

1990

An examination of certification and professional development of superintendents and principals across the fifty states

Beth Silhanek
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Silhanek, Beth, "An examination of certification and professional development of superintendents and principals across the fifty states " (1990). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 9893.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/9893>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

91

10566

U·M·I

MICROFILMED 1991

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 9110566

**An examination of certification and professional development of
superintendents and principals across the fifty states**

Silhanek, Beth, Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1990

Copyright ©1991 by Silhanek, Beth. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



An examination of certification and professional development
of superintendents and principals across the fifty states

by

Beth Silhanek

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1990

Copyright © Beth Silhanek, 1990. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purposes of the Study	2
Research Questions	4
Basic Assumptions	5
Delimitations of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	6
Organization of the Study	8
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
National Focus on Improving School Leadership	9
The Role of State Government in Educational Policy	14
Importance of Certification and Professional Development of Administrators	17
Studies Related to this Research Effort	20
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	24
Development of the Survey Instrument	24
Method for Collecting the Data	30
Summary of the Data Analysis Procedures	33
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS	35
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	92
Summary of the Findings	92
Conclusions and Discussion	98
Recommendations for Further Research	101

	<u>Page</u>
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	107
APPENDIX A. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED	109
APPENDIX B. LETTER TO PANEL OF EXPERT JUDGES, RESPONSE FORM AND INITIAL SURVEY AND ACCOMPANYING COVER LETTER	112
APPENDIX C. FINAL SURVEY AND ACCOMPANYING COVER LETTER	132
APPENDIX D. LETTER TO IOWA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE	141
APPENDIX E. LETTER FROM DR. WILLIAM L. LEPLEY, IOWA CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER, TO OTHER CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS	143

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Certification requirements and reciprocity for superintendents and principals	39
Table 2. States affected by interstate reciprocity agreements for superintendents and principals	43
Table 3. Mutual and unilateral reciprocity of certification for superintendents and principals	44
Table 4. States with agencies different from the state department of education having primary responsibility for certification-related decisions	46
Table 5. Roles state departments assume in providing professional development for superintendents and principals	48
Table 6. Number and percentage of state departments assuming each role	51
Table 7. FTE for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	52
Table 8. Services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents	56
Table 9. Services and provisions for the professional development of principals	60
Table 10. Number of states having responsibility for or providing funds for services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals according to broad categories	65
Table 11. States where departments of education have primary responsibility for services and provisions for superintendents and principals	67
Table 12. States where state governments are primary funding source of services and provisions for superintendents and principals	69

	<u>Page</u>
Table 13. Number of states having responsibility for or providing funds for services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals according to specific categories	71
Table 14. Composite report of state funding provided for the professional development of superintendents and principals	74
Table 15. Possible associations between geographic region and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	78
Table 16. Possible associations between state population and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	80
Table 17. Possible associations between state wealth and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	82
Table 18. Possible associations between state revenue per pupil and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	84
Table 19. Possible associations between school success and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	85
Table 20. Possible associations between the number of approved reforms and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	87
Table 21. Possible associations between administrator improvement initiatives and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	89
Table 22. Possible associations between state control and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals	91

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

A report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk (1983), and other national reports gained the attention of governors, legislatures, state boards of education and educators by criticizing the quality of American education. These reports dramatically seized the attention of the public and resulted in a first major wave of education reform aimed at establishing standards for schools. There is now a second wave of education reform focusing on the processes of schooling, emphasizing the need for strong, competent leadership in the schools. In 1986, Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton, Chairman of the National Governors' Association (NGA) Task Force on Leadership and Management, emphasized the importance of school leaders in education reform and the necessity for the states to help and support these leaders:

Strong leaders create strong schools. Research and common sense suggest that administrators can do a great deal to advance school reform. They will lead the next wave of reform, and states and governors must act now to help them lead (Clinton, 1986, p. 10).

The challenge, according to Clinton, is to "develop state policies that strengthen school leadership" (Clinton, 1986, p. 11). As states develop policies and new standards for school leaders, requirements for initial certification, levels of certification, temporary certification, renewal of certification, alternative certification and reciprocity of certification must be reviewed and revised.

The connection between strengthening school leadership and the mandates and initiatives of the states was specifically articulated in the summary statement of the 1986 NGA Task Force on Leadership and Management:

Addressing issues related to the preparation, selection, certification, training, and rewarding of principals should help schools get the high quality leadership they need to create school improvement strategies, become effective schools, and develop the capacity to meet their goals (NGA, 1986a, p. 57).

Peter Schmidt (1989, p. 10), who reported findings of the National Governors' Association, noted that even though "27 states have adopted or are implementing initiatives to promote restructuring at the school or district level," these states are "starting small and using a limited number of strategies" and are generally ignoring or slighting leadership issues. He further reports from these findings:

The education community lacks a consensus on the role of administrative and leadership positions and how best to prepare candidates for such jobs. With few exceptions, the report says, leadership issues have been slow in finding their way onto the education-reform agendas (Schmidt, 1989, p. 10).

Consequently, there is a definite need to examine nationwide state policies, mandates and initiatives in the areas of certification and professional development of school leaders and a need to study what state structures and funding levels exist across the nation for professional development of school administrators.

Purposes of the Study

Issues directly related to effective school leadership include (1) requirements for administrator certification, (2) ways states are

structured to handle certification and professional development of administrators, (3) professional development opportunities for these administrators and (4) state funding levels for their professional development. This study, therefore, is designed to examine how superintendents and principals across the nation are certified, to determine how states are structured to handle certification and professional development of these administrators, to report the services and provisions utilized within the states for professional development of administrators and to determine the state funding levels for their professional development. The intent of this study is to provide information that will be helpful to states, to organizations such as the National Governors' Association and national administrator professional associations and to others who are interested in policies and mandates that influence the certification and professional development of school leadership personnel. The purposes of this study are:

1. To report the states requiring certification to practice as a superintendent or principal.
2. To report the states having requirements or provisions for levels of certification, temporary certification, renewal of certification and alternative certification for superintendents and principals.
3. To report the states having reciprocity of certification for superintendents and principals.

4. To report how each of the states are structured to handle certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.
5. To report those services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals for which each of the state departments of education has primary responsibility or for which the state governments are the primary funding source.
6. To report the level of funding that each of the state departments of education provides for professional development of superintendents and principals.
7. To report factors that may influence practices across the fifty states related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.

