiring the rotation of administrators kept administrators alert and helped in the transplantation of change initiatives from one school to another (Boesse, 1991; MacMillan, 1996; Johnson, 2001). The “trickle down” hypothesis (Johnson, 1999; 2001) may “hold ground” but it lacks any comprehensive dialogue or even planned inquiry related to the purpose or potential outcomes of regular rotation. Ironically, the systemic regularity of administrator transfer may lead to a culture of “interchangeability” which denies the uniqueness of schools or leaders and possibly results in the opposite of what one can assume was originally intended by system leaders. For example, one could argue that these two school districts promote a managerial response to school leadership, particularly in challenging schools where renewal activities require visionary, sustained leadership over time.

In District A and District B there has been consideration of how the position demands, expectations, and responsibilities of school administrators have changed before launching what the senior administrators referred to as “appropriate” recruitment and selection processes. Previous research has suggested the importance of considering these factors, along with time, money and energy, in promoting the entrance of more qualified candidates (Crowe, 1987; Musella & Lawton, 1986; Caldwell & Tymko, 1990; Rebore, 1992; Herman, 1994; Barbour, 1994; Miklos, 1996; Pounder & Young, 1996; Anderson, 1998; Castello, 1992; Castetter, 1992; Coffin & Leithwood, 2000; IEL, 2000).

“Age, stage of career, life’s experiences, and gender factors make up the total person” (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, p.27). The research that describes administrative candidates (Anderson, 1991; Jenkins & Bebar, 1994; ERS, 1998; Pounder & Merrill, 2001) presents a picture of those candidates similar to the ones in this study in terms of
years of experience. These candidates would fit into the "mid career" phase of adult development as described in the literature. According to Erikson (cited in Troen & Boles, 1995, p.367) it is often at mid career that achievement and recognition are central development objectives.

As supported in other research (Stout, 1973; Anderson, 1988; Castetter, 1992; Herman, 1994; IEL, 2000; OPC, 2000) these two districts had extensive administration preparation programs that were directed toward placing and retaining qualified administrators for schools. Senior administrators and practicing principals in both districts indicated that before any contact was made with candidates their tendency was to review current staffing and plan future staffing needs accordingly (Caldwell & Tymco, 1990; Castallo, Fletcher, Rossetti, & Sekowski, 1992; Castetter, 1992; Willms, 1998).

The literature supports the practice of having two pools of candidates from which school districts can draw: internal and external (Rebore, 1992; Herman, 1994; Miklos, 1996; Renihan, 1999; IEL, 2000). Contrary to what the research indicates as "best practices in recruitment", in District A and District B there were only internal candidates who were recruited, trained and promoted throughout the ranks of teaching and administration. Although some research indicates that some school districts routinely favor the selection of administrative applicants with experience in curriculum consulting roles the most promising (Ross, 1989), the central office personnel in these two districts did not have any preference except that teaching experience was essential. As supported in the literature (NASSP, 1996; ERS, 1998; 2000; IEL, 2000; Kennedy, 2000; Black, 2000), the school administrators in both districts were required to have qualities of leadership rooted in established knowledge and skills that resulted in dedication to good instructional practice and learning.

As indicated in previous research (Smylie,1995), socialization experiences and interactions with colleagues promoted the growth of administrators and can help in the preparation for new administrators. Other findings in this study on socialization experiences and opportunities are supported by the literature (Van Berkum, Richardson & Lane, 1994; Seyfarth, 1999). Professional development of administrators enhanced growth and integrity if planned with the dynamics of the administrative career and stages of development in mind. Within the training programs, collegial exchange opportunities
and feedback processes for aspiring and practicing administrators were provided for and done collectively with the assistance of practicing administrators. This added credibility to and supported the competence of the administrators to the participants.