Research Questions

The problem of this investigation is to describe certification requirements and provision of professional development for superintendents and principals by state departments in each of the fifty states by answering the following seven questions:

1. What states require certification to practice as a superintendent or principal in their states?
2. What states have requirements or provisions for levels of certification, temporary certification, renewal of certification and alternative certification for superintendents and principals?

3. What states have reciprocity of certification for superintendents and principals?
4. How are each of the fifty states structured to handle certification and professional development of superintendents and principals?
5. What are the services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals for which each of the fifty state departments of education have primary responsibility or for which the state governments are the primary funding source?
6. What is the level of funding that each of the fifty state departments of education provides for professional development of superintendents and principals?
7. What factors influence practices across the fifty states related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals?

Basic Assumptions

1. The survey is a valid and reliable means of data collection.
2. All state departments of education have accurate methods for collecting, maintaining and reporting data relative to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.
3. The survey instrument is a carefully developed instrument that addresses reasonably constructs and concerns related to

certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.

4. Respondents completed the survey accurately and in a consistent manner.

Delimitations of the Study

1. The administrative positions addressed include only local school district superintendents and principals.
2. Certification requirements, agreements, structures, services and provisions and levels of funding are those for Fiscal Year 1990 or those in effect as of September 1, 1989--whichever is appropriate for the specific question.

Definition of Terms

These definitions are presented to provide clarity and understanding of their use in this investigation:

Initial certification requirements - the certification requirements for the first, regular administrative certification issued in a state for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

Levels of certification requirements - the certification requirements in the state for one or more stages, levels or tiers of certification issued after the initial certification (not the renewal of first stage, level or tier certification) for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

Principal - building-level administrator of a public school (excluding assistant principal, associate principal and other supportive administrators).

Mutual reciprocity of certification - reciprocity of certification whereby superintendents and principals educated, experienced or certified in one state automatically are certified on that basis in another state, and vice versa.

Professional development - any program of learning opportunities that a superintendent or principal undertakes individually or with others for the purpose of improving professional knowledge, skills and performance after being initially certified (not pre-service training nor initial preparation).

Reciprocity of certification - either an agreement by a formal Interstate Certification Agreement or a written set of state requirements whereby superintendents and principals educated, experienced or certified in one state are automatically certified on that basis in another state.

Renewal of certification requirements - the certification requirements in a state to continue the validity of the initial certificate for the position of superintendent and the position of principal.

Superintendent - chief administrative officer of a public school division.

Unilateral reciprocity of certification - reciprocity of certification whereby superintendents and principals educated, experienced or certified in one state automatically are certified on that basis in another state, but whereby superintendents and principals in the second state are not automatically certified in the first state.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five major parts or chapters. Chapter I presents a statement of the problem, purposes of the study, research questions, basic assumptions, delimitations of the study and definition of terms. Chapter II reviews and summarizes recent literature and research related to certification and professional development of school superintendents and principals. Chapter III presents the design of the study and describes the data sources and the methods and procedures that were used to gather and analyze the required data for the study. Chapter IV reports and describes the findings of the study. Chapter V includes a summary of the findings, discussion and conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews and summarizes recent literature and research related to certification and professional development of school superintendents and principals. The chapter is divided into four sections: (1) national focus on improving school leadership, (2) the role of state government in educational policy, (3) importance of certification and professional development of administrators and (4) studies related to this research effort.

National Focus on Improving School Leadership

One of the first major education reports providing national focus on improving school leadership was that of the National Governors' Association, Time for Results (1986a). This report articulated the strong commitment of the governors to enter into a compact with professional educators in America to lead a coalition of everyone interested in better schools and to specifically face, among other challenges, that of matching state-sponsored educational training and certification requirements to the skills principals need to be effective.

The three major national school administrator associations (the National Elementary School Principals Association, the National Association of Secondary School Administrators, and the American Association of School Administrators), each having a great stake in issues related to certification and professional development of its members, joined forces with the governors and educators across the nation in advocating and supporting efforts to strengthen leadership proficiencies

of its membership. For example, in 1986 one of the publications of the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) included the statement that for principals to be proficient in evaluation of teachers, the principals need be "concerned with their own continued professional development, both toward acquiring new skills and toward setting an example" (NAESP, 1986, p. 12) since "no preparation program could assure a principal lifetime proficiency" (NAESP, 1986, p. 18). The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) not only emphasized the need for on-going professional development of school administrators but also linked the professional development to state credentialing structures and professional development initiatives:

Improvement of principal preparation programs requires that they be viewed as systems of interdependent parts, encompassing recruitment and selection procedures, the design and delivery of instruction, the credentialing of administrative candidates, and the professional development of practicing principals.... A principal preparation program operates in the broad context of other college/university preservice programs, related accrediting agencies, professional associations, and state department of education. The growth of any program is related directly to the health of the environment in which it operates (NASSP, 1985, pp. 6-7, 28-29).

In addition, as early as 1979, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) issued written guidelines for the preparation and training of school administrators and, like NAESP and NASSP, contended that:

Leaders should recognize the continual need to upgrade their knowledge and management skills in light of the development of new knowledge, new techniques and new interpretations of need (AASA, 1979, p. 10).

Further, AASA specifically stated that to ensure that school administrators respond rationally to the challenges of the future, "educational authorities should enforce and seek to improve certification standards for administrators" (AASA, 1979, p. 5). AASA urged representatives of higher education, local school organizations, professional administrative organizations and state and federal education agencies to cooperatively design new standards for certification.

The recently published 1989 Handbook of the American Association of School Administrators stated:

B.4 Educator Licensure/Certification

AASA believes that the determination of who shall teach or administer programs in public schools is clearly a public responsibility. Licensure/certification of educators should be controlled and continuously reviewed by a public agency. Such an agency, when not a state board, should be composed of representatives from teacher, administrator, university, and other appropriate groups without any single group having a majority. In every case the final decision should be under the control of the state board.

B.5 Certification Reciprocity

AASA urges chief state school officers to lead and coordinate efforts by teacher training institutions, school administrators, state boards of education, and state legislatures to reemphasize the need for a national program of certification reciprocity.

B.11 Administrator Preparation, Certification, and Development

AASA reaffirms its concern for high quality preparation and certification programs and urges state departments to maintain accreditation standards rigorous enough to meet the needs of students being served. Field experiences should be a major component of these programs.

AASA believes that the time, support, incentives, and programs for personal and professional development should be provided by boards of education for administrators. AASA encourages boards of education, universities, and associations to continue efforts to provide personal and

professional development programs for administrators in order to maintain/advance the leadership skills necessary to manage quality educational programs (AASA, 1989a, pp. 5-6).

In addition to these three national administrator associations, others also recognize the importance of strengthening school leadership and go so far as to advocate national certification and standards. In a report released May, 1989, "Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform"--a year-long effort of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA)--it was recommended "that the doctorate in educational administration (Ed.D.) be a prerequisite to national certification and state licensure for full-time administrators who are in charge of a school or school system" (NPBEA, 1989, p. 22). The rationale for this recommendation included the statements that "the current approaches to licensure among the various states guarantee neither mobility nor quality," that "the standards for the licensure process have been set too low" and that the Ed.D. should not be the final educational experience for school administrators but instead "a beginning, to be followed by lifelong learning through professional development training programs" (NPBEA, 1989, pp. 22-24). The recommended changes, according to NPBEA, "would simply elevate school administrative preparation to the level of other professions crucial to our society" (NPBEA, 1989, p. 24). This report was a first step toward national certification of school administrators which will eventually influence state licensure. In response to the report, AASA President A. Dean Speicher stated:

This program just says that if you want to be nationally certified, and carry this "Good Housekeeping" seal of approval, you need to meet certain standards. The hope

is that someday school districts will want to employ those who carry that seal of approval (AASA, 1989b, p. 2).

The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (Griffiths, Stout and Forsyth, eds., 1988) addressed the issue of competent, skilled and visionary leadership, made recommendations for improved preparation of school leaders and asked policymakers throughout the nation for "resolve and great urgency in meeting the task of reform in educational administration" (p. xv). Although the recommendations of the Commission primarily addressed the preparation of educational administrators, the report emphasized that "preparation of educational administrators cannot be isolated from their identification, recruitment, licensure, employment, and continued professionalization" (p. 30). The report concluded that unless the policymakers accept the challenges presented by the Commission,

the reforms advocated in the major reports, already sparking public debate and commitments, may become a revolution that dies for lack of leadership, taking with it the confidence of the American public and the will of the American society to support an education system that can assure it of a viable future (p. 30).

Nevertheless, in spite of the widespread national concern of the National Governors' Association, the national school administrator associations and others relative to the need for state mandates and initiatives for reforming administrator certification and professional development, at present, state commitments in these areas are "woefully inadequate...few states and school districts offer programs answering the needs of their current administrative cadre" (Bowles, 1989, p. 40).

The apparent discrepancy between national recommendations and actual educational practices may be partially explained by considering the traditional role of state government in educational policy.

The Role of State Government in Educational Policy

Numerous authors have traced the emerging role of state government in educational policy from the initial state involvement in education to the present era of proliferation of state-level educational reforms and all have cited research establishing that public education in the United States is a function and responsibility of the state government (Fielder, 1989; Kirst, 1985; Knezevich, 1975; Miller, 1987; Swanson, 1989; Wiles and Bondi, 1983). Many writers have acknowledged the deluge of state-level initiatives in response to the national call for reform measures related to improving school leadership (Crowson, 1987; Fielder, 1989; Firestone, Fuhrman and Kirst, 1989; Glasman and Glasman, November 1988; Hoyle, January 1989; Kirst, 1985; Miller, 1987; and NGA, 1989). However, concerns have been expressed that many of the state reforms related to administrator certification and professional development may be misdirected, ineffective and counterproductive (Griffiths, Stout, Forsyth, eds., 1988; Fielder, 1989; Firestone, Fuhrman and Kirst, 1989; NGA, 1989; Swanson, 1989). Difficulties states encounter in accomplishing major reforms are extensive: (1) the impact of policy may take a decade or more to be realized whereas the American public expects and even demands immediate results (Borg and Gall, 1989; Firestone, 1989; Glasman and

Glasman, 1988; Kirst, 1985); (2) the information base is spotty to nonexistent (Crowson, 1987; Swanson, 1989; Sykes, 1989); (3) recommendations and initiatives of policymakers provoke controversy and backlash (Bradley, 1989); (4) "education in the United States is a complex mixture of public and private institutions organized and administered at various levels under the interdependent authority of federal, state, and local agencies and boards" which "results in conflicting evaluations of educational problems and practices at cross-purposes that meet neither national nor local goals" (Walberg and Haertel, 1984, p. 5); (5) most state reform packages lack coherence (Firestone, Fuhrman and Kirst, 1989); (6) leadership training for administrators often has been disconnected from state education agendas (NGA, 1989); (7) lobbying and interest groups, including sometimes those of the government's own agencies, exert negative pressure (Ippolito and Walker, 1980) and (8) a definition of good educational leadership and a national sense of cooperation in preparing school leaders does not exist (Griffiths, Stout and Forsyth, eds., 1988).

Further obstacles to administrator reform are evident in the synthesis of the research provided by Fielder (1989) asserting that state education agencies, the executive or implementing arm of the state board of education, also face a multitude of difficulties limiting their effectiveness in education reform: (1) state education agencies typically do not have a well-defined data collection and dissemination system; (2) state education agencies are not well understood as organizations; (3) most state education agencies experience high levels of fiscal stress, limited resources and program discontinuity and (4) state education

agencies do not have a powerful, cohesive clientele to support their legislative proposals. In addition to these challenges, states also face the arduous task of determining the expectations of their constituents regarding their policymaking role and, then, of meeting the responsibilities integral to the process of establishing policy. The states may even lack an appropriate definition of policy. Guba (1984), contending that the term "policy" is not defined in any uniform way and that it is rarely defined at all, provided eight different definitions of policy categorized into three policy types: (1) policies-in-intention, (2) policies-in-implementation and (3) policies-in-experience.

Policies-in-intention

1. Policy is an assertion of intents or goals.
2. Policy is the accumulated standing decisions of a governing body by which it regulates, controls, promotes, services, and otherwise influences matters within a sphere of authority.
3. Policy is a guide to discretionary action.
4. Policy is a strategy undertaken to solve or ameliorate a problem.

Policies-in-implementation

5. Policy is sanctioned behavior, formally through authoritative decisions, or informally through expectations and acceptance established over time.
6. Policy is a norm of conduct characterized by consistency and regularity in some substantive action area.
7. Policy is the output of the policy-making system.