Previous research on the impact of formal college and university preparation programs on school administrators (Greenfield, 1985a, 1985b; Murphy, 1992; Schein, 1992; Milstein, 1993; Bredeson, 1996; Hart & Weindling, 1996; Begley, 2000) is supported by the findings in this study. There was a lack of “practical” applications and/or professional knowledge base training from formal university preparation programs. This suggests that some serious flaws exist in the formal pre-service professional training.

It is a common belief among administrators in District A and District B that accountability in their education systems meant that information must be made available to their various stakeholders in a form that allows them to have reasonable expectations of the system. This is consistent with previous research on accountability purposes (Brown, 1991; Murphy, 1992; Milstein, 1993; Mohrman & Wohlstetter, 1994; Ladd, 1996; Seyfarth, 1999; AWSP, 2000).

The lack of understanding of each district’s accountability system demonstrated by participants in both districts is supported in the literature (Meyer, 1994; Ladd, 1966; AWSP, 2000; IEL, 2000). Central office administrators had a clear understanding of how the process worked and felt that school administrators had an understanding as well. However, many of the school administrators became suspicious when the accountability system was unclear. Since many inexperienced administrators felt they were accountable “for everything that happens in the school” or “everything and anything” (Boyer, 1993) it became clear that many administrators were unsure of how their systems worked.

Leadership development and leadership succession planning involved professional development for school administrators in both districts. Accountability was briefly discussed in the professional development activities but considered insufficient by administrators. While it was very common for participants to speak of accountability in general terms it became apparent that accountability was an issue requiring more clarity in the area of succession planning.
Conclusions

In this section implications and recommendations are summarized for educational practitioners, policy makers and for future research.

Towards a New Framework/Model for Leadership Succession Planning

The primary conclusion from this study is a revised framework and/or model for leadership succession planning. The new framework reflects the following changes to the original framework. Initially, based on the literature, accountability served as the impetus for the three original constructs (succession planning, recruitment and selection, and socialization) in the conceptual framework. However, after data analysis, it became clear that accountability is a variable that becomes part of the overall leadership succession planning process. Therefore, the constructs changed accordingly. Instead of accountability, principles and structures of leadership succession planning became the overarching construct in which recruitment and selection, socialization, and accountability are integral components. In addition to this change, other sub-variables shifted from one construct to another. For example, the literature asserts that the "role of the administrator" needs to be considered in the recruitment and selection stage of succession planning. However, the data from this study clearly indicate that the role of the administrator needs to be outlined in the expectations when central office personnel begin establishing principles and structures in the planning stage.

Other sub-variables began to shift as well from specific concepts to broader categories. For example, specific variables such as "job description" became an integral part of "clear expectations" of the school districts. Another change is that of "contractual considerations". According to the literature this is an integral component of the planning stage of succession planning. While it remains an important aspect of succession planning the data from this study indicate that it is specific to the recruitment and selection of administrators.

As is shown in Figure 2, districts need to consider four aspects as they pursue leadership succession planning: principles and structure (philosophy, organization, and responsibility) for leadership succession planning; recruitment and selection;
socialization; and accountability. Each component and the associated variables are briefly described in the following paragraphs.

**Figure 2 - A New Framework for Understanding Leadership Succession Planning.**

**Leadership Principles and Structure:** Expectations, philosophy or guiding principles, organization and responsibility are four variables that guide and influence decision-making through all stages of the leadership succession planning process (recruitment and selection, socialization, and accountability). Clear expectations for leadership are central and key to leadership succession planning. Potential administrators, practicing administrators, and senior administrators need to know what leadership
knowledge, skills, attitudes, and roles are expected and supported in the district. This is especially important as the role of the administrator is changing and expanding.

The philosophy of leadership succession planning also needs to be articulated. Some districts adopt the philosophy of internal promotion, some support external promotion, while others endorse a combination of internal and external promotion. The overall organization of the succession planning process needs to be clear outlining the structures, parameters, timelines, and events. Finally, the responsibility for leadership succession planning needs to be delegated or assigned. Some districts appoint the responsibility to a superintendent and organize centrally, while other districts employ a distributed approach and assign responsibility to assistant superintendents or to staff development coordinators.