Policies-in-experience

8. Policy is the effect of the policy-making and policy-implementing system as it is experienced by the client (pp. 64-65).

States have the dilemma of determining the definition(s) that will guide their actions.

In spite of the many parties involved in educational policy, in spite of the complexity of issues related to policy development and in spite of the infinite number of obstacles limiting the approval and effectiveness of state-level reforms, state governments are expected to function as the primary educational policymaking agencies in the nation. As primary educational policymakers, they must respond actively and directly to the national call for reform in all areas of school leadership, including certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.

Importance of Certification and Professional Development of Administrators

Certification and professional development are integral and essential components of school administrator reform (Baptist, 1989; Bradley, 1989; Crowson, 1987; Fielder, 1989; Griffiths, Stout and Forsyth, eds., 1988; Knezevich, 1975; NGA, 1989; NPBEA, 1990; Thomson, 1990; Wiles and Bondi, 1983; Wise, 1989). However, there is research that indicates that current methods of selecting, training, and certifying administrators do not "foster the type of behaviors exhibited by effective school leaders and, in fact, may run counter to what the research suggests will promote school improvement" (NGA, Supporting Works, 1986b, p. 18). Nevertheless, Thomson (1990) asserted that the "purpose of state certification and licensure is to protect the public against malpractice" and that "all processes and

procedures for licensure in any profession, including education, must serve the public by providing assurance that quality of service is not compromised." Wise (1989) also contended that "while standards boards promote the development of professions, their most important purpose is to guard the consumer against incompetent performers." Sykes (1989) proposed that three functions of certification or licensure systems--creating supply, constructing categories of competence and inventing conceptions of quality--are difficult to reconcile but, he adds, "to design effective reforms, policymakers must recognize and regularly appraise all elements of the credentialing process and the complex interaction among them."

Cognizant of the intricate relationship between certification and professional development and improved administrator performance, many experts include among their proposals for reform in the area of school leadership specific recommendations for improvements in practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. Six general principles were proposed for use in redesigning the certification system for principals:

1. Certification should be based on outcomes, not training requirements.
2. Behavioral data should be used.
3. Candidates should have experience in administration.
4. Continuous learning is a key to effective principalship.
5. School districts should have some accountability.
6. There should be several levels of certification (NGA, Supporting Works, 1986, p. 58).

For improvements in approaches to administrator professional development, the following were emphasized:

1. Training should be developmental rather than incidental.
2. There should be multiple providers of training (NCA, Supporting Works, 1986b, p. 50).

Related to certification of administrators, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in its statement of purpose (1990) recommended:

1. School leaders should be certified by a professional body, as well as be licensed by the state to practice educational administration.
2. Certification should be national in scope, defining entry level qualifications and advanced professional standing.

Thomson (1990) discussed alternative certification for school leaders, but in proposing criteria for the alternative credential, he also maintained that the alternative certification process "must assure citizens that the usual standards for admission to practice are maintained, that criteria are not compromised, and that expediency does not erode quality."

The twenty-seven-member National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration made recommendations regarding administrator certification and professional development to public schools, professional organizations, universities, state policymakers, federal policymakers and the private sector; however, the recommendations to state policymakers are the most germane for this study:

1. Each state should have an administrative licensure board to establish standards, examine candidates, issue licenses, and have the authority to revoke licenses.

2. Licensure should depend on the completion of a state-approved program, demonstration of knowledge and skills, evidence of performance, recommendation by the professional preparation program, adherence to a professional code of ethics and, for principals, teaching experience.
3. Licenses for educational administrators should have two tiers: entry-level and fully-licensed status.
4. Temporary or emergency licensure should not be granted.
5. A license should be issued for a specified time period. Renewal of the license should depend on successful performance and continuing professional development.
6. Licenses should be portable from state to state.
7. School administrators should be able to transfer retirement benefits from state to state.
8. States should supplement the cost of financing professional development programs for educational administrators.
9. Each state should develop policies for the recruitment and placement of minorities and women in administrative positions (Griffiths, Stout and Forsyth, eds., 1988, pp. 21-24).

This study addresses all the Commission's recommendations to state policymakers, with the exception of the seventh.

Studies Related to this Research Effort

Information regarding certification and professional development of superintendents and principals across the fifty states may be obtained primarily from two types of sources: (1) directories and manuals and (2) related research studies.

First, two manuals providing information on certification are The NASDTEC MANUAL: Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States (Mastain, 1988) and Requirements for Certification for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges: Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, Fifty-third Edition (Burks, 1988). Both of these manuals provide state-by-state information related to certification of superintendents and principals.

Next, there is a limited, but growing number of research studies addressing the issues of certification and professional development of superintendents and principals in each of the fifty states. Bray (1985) conducted a "50-State Survey of Academies, Institutes and Inservice Programs for Administrators" and reported findings from all fifty states. Hazi (1986) reported that twelve states had competency tests for administrators in effect or planned to be in effect by 1986. Splawn (1987) reviewed certification requirements for principals in the fifty states and reported state-by-state (1) the educational requirements for certification, (2) the experience requirements for certification and (3) the level of the certificate, the term of the certificate and the certificate renewal requirements. Fielder (1989) conducted an extensive study of the state-level policy initiatives that focused on the improvement of school administration, including both the reform of preparation programs and the continuing improvement of practice and reported findings for forty-nine states. Baptist (1989) completed a study of public school superintendents' certification requirements and reported findings from all fifty states. Research studies in progress include a

study of inservice education for administrators from the perspective of the fifty state departments of education (Harper, 1990) and a study of the requirements in each of the fifty states for renewal of certification of superintendents (Vance, 1990).

These individual studies provide valuable information on various aspects of certification and professional development of superintendents and principals; however, findings of individual studies have not been integrated. Gousha, LoPresti and Jones have provided some continuity to research on administrator certification and professional development by conducting four national surveys of certification and employment standards for educational administrators over the past six years. Responses to the first survey, initiated in the fall of 1984, were received from thirty-nine states; results of the survey that were reported state-by-state are: (1) states requiring certification of educational administrators for service in the public schools, (2) specific categories of certification of educational administrators, (3) the date state standards for certification of educational administrators were enacted or amended and the current discussion of possible revisions, (4) specific competencies within the state standards which candidates for certification as educational administrators must possess, (5) examination required for certification as an educational administrator, (6) performance assessment required for certification as an educational administrator, (7) internship or other field experience required for certification as an educational administrator, (8) classroom teaching experience required for certification as an educational administrator, (9) mandated continuing

education or staff development requirements for certified educational administrators and (10) reciprocity agreements with respect to certification for educational administrators (Gousha, LoPresti and Jones, 1985). Responses to the second survey were received from forty-one states; the number of states indicating a change in any of the practices was reported (Gousha and others, 1986). Thirty-four states responded to the third survey and once again the number of states indicating a change in any of the practices was reported for the purpose of revealing patterns of changes in state certification and professional development (Gousha, LoPresti and Jones, 1988). Forty states responded to the fourth survey and the number of states responding negatively and the number responding positively to each question was reported (LoPresti, Jones, Gousha and Blanchet, 1990). The information obtained from the four annual surveys provided a basis for considering patterns of change. Even though all the four surveys had a return rate less than 100% and the questions primarily addressed initial certification requirements, these annual studies have made a substantial contribution in providing needed information to other researches and to policymakers.

The intent of this study is to build upon the existing information and to provide additional information relative to the certification and professional development of superintendents and principals in the fifty states.

CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were used to gather and analyze the data for the study. The chapter is divided into three sections: (1) development of the survey instrument, (2) the method employed for collecting the data for the study and (3) a summary of the data analysis procedures.

Development of the Survey Instrument

Information about administrator certification and professional development was obtained from two main sources: a survey instrument and documents obtained from the states.

Borg and Gall (1989) outlined the following steps to develop a new metric:

1. Define objectives.
2. Define the target population.
3. Review related measures.
4. Develop an item pool.
5. Prepare a prototype.
6. Evaluate the prototype.
7. Revise measure.
8. Collect data on test validity and reliability (pp. 273-76).

These eight steps served as a guide in developing the survey for this study. The objectives of the study were defined and corresponding research questions were posed (Step 1). The target population was defined as the state department of education of each of the fifty states (Step 2). Three main activities were used to accomplish Steps 3-8: (1) review of the literature (Step 3), (2) telephone and personal interviews (Steps 4-5) and (3) a written review by a panel of expert judges (Steps 6-8).

Review of the literature

During January, 1990, a review of the pertinent literature in this field was first undertaken to determine what relevant information exists. Appropriate manuals, handbooks and materials were collected. For example, one major source of data was The NASDTEC MANUAL: Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States (Mastain, 1988) which includes information concerning administrator certification. Another major source was Requirements for Certification for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges; Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, Fifty-third Edition (Burks, 1988). These and numerous additional sources were carefully examined and analyzed in order to answer the research questions. A determination was then made as to additional information needed for the purpose of answering the research questions.

Telephone and personal interviews

The second phase of the survey development, conducted in February and March of 1990, involved individual telephone and personal interviews with authorities knowledgeable in state policy, in certification of superintendents and principals and in professional development of these school administrators. These persons included representatives from the National Governors' Association, the Education Commission of the States, the National Policy Board of Educational Administration, the National Association of State Director of Teacher Education and Certification, the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of

Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the Iowa Department of Education and selected university educational administration programs. A list of persons contacted is found in Appendix A. In initiating the interview, an introductory telephone contact was made explaining the nature of the study and asking for information and assistance in developing the survey instrument and in conducting the study. These contact persons provided comments and information relative to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. They also suggested areas where additional information is needed. Additional items for the survey were generated in response to suggestions received from the contact persons during these telephone interviews. Two personal meetings were held with the Iowa Department of Education Bureau Chief of Teacher Education and Certification for the purpose of gaining information and assistance in developing the survey. Subsequently, a draft survey instrument was developed. Since this survey was later revised, it is referred to as the initial survey. On March 16, 1990 a meeting was held with four employees of the Iowa Department of Education Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification for the purpose of gaining comments, advice and suggestions for improving the initial survey. Several revisions were made in the initial survey during this time in response to suggestions received in both the telephone and personal interviews.

Written review

A third phase of the survey development involved a written review of the initial survey by a panel of expert judges. On April 6, 1990 a copy of the initial survey was mailed to fourteen of the many members of the expert panel who had indicated a willingness to provide further assistance in developing the survey. These fourteen expert judges were selected by the researcher on the basis of knowledge, experience, prominence and national leadership and represent a wide geographic range, vary considerably in the type of agency or organization in which they are currently employed and have a vested interest in administrator certification and professional development. The fourteen expert judges were Terry A. Astuto, National Policy Board for Educational Administration; Beth Jones Baptist, Martinsville, Virginia; B. Dean Bowles, Professor, University of Wisconsin; Melody Bush, Education Commission of the States; Kathy Christie, Education Commission of the States; Ronald S. Fielder, Administrator, Grant Wood Education Agency, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Orrin Nearhoof, Director, Iowa Board of Educational Examiners; Alan H. Jones, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Polly Liss, American Association of School Administrators; Richard K. Mastain, Editor, The NASDTEC MANUAL, Sacramento, California; Chris Piphon, Director, Education Commission of the States; Susan Traiman, National Governors' Association; Scott Thomson, Executive Director, National Policy Board for Educational Administration and Wayne Worner, Professor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

In a cover letter further explaining the purposes of the study and providing directions for completing the review, each expert judge was asked to (1) examine the survey directions, format and content, (2) to make suggestions for additions, deletions and modifications and (3) to offer advice for improving the survey. Enclosed with the letter were a draft copy of the intended cover letter of the survey, the initial survey and a response form for the panelists to provide a written review including comments and suggestions. Copies of the letter to the panel of expert judges, the response form and the initial survey and accompanying cover letter are included in Appendix B. Panelists were asked to provide feedback on the following elements of the instrument: clarity of directions, clarity and specificity of items, the validity of the items, the comprehensiveness of the survey and the utility of the items (to what extent will the survey yield useful information).

Ten of the expert judges responded in writing by April 20, 1990. A determination was made that the information and suggestions of these judges were sufficiently in agreement to be incorporated into the survey. Their reactions, suggestions and advice were considered and the initial survey and its accompanying cover letter were revised accordingly. The following improved the clarity and utility of the survey instrument:

- (1) rewording several questions;
- (2) changing and deleting some of the wording of the cover letter;
- (3) reformatting some of the survey pages and
- (4) adding a section for definitions. Special terms were defined on the instrument to ensure that all respondents interpreted their meaning in the same manner.