**Recruitment and Selection:** Recruitment and selection involves attracting, screening, and identifying potential leadership candidates. It also involves administrator preparation and support. In order to attract potential administrators within a school district, there needs to be a process in place for identifying future leaders. Principals and superintendents need to recognize leadership qualities among their teachers and to encourage them to pursue and prepare for administrative roles. The application process must be made clear to all aspiring administrators and structured to suit the needs of the school district. The application process must be aligned with the selection process and must include any contractual considerations that may hinder and/or support the appointment of any administrator. As part of the recruitment process, school districts need to ensure emotional and financial support in the preparation of aspiring administrators. Districts need to consider how they prepare future leaders. Development of a structured administration preparation program for aspiring administrators is a key part of leadership succession planning.

**Socialization:** Socialization refers to the processes put in place by a district for initial and ongoing leadership development. Leaders participate in both professional and organizational experiences throughout their years as administrators. Professional socialization involves administrators in learning about leading. Organizational socialization involves understanding the culture, norms and values of the new school or the district. Socialization experiences range from formal activities such as certification
requirements and deliberate mentoring opportunities to informal activities such as on-the-job experience and on-going workshops and other learning events.

Professional socialization begins at the recruitment stage of the process when aspiring administrators prepare for the selection process. Professional development activities and opportunities need to be available for aspiring and practicing administrators on a continuous basis. Organizational socialization begins once aspiring administrator has taken on a new role. Formal induction programs that are well structured are important to support new administrators in the transition from a teaching role to an administrative role. It is important to plan for resocialization over the years as expectations and society changes.

**Accountability:** The accountability stage of the leadership succession planning process needs to be clear, transparent, and with the other parts of the leadership succession planning process. The purpose(s) of accountability (i.e., promotion, transfer, development, or termination) should to be clear and communicated. Once expectations are clarified and leaders are provided with opportunities for professional development, then accountability is legitimate and necessary to ensure that all schools have strong leaders and that leaders are continuing to grow and develop. The accountability system should identify “what” school administrators are accountable for (expectations), “who” is involved in the accountability process (teachers, parents, students, district administrators, board members), “how” or the approach to accountability (leadership portfolios, surveys, 360 degree feedback, interviews, observations), and “when” the accountability process is carried out (annually, biannually, every three years). In defining the accountability system a number of issues must be considered including, but are not limited to, “fairness” of accountability systems, “internal versus external”, “compatibility and alignment”, and communication.

**Implications for Educational Practice**

- **Need for collaboration and support.** In broad terms, there are implications from this study that have to do with school reform which points to the need to shift the focus from the leadership of the principal alone to a more inclusive form of leadership, to the collaborative empowerment of school administrators, new and experienced and
senior administrators and a recognition of the importance of promoting positive collegial relationships. District superintendents and school administrators, along with other stakeholders, need to collaborate for the same reasons that principals and teachers are expected to collaborate. The district office personnel need to foster school and district cultures that are collaborative and support an atmosphere of inquiry. They must encourage the talents, creativity and contribution of all school members within their districts.

- **Address the issue of “time” and “costs”**. While some of the training structures have been used in the past (such as mentoring, job-shadowing, peer coaching) and have frequently been unsuccessful, there is a need to determine what those barriers were that were prohibitive and work towards their elimination. “Time” has always been a constraint for training as has “cost”. These problems need to be addressed in creative ways in order to overcome that barrier.

- **Relevance of Educational Administration programs and Principal’s Qualifications Course**. The traditional principal preparation programs offered by colleges and universities are often disconnected from the daily realities and needs of schools. University faculties will need to continue revisiting their leadership programs and recreate these components for more practical use to assist in the preparation of school administrators. The Principal’s Qualifications Program needs to be revisited as well to ensure that components are revamped to meet the changing expectations and accountability demands of the administrator’s role. There needs to be a larger focus on instructional, community and visionary leadership roles in improving student learning in schools.