The final survey was designed to obtain from respondents information in nine categories related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals: (1) initial certification, (2) levels of certification, (3) temporary certification, (4) renewal of certification, (5) alternative certification, (6) reciprocity of certification, (7) structures for handling certification and professional development, (8) services and provisions for professional development and (9) levels of funding for professional development. The survey items specifically designed to obtain information in each of these nine categories are as follows:

Initial certification:

Part I A, Item 9 and Part II, Item 1

Levels of certification:

Part II, Item 3

Temporary Certification:

Part II, Item 1, b

Renewal of Certification:

Part II, Item 2

Alternative Certification:

Part II, Item 1, a

Reciprocity of certification:

Part I A, Item 10 and Form A and Part II, Item 4

Structures for handling certification and professional development:

Part I A, Items 1, 2, 3 and 4

Services and provisions for professional development:

Part I B

Levels of funding for professional development:

Part I A, Items 5, 6 and 7

Items requesting demographic data were also included in the survey instrument. A copy of the final survey and the accompanying cover letter are found in Appendix C.

Method for Collecting the Data

Information about administrator certification and professional development was obtained in two ways: by summarizing and analyzing responses to questions asked in a written survey and by reviewing and analyzing documents requested as part of the survey. Prior to collecting the data, support for the study was requested and received from the Iowa Governor's Office in a letter dated April 23, 1990. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix D. The study was supported by the Iowa Leadership in Educational Administration Development (I-LEAD) Project Policy Board, as evidenced by the minutes of the November 8, 1989 policy board meeting.

The sequence of data collection for description of initial certification, levels of certification, temporary certification, renewal of certification, alternative certification, reciprocity of certification, structures for handling certification and professional development, services and provisions for professional development and levels of funding for professional development began with contacting representatives of the state departments of education in each of the fifty states. The agency

responsible for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals varies from state to state. For that reason, initial contacts were made with each department of education through the office of the chief certification officer of each state department of education. Names and mailing addresses of the chief certification officers were obtained from the 1988-1989 Directory of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC, 1988).

Data were collected by mailing on April 30, 1990 a cover letter and a survey instrument to the chief certification officer of each of the fifty state departments of education. A self-addressed, postage-paid envelope was included with the cover letter and the survey instrument.

Only eleven states responded to the initial request for information within the following two weeks. Because so few states responded to the first request, a follow-up letter was deemed advisable. Therefore, in an effort to enhance the return rate, Dr. William L. Lepley, the Iowa chief state school officer, was asked to mail to the chief state school officer of each state not returning the survey a letter requesting that the survey be completed and returned. This letter, mailed on May 24, 1990, included a copy of the survey and a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. A copy of Dr. Lepley's letter to the other chief state school officers is included in Appendix E.

In the following three weeks a number of additional surveys and documents were received. By June 18, 1990 a total of thirty-seven states had responded.

In an attempt to gain response from all fifty states, a contact by telephone was made between June 26, 1990 and September 10, 1990 with each potential respondent not yet returning the completed survey. In several states, numerous phone calls were necessary to locate the person assigned responsibility for administrator certification and professional development. In twelve of thirteen cases--for a variety of reasons--it was necessary to mail once again the cover letter, the survey and a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. By September 24, 1990, all fifty states mailed the requested materials and returned the completed survey.

There was considerable variability in the amount and variety of documents sent by the states. One state sent only a single paragraph, while other states sent large packets containing several documents and many pages of printed materials. The quality of the documents varied from a single typed page to large commercially printed and bound handbooks.

All cover letters to panelists and respondents included an opportunity to request a summary of the findings of the study.

In summary, data collection occurred through the following steps: (1) an initial letter was mailed to the state chief certification officer of each of the fifty states requesting completion of the survey and submission of copies of any and all documents related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals, (2) copies of all documents were placed in a file folder labeled for each state and an active list of states that indicated those responding and those not responding was maintained, (3) after a sufficient period of time for

response, the Iowa chief state school officer mailed a follow-up letter to the chief state school officer of those states that failed to respond, (4) for those states that failed to respond to the follow-up letter, one or more phone calls was made to each state requesting cooperation in completing the survey and mailing the documents, (5) a telephone contact was made with each state sending information that appeared incomplete and a request was made that any additional relevant information be sent, if possible and (6) after completion and recording of the above steps, a decision was made to terminate the data collection phase and begin data analysis.

Summary of the Data Analysis Procedures

Data for analysis were obtained from the survey and the documents. Guba and Lincoln (1981) defined a document as "any written material other than a record that was not prepared specifically in response to some request from the investigator" (p. 228). An initial review was conducted to determine the completeness of the survey response and the scope of the documents received. If the survey or the documents submitted by any state seemed inadequate or incomplete, additional follow-up was conducted by telephone with the representative of that state to obtain further information, if available. When all responses were received, the data from the survey and the documents were tabulated and summarized. Descriptive statistical reports were generated from the data, including both numerical and graphical representations of findings. The data were presented in frequency counts and percentages. Tables were constructed

for the results of each of the seven questions. Summary tables were also constructed. The data from the survey were examined and analyzed and the findings were reported. All fifty respondents were used in the data analysis.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

The basic problem for this study is to examine how school district superintendents and principals across the nation are certified, to describe how each of the fifty states is structured to handle certification and professional development of these administrators, to report the services and provisions utilized within the states for their professional development and to determine the state funding levels for their professional development. The purpose of this chapter is to report findings and examine descriptive data for the research questions that provided focus for the study. The findings that address these questions are presented below. Each of the seven research questions is presented and the results for each are displayed in table form and described in the narrative accompanying the table.

The survey responses in a few cases did not match the information provided in the documents. For example, Michigan responded that certification is required to practice as a superintendent, but added a statement that this requirement is "not implemented." In reference to reciprocity of certification, Massachusetts indicated that the state does have written interstate certification agreements, but also added a statement that the reciprocity is granted for "experienced educators only." Discrepancies such as these may demonstrate differences between written policy and practiced policy. In other instances, states indicated that requirements for levels of certification, temporary certification, renewal of certification and alternative certification were enclosed but, upon examination of the documents, the information was either missing or

not sufficiently clear for analysis. The extreme variance from one state to another in terminology and practices relative to some of the research questions and the varying manners in which states collect, maintain and report information added to the difficult task of interpreting data. Therefore, in order to assure accuracy, only those findings that the data clearly substantiated are reported.