- **Reconfiguring training programs around redefined role and standards**. Another implication for educational practice is that training programs need to be re-configured around the redefined role of the school administrator and higher standards need to be developed for administrators as well as a more rigorous means of credentialing them. Greater rigor and higher standards, similar to those outlined by ISLLC, should also be required for the accreditation of administrator training programs which will be responsible for delivering the upgraded and re-configured training for the administrator role.
• **Leadership Development Series.** Both school districts deliver a comprehensive leadership development series for current and aspiring school leaders. The series include a foundation program for aspiring administrators and a renewal series for new and experienced principals and vice-principals. Instead of having the renewal series for both new and experienced at the same time this series could be broken into separate series. For newly appointed vice-principals there could be an “issues” series that focus on the needs of only newly appointed vice-principals. In addition there could be a “succession” series for newly appointed principals. Given the findings from previous and current research, the leadership series should include ongoing workshops and seminars for first year principals. This program should explore the phenomenon of leadership succession but would also include educational, policy and management practices. Moreover, a “transition” series for cross-panel transfers might be considered in both districts. This program would include a series of professional development activities across panels and opened for all school administrators within the school district who may be interested in transferring from the elementary panel to the secondary panel or vice-versa.

**Implications for Policy Makers**

• **Ongoing professional development.** Policy makers need continue to provide powerful, ongoing professional development focusing on effective strategies for improving student learning. In addition to the series of new programs and activities that support networking among administrators such as mentoring and coaching, systemic efforts might include a program whereby administrators evaluate each other’s schools using an established protocol for observing instruction. The principals of tomorrow’s schools must be more than building managers—they must have training, tools and skills for leadership for student learning.

• **Resources and flexibility.** Policy makers need to alleviate the unnecessary stresses placed on their administrators by reconfiguring and supporting the primary role of the school administrator as leader for student learning. One person cannot provide effective leadership for student learning while tending to the myriad of tasks traditionally faced by the administrator. Perhaps the school districts should recognize
the need to provide administrators with the resources and flexibility to delegate specific responsibilities and to distribute leadership as needed. School district and community support is vital to the new leadership role of the school administrator.

- **School system administration.** Current districts' policies on regular rotation of administrators need to be revisited to determine the efficacy of a fixed term appointment to a school. School districts should do so through a collaborative process that would include superintendents, school administrators and possibly a representative group of school council members, including teachers. If the school districts continue to enforce this policy, they need to define more clearly the objectives of this management practice and integrate these within the system's mission and vision.

- **Professional accountability.** School district personnel in both districts need to collect information on administrators, individually and collectively, to help them perform better. District personnel have only just begun to hold school administrators responsible for enhancing student learning. Principal and/or vice-principal evaluation, in most cases, is infrequent and not geared to promote professional growth. Many administrators go years without any evaluation whatsoever. When they are assessed, evaluations seldom incorporate professional accountability measures to spur improvement. The feedback administrators receive rarely provides the opportunities they need to reflect substantively on strengths, weaknesses and ways to support student learning.

**Recommendations on Leadership Succession**

- Succession planning should allow aspiring and practicing administrators to learn as much as possible about the communities they serve. It should be customized to the school and school district initiatives, mission and goals (tailored to the needs of the organization). Succession planning should focus on future strategy and culture. Long term focus is ideal. It must be aligned with future strategic direction.

- Succession planning should be driven by top management. Top management must be involved with and support the succession planning process. Central
administration should provide more support for newly appointed administrators and planned programs of induction, including more official time for visits and interactions at the new school.