The first three research questions were designed to determine how superintendents and principals across the nation are certified. These questions specifically address (1) certification of superintendents and principals for practice, (2) requirements or provisions for levels of certification, temporary certification, renewal of certification and alternative certification and (3) reciprocity of certification that exists between states. Findings related to these three questions are presented and discussed below.

1. What states require certification to practice as a superintendent or principal in their states?

Table 1 shows the findings relative to requirements for certification for practice for superintendents or principals in each of the fifty states. Forty-four states (88%) require certification for superintendents to practice in their states and the remaining six states (Florida, Hawaii, New Mexico, Virginia, Washington and West Virginia) do not. All fifty states (100%) require certification for principals to practice in their states.

2. What states have requirements or provisions for levels of certification, temporary certification, renewal of certification and alternative certification for superintendents and principals?

Table 1 also shows the findings relative to requirements or provisions for levels of certification, temporary certification and renewal of certification for superintendents and principals in each of the fifty states. Levels of certification was defined as "one or more stages, levels or tiers of certification issued after the initial certification (not the renewal of first stage, level or tier certification)." Temporary certification was defined as "certification issued for a limited time to a superintendent or principal not meeting all the requirements for initial certification." Renewal of certification was defined as "certification requirements that a superintendent or principal must meet to continue the validity of the initial certificate."

Twenty-seven states (54%) have provisions for levels of certification for superintendents or principals. Of these twenty-seven, twenty-five provide levels of certification for both superintendents and principals and two (Florida and Louisiana) provide levels of certification for principals only.

Seventeen states (34%) provide temporary certification for superintendents or principals. Of these seventeen, all but four provide temporary certification for both superintendents and principals. Alaska provides temporary certification for superintendents only and Florida, New Mexico and North Carolina provide temporary certification for principals

only. Some states, rather than using the term "temporary," use the term "waivers," "provisional" or "emergency." Temporary certification is authorized in one of three ways: (1) the certification may be issued directly to the administrator for practice in any district in the state, (2) the certification may be issued to the administrator for practice only in a specific district of employment or (3) a waiver may be granted directly to the employing district itself, thereby providing an exemption from a requirement to employ only fully certified superintendents or principals.

Forty-one states (82%) require renewal of certification for superintendents and principals. Of these forty-one, all but three require renewal of certification for both superintendents and principals. Florida, Maine and New Mexico require renewal of certification for principals only.

All fifty states were asked to provide information relative to state requirements and provisions for alternative certification for superintendents and principals. While sixteen states (32%) indicated that alternative certification requirements were enclosed, the information, for the most part, was not sufficient for meaningful analysis. Other findings related to alternative certification are not reported in this investigation.

Table 1. Certification requirements and reciprocity for superintendents and principals^a

States	Certification required	Levels	Temporary	Renewal	Reciprocity
Alabama	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Alaska	SP		S	SP	
Arizona	SP		SP	SP	
Arkansas	SP		SP	SP	
California	SP	SP		SP	
Colorado	SP			SP	
Connecticut	SP	SP		SP	P
Delaware	SP			SP	SP
Florida	P	P	P	P	
Georgia	SP	SP		SP	
Hawaii	P				
Idaho	SP			SP	
Illinois	SP				
Indiana	SP			SP	
Iowa	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Kansas	SP			SP	
Kentucky	SP	SP		SP	
Louisiana	SP	P		SP	
Maine	SP		SP	P	
Maryland	SP	SP		SP	P
Massachusetts	SP				SP
Michigan	SP			SP	
Minnesota	SP	SP		SP	
Mississippi	SP	SP		SP	
Missouri	SP	SP		SP	
Montana	SP	SP	SP	SP	

Nebraska	SP	SP		SP	
Nevada	SP				
New Hampshire	SP			SP	SP
New Jersey	SP				
New Mexico	P		P	P	
New York	SP	SP			SP
North Carolina	SP		P	SP	SP
North Dakota	SP	SP		SP	
Ohio	SP	SP		SP	
Oklahoma	SP	SP		SP	
Oregon	SP	SP		SP	
Pennsylvania	SP	SP		SP	
Rhode Island	SP	SP		SP	SP
South Carolina	SP		SP	SP	SP
South Dakota	SP			SP	
Tennessee	SP			SP	
Texas	SP		SP		
Utah	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Vermont	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
Virginia	P				
Washington	P	SP	SP		SP
West Virginia	P	SP		SP	SP
Wisconsin	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Wyoming	SP	SP	SP	SP	
TOTAL	44(88%)	27(54%)	17(34%)	41(82%)	14(28%)

^a Key: SP-For both superintendents and principals; S-For superintendents only;
P-For principals only.

3. What states have reciprocity of certification for
superintendents and principals?

Reciprocity of certification was defined as "an agreement, either by a formal Interstate Certification Agreement or by a written set of state requirements, whereby superintendents and principals educated, experienced or certified in one state are automatically certified on that basis by another state." Table 1 also shows the states having reciprocity of certification. Fourteen states (28%) do have written interstate certification agreements for superintendents and principals while thirty-six states (72%) do not. Of the fourteen states having written interstate certification agreements, twelve have agreements for both superintendents and principals while Connecticut and Maryland have agreements for principals only.

To provide additional information on reciprocity of certification, data were organized in table form to present the states affected by interstate certification agreements. Table 2 shows the states granting reciprocity of certification for superintendents and principals and the states offered reciprocity.

There are two types of reciprocity of certification between states: mutual and unilateral. Table 3 shows a state-by-state listing of both mutual and unilateral reciprocity of certification for superintendents and principals based on the data submitted by the fourteen states. Mutual reciprocity of certification is that whereby superintendents and principals educated, experienced or certified in one state automatically are certified on that basis by another state, and vice versa.

For example, Alabama certifies superintendents with Delaware certification and Delaware also certifies superintendents with Alabama certification. As Table 3 indicates, both Alabama and Delaware have mutual reciprocity of certification.

Unilateral reciprocity of certification exists when superintendents and principals educated, experienced or certified in one state automatically are certified on that basis by another state, but whereby superintendents and principals in the second state are not automatically certified by the first state. For example, Connecticut certifies principals with Delaware certification, but Delaware does not certify principals with Connecticut certification. Therefore, Table 3 reports that Connecticut has unilateral certification of reciprocity with Delaware but that Delaware does not have certification reciprocity with Connecticut.