- Succession planning should focus on development with shared responsibility. Succession planning is not just selection. It involves identifying individual development plans for each individual where development becomes key. Each successor must take ownership of his/her development, with strong leadership support by focusing on development opportunities with the greatest impact (coaching, mentoring, job-shadowing)

- Administrator training programs must reconfigure their work around the redefined role of the administrator. Professional development of school administrators must reflect “best practices”. It should provide powerful, ongoing professional development focusing on effective strategies for improving student learning (systemic efforts via coaching, networking, and mentoring). Revamp the principal preparation programs to ensure that all programs focus on instructional, community and visionary leadership roles in improving student learning in real schools. Clarification of what the administrator’s role is and of what the roles and responsibilities are and ought to be to the district and to the school is imperative, especially if site-based management continues to gain favor.

Recommendations For Further Research

Leadership succession planning is a relatively new field on inquiry in educational administration. There are relatively few empirical studies at this time on leadership succession planning as it pertains to school and school district administration. However, among the studies done in this area, primarily concerning the dynamics among teachers and school administrators, the research literature and expert opinion literature confirms “leadership succession” as an organizational event of great potential importance to those who work in schools (Hall & Mani, 1989; Hart, 1993; MacMillan, 1996; Johnson, 2001). To date it has been conceptualized as a crucial set of circumstances which are organized to ensure that leadership positions are appropriately filled when they become vacant. However, at this time there remains a need for considerably more research-based inquiry
before a full-blown theory of leadership succession planning can emerge. The present study contributes in a modest way to this important knowledge base, however much more research is necessary.

Currently, school administrators are very conscious of the pressure of changing social, political and professional expectations for them. They perceive a push to adopt new and expanded administrative roles within a context of much increased demands for professional accountability. This is experienced within a general educational reform movement that seems to influence all areas of the educational enterprise. The challenge for school and district office administrators is meeting these social and professional demands, without losing sight of the need to meet the needs of children and protect their best interests.

Based on the findings from this study, there are two specific implications for future research. These relate to clarifying the nature and function of leadership succession and a pervasive social preoccupation with accountability. These implications are outlined as follows:

- **Leadership Succession Success:** The two school districts in this study are in the early stages of leadership succession planning. It is difficult to surmise at this time the overall outcomes of implementing these leadership succession activities. We can see the specific steps taken by two school districts and can report on the perceptions of the participants, but there is still much in the individual plans yet to unfold before long-term effects can be ascertained. This study is also limited to the experience of two specific school districts. The data that have been collected clearly indicate that most participants believe their professional needs are being met. The levels of satisfaction among participants appear to be high. However, a more longitudinal study is required to determine the real validity of leadership succession processes in these school districts as strategies aimed at improving the quality of education generally, and learning outcomes for students specifically. The whole concept of leadership succession must also be integrated as a component of the overall process of educational governance in a school district. At this time there are limited examples of documented leadership succession processes in school districts. Finding relevant information requires searching under other labels and categories of literature such as
“effective school districts” and “educational governance” and “transformational leadership” and “organizational learning.” In particular there is a need for research that clearly conveys the links between leadership succession and more generalized school district leadership practices. Leadership succession cannot be treated as a lone concept in isolation, but rather as a component of organizational governance and procedural structures within a school district.

- **Accountability**: There is a considerable gap between the perceptions of academics and educational practitioners when it comes to the meanings associated with accountability. Compared to the consensus apparent across the conceptualizations of accountability presented by Kogan (1986), Wagner (1989) and Leithwood (1999), Leithwood & Earl (2000), there seems to be a broad range of interpretations and ideologies reflected by practitioners in the field. The findings of this study indicate that senior school district administrators seem to articulate notions of accountability consistent with those of the literature. However, many of the other participants in the study – principals, vice principals, and aspiring administrators—revealed perspectives that were much more varied and scattered. These individuals often associated accountability with performance appraisal, report cards, and school/site plans rather than some sort of rationalized and integrated school district process. It’s clear from the data in this study that current academic notions on accountability are not filtering down to the perceptions of school administrators. Moreover, it appears that much of what passes for accountability-oriented school reform is driven more by ideology or philosophy rather than empirical evidence. Clearly there is a need for much more research and documentation of school district based leadership succession processes. Given the continuing emphasis on decentralized school system governance processes, it seems crucial to conduct more research on how senior administrators can best convey their expectations of accountability to the schools and the people working in them.

Three other areas emerged from the results of this study as requiring further investigation. One was the impact of regular administrator rotation on student learning. Is this a desirable component of a leadership succession process? Can administrative
rotation be shown to have a positive effect on student learning outcomes? A second area that begs further inquiry is administrator preparation programs. What kinds of experiences are necessary to properly prepare candidates to be instructional, visionary and community leaders? Finally, there is room for a lot more research on the range of practical yet effective strategies available to be employed by school districts to recruit and select school level administrators.
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APPENDIX A
Interview Guide - Central Office Personnel

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. How many years have you been a senior administrator?

2. What is your role at central office?

3. What other administrative positions did you hold before becoming a senior administrator? How long were you in each position?

4. Did you work at the elementary or secondary panel?

5. Did you work in an urban or rural school?

6. How long were you a teacher before you became an administrator?

7. Have you ever been a teacher at the same school in which you were an administrator?

8. Have you ever been transferred from one school to another as an administrator? How frequently have you transferred?

PHILOSOPHY AND STRUCTURE OF LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION QUESTIONS

1. Is there a philosophy of your school district’s leadership succession plans? If so, what is it?

2. How are the current needs and issues of school administrators addressed by central office administration?

3. Describe the process of developing and implementing your district’s leadership succession plans. Why is it necessary? What is its purpose? Who is involved? What are the roles?

4. Describe the structure of the district’s leadership succession plans.

5. Does the district have a leadership development model?

6. How do leadership succession plans help (candidates, vice-principals, principals, new principals, experienced principals) to prepare for leadership roles?

7. How are your school district leadership succession plans monitored and/or evaluated?
RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION QUESTIONS

1. In your opinion, what is the role of vice-principal/principal?

2. What are the qualities and characteristics that your board looks for in potential school administrators?

3. What are the board's expectations of administrators?

4. What qualifications are required for the school administrators in your board?

5. How does the board recruit candidates for the administrator's role?

6. What is the application procedure?

7. What is involved in the selection process?

8. What support system (formal and informal) is in place to assist administrators during the recruitment and selection phase?

9. What are the major issues and factors related to recruitment and selection of administrators?

SOCIALIZATION PROCESS QUESTIONS

1. How do you prepare candidates for the vice-principalship/principalship?

2. What formal and informal support structures are in place for vice-principals/principals? (mentors, workshops, conferences, study groups, handbooks, principal meetings, and so forth)

3. What kind of professional development is available for vice-principals/principals?

4. In your opinion, what were the most valuable learning opportunities that helped prepare the candidates for the vice-principalship/principalship?

5. In your opinion, what key experiences were of greatest and least value in preparing candidates in your district for educational administration?

6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of current socialization processes?
ACCOUNTABILITY QUESTIONS

1. What does "accountability" mean to you?
2. What are your school administrators held accountable for?
3. To whom are they held accountable?
4. How does the district office personnel hold school administrators accountable?
5. Describe the accountability process for school administrators in your district.
6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current accountability process?
7. Is there a portfolio required? If so, how does the portfolio process work?
8. Describe the performance appraisal process for school administrators.
9. What are the major issues related to school administrator accountability?
10. What suggestions do you have for improving school administrator accountability?
11. How is leadership succession planning linked to accountability?
APPENDIX B
Interview Guide - Candidates, Vice-Principals, Principals

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS

1. What interested you in school administration? (Candidate)

2. Have you thought about a career in school administration prior to now? (Candidate)

3. How many years have you been a principal/vice-principal?

4. In how many schools have you been a principal/vice-principal?

5. What other administrative positions did you hold before becoming a principal/vice-principal? How long were you in each position?

6. Do you work at the elementary or secondary panel?

7. Do you work in an urban or rural school?

8. How long were you a teacher before you became an administrator?

9. Have you ever been a teacher at the same school in which you were an administrator?

10. Have you ever been transferred from one school to another as an administrator? How frequently have you transferred?

PHILOSOPHY AND STRUCTURE OF LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION QUESTIONS

1. Is there a philosophy of your school district's leadership succession plans? If so, what is it?

2. How are the current needs and issues of school administrators addressed by the central office administrators?

3. Describe the process of developing and implementing your district's leadership succession plans. Why is it necessary? What is its purpose? Who is involved? What are the roles?

4. Describe the structure of the district's leadership succession plans.

5. Does the district have a leadership development model?
6. How do leadership succession plans help (candidates, vice-principals, principals, new principals, experienced principals) to prepare for leadership roles?

7. How are your school district leadership succession plans monitored and/or evaluated?

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION QUESTIONS

1. In your opinion, what is the role of vice-principal/principal?

2. What are the qualities and characteristics that your board looks for in potential administrators?

3. What are the board’s expectations of administrators?

4. What qualifications are required for the administrators in your board?

5. How does the board recruit candidates for the administrator’s role?

6. What is the application procedure?

7. What is involved in the selection process?

8. What support system (formal and informal) is in place to assist administrators during the recruitment and selection phase?

9. What are the major issues and factors related to recruitment and selection of administrators?

SOCIALIZATION PROCESS QUESTIONS

1. How do you prepare for the vice-principalship/principalship?

2. What formal and informal support structures are in place for vice-principals/principals? (mentors, workshops, conferences, study groups, handbooks, principal meetings, and so forth)

3. What kind of professional development is available for vice-principals/principals?

4. What were the most valuable learning opportunities that prepared you for the vice-principalship/principalship?
5. What key experiences were of greatest and least value in preparing you for educational administration?

6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of current socialization processes?

ACCOUNTABILITY QUESTIONS

1. What does “accountability” mean to you?

2. What are you held accountable for as an administrator?

3. To whom are you held accountable?

4. How does the district hold school administrators accountable?

5. Describe the accountability process.

6. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current accountability process?

7. Is there a portfolio required? If so, how does the portfolio process work?

8. Describe the performance appraisal process for school administrators.

9. What are the major issues related to administrator accountability?

10. What suggestions do you have for improving administrator accountability?

11. How is leadership succession planning linked to accountability?
APPENDIX C
The Role of Influence in Alternative Leadership Models
(Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999, p. 24-25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Approaches</th>
<th>Who Exerts Influence</th>
<th>Sources of Influence</th>
<th>Purposes of Influence</th>
<th>Outcomes of Influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>Those in formal leadership roles, especially principals.</td>
<td>Expert knowledge (Typically positional power)</td>
<td>Enhance the effectiveness of teachers classroom practices</td>
<td>Increase student growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Typically those in formal leadership roles, but not restricted to such persons</td>
<td>Inspire higher level of commitment and capacity among organization members</td>
<td>Greater effort and productively develop more skilled practice</td>
<td>Increased capacity of organization to continuously improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Those in formal administrative roles</td>
<td>Use of a system of moral values to guide organizational decision-making</td>
<td>Increased sensitivity to the rightness of decisions; increased participation in decisions</td>
<td>Moral justified course of action Democratic schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>The group (including non-administrative organization members)</td>
<td>Interpersonal communication</td>
<td>Increased participation in decision-making</td>
<td>Increased capacity of organization to respond productively to internal and external demands for change More democratic organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Those in formal administrative roles</td>
<td>Positional power, policies and procedures</td>
<td>Ensure efficient completion of specified tasks by organizational members</td>
<td>Achieve formal goals of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent</td>
<td>Typically those in formal leadership roles</td>
<td>Matching leader behavior to organizational context Expert problem-solving processes</td>
<td>Better meets needs of organizational members More effective responses to organizational challenges</td>
<td>Achieve formal goals of the organization Increased capacity of organization to respond productively to internal and external demands for change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Structured Socialization Opportunities for School Administrators
(Adapted from Daresh, 1988; Daresh & Playko, 1992; Daresh, 2000; Lipham et al., 1985; Riordan et al., 1995)

- **Orientation Program:** Simply handing a new principal the keys to and expecting him/her to learn district-specific procedures by trial and error should not be the norm. Scheduled orientations with the business office, transportation, maintenance, public relations, personnel, and other important school system offices should all be included as part of a comprehensive orientation program. Personnel responsible for each area should provide newcomers with specific procedural details that will help them learn the technical procedures and expectations of the district. Simply handing new administrators vague job descriptions, district policy handbooks, curriculum guides, and collective bargaining agreements is an ineffective strategy. The new administrators need to know what to do, what is most and least important, what procedures are open to change or challenge, and why certain procedures are necessary. Orientations can be carried out by well-coordinated team of senior administrators. Although central office administrators should play an important role in orienting new administrators, experienced administrators are probably the most valuable resource for orienting new administrators.

- **Institute a “Buddy System”:** Many educators interested in the improvement of practice for new administrators suggest that districts should pair experienced administrators with rookies in a sort of “buddy system” to help newcomers learn the “informal ropes” of a district. This type of system can help reduce the isolation that many new administrators experience, and it lets successful veteran administrators give newcomers a needed understanding of the norms of the district. Untrained mentors may simply pass on ineffective practices to new administrators, perpetuating traditional processes and norms they may need to change. Effective mentors, therefore, must not tell beginning administrators what they should do, but instead guide newcomers so that they are able to make their own decisions, based on a thorough understanding of the potential consequences of their choices.

- **Structure “Beginners” Workload:** Beginning administrators need a great deal of time in their buildings to develop productive working relationships with staff, students, and parents and to assess various aspects of their schools’ programs and operations. Hence, senior administrators must protect beginners from activities that require them to divert energy away from learning about their school.

- **Give all administrators feedback:** Districts should develop a system whereby all administrators, especially beginning administrators, are provided with specific and constructive feedback on their performance. Principals’ supervisors can provide this type of feedback, but it requires a great deal of time observing and
working with them. Because superiors may be judgmental in their assessments and are often extensively involved in other district responsibilities, many educators recommend a collegial supervisory model, such as Peer-Assisted Leadership and principals Inservice Program, to provide all administrators with feedback.

- **Develop a plan for professional growth:** If beginning administrators are to continue to develop leadership skills and grow professionally, districts must assess newcomers' general leadership strengths and weaknesses as well as their skills and knowledge regarding district-specific priorities. Superiors, colleagues, and beginning administrators should all be involved in assessing a newcomer's needs and then help the beginner develop a plan of growth that includes specific learning objectives, activities to help in the development process, an implementation time line, and an evaluation plan.

- **Facilitate “reflective” activities:** Districts should encourage, or even require, that beginning administrators and successful veterans observe each other to reduce newcomer isolation and to improve their work through a process of peer observation. Such an activity should not only include time to observe, but time for reflective analysis between participants. Districts should bring together beginning administrators in reflective seminars to discuss their experiences and to offer suggestions for handling specific problems.
APPENDIX E

Approaches and Attributes of Accountability Systems

(Adapted from Henig, 1994; Romzek and Dubnick, 1987; and Wagner, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Incentive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Layperson/Expert</td>
<td>Special knowledge</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic/</td>
<td>Superior/Subordinate</td>
<td>Compliance with organizational rules</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Reward/punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Customer/Provider</td>
<td>Service provision</td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>Community/school</td>
<td>Shared decision-making</td>
<td>Internal/External structures</td>
<td>Equal representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Constituent/Representative</td>
<td>Compliance with legal mandates</td>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Legal sanction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Policymaker/Implementer</td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Election</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>Group/Individual</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
<td>Affirmation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>