Most of the certification agreements are agreements for mutual reciprocity of certification. The certification agreements of the states granting reciprocity of certification to superintendents and principals from California, Hawaii, Maine, Michigan, New Jersey, South Dakota and Tennessee are agreements for unilateral reciprocity of certification.

Table 2. States affected by interstate reciprocity agreements for superintendents and principals^a

States granting reciprocity	States offered reciprocity																					
	AL	CA	CT	DE	HA	ME	MD	MA	MI	NH	NJ	NY	NC	RI	SC	SD	TN	UT	VT	WA	WV	
Alabama			SP	SP				SP		SP		SP	SP	SP	SP				SP	SP		SP
Connecticut	P			P	P			P		P		P	P	P	P				P	P	P	P
Delaware	SP						SP	SP		SP		SP	SP	SP	SP				SP	SP	SP	SP
Maryland				P				P		P		P	P		P				P	P		
Massachusetts	SP		SP	SP	SP				SP	SP		SP	SP	SP	SP	SP			SP	SP		
New Hampshire	SP		SP	SP			SP	SP				SP	SP	SP	SP		SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
New York	SP			SP			SP	SP		SP			SP	SP	SP				SP	SP	SP	SP
North Carolina	SP		SP	SP			SP	SP		SP					SP				SP	SP	SP	SP
Rhode Island	SP			SP				SP		SP	SP	SP	SP		SP			SP	SP	SP	SP	SP
South Carolina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Utah	SP		SP	SP	SP			SP		SP		SP	SP	SP	SP	SP				SP		SP
Vermont	SP			SP	SP			SP		SP		SP	SP	SP	SP				SP			SP
Washington		SP			SP	SP		SP		SP	SP		SP					SP	SP	SP		SP
West Virginia	SP			SP				SP		SP		SP	SP	SP	SP	SP			SP	SP	SP	

^aKey: SP-For both superintendents and principals; P-For principals only;
 --A state-by-state listing is not available at this time.

Table 3. Mutual and unilateral reciprocity of certification for superintendents and principals^a

States granting reciprocity	States offered reciprocity																					
	AL	CA	CT	DE	HA	ME	MD	MA	MI	NH	NJ	NY	NC	RI	SC	SD	TN	UT	VT	WA	WV	
Alabama			M	M				M		M		M	M	M	-			M	M			M
Connecticut ^b	M			U	U			M		M		U	M	U	-			M	U	U		U
Delaware	M						M	M		M		M	M	M	-			M	M	U		M
Maryland ^b				M				U		M		M	M		-			U	U			
Massachusetts	M		M	M	U				U	M		M	M	M	-	U		M	M			
New Hampshire	M		M	M			M	M				M	M	M	-		U	M	M	M		M
New York	M			M			M	M		M			M	M	-			M	M	U		M
North Carolina	M		M	M			M	M		M		M			-			M	M	M		M
Rhode Island	M			M				M		M	U	M	U		-		U	M	M	U		M
South Carolina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Utah	M		M	M	U			M		M		M	M	M	-	U						M
Vermont	M			M	U			M		M		M	M	M	-			M				M
Washington		U			U	U		U		M	U		M		-		U	U	U			M
West Virginia	M			M				U		M		M	M	M	-	U		M	M	M		

^a Key: M=Mutual reciprocity of certification; U-Unilateral reciprocity of certification; --Data not available.

^b For principals only.

The next three research questions were designed to determine how states are structured to handle certification and the professional development of superintendents and principals, the services and provisions for their professional development and the state funding levels for their professional development. The findings that address these questions are presented and discussed below.

4. How are each of the fifty states structured to handle certification and professional development of superintendents and principals?

States were asked to report the agency in the state responsible for certification-related decisions, the roles the state departments of education assume in providing professional development for superintendents and principals and the number of state department of education employees assigned responsibility for both certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.

First, states were asked to indicate if an agency different from the state department of education has primary responsibility for certification-related decisions such as setting certification standards, determining requirements, issuing certificates and taking disciplinary action of superintendents and principals. In eleven (22%) of the fifty states, there is a different agency responsible for certification-related decisions. Table 4 shows these eleven states and the title of the agency in each of these states. California, Iowa and Oregon also listed the same agency as the certification agency on the demographic section of the

Table 4. States with agencies different from the state department of education having primary responsibility for certification-related decisions

State	Agency title
California	Commission
Idaho	Professional Standards Commission
Iowa	Board of Educational Examiners
Kentucky	Professional Standards Board
Nevada	Commission of Professional Standards in Education
New Jersey	Board of Examiners
Oklahoma	Professional Standards Board
Oregon	Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
Texas	Commission on Standards for Teaching Profession
Utah	Professional Practices Advisory Commission
Vermont	Standards Board for Professional Educators

survey, whereas the remaining forty-seven states listed the state department of education as the certification agency.

Next, states were asked the roles the state departments of education assume in providing professional development for superintendents and principals. Table 5 shows the roles state departments of education assume in providing professional development for superintendents and principals.

For professional development of superintendents, Table 5 reveals that state departments of education in thirty-four states (68%) regulate, sixteen (32%) provide funding, sixteen (32%) provide trainers, twenty-four (48%) provide training programs, thirty-five (70%) provide technical assistance or consulting and thirty (60%) host or sponsor training provided by others. The departments of education in five states (10%) do not actively provide professional development for superintendents. One state (Indiana) did not provide information for superintendents.

It is noteworthy that, although six states do not require certification for superintendents (Florida, Hawaii, New Mexico, Virginia, Washington and West Virginia), the departments of education in all these states do provide professional development for superintendents.

For professional development of principals, Table 5 also reveals that state departments of education in thirty-five states (70%) regulate, seventeen (34%) provide funding, seventeen (34%) provide trainers, twenty-five (50%) provide training programs, thirty-five (70%) provide technical assistance or consulting and thirty (60%) host or sponsor training provided by others. The state departments of education in four states (8%) do not actively provide professional development for principals.

Table 5. Roles state departments assume in providing professional development for superintendents and principals^a

States	Regulate	Fund	Provide trainers	Provide programs	Technical	Host	No active role
Alabama			SP	SP	SP	SP	
Alaska	SP		S		S	S	
Arizona	SP				SP		
Arkansas				SP	SP	SP	
California					SP	SP	
Colorado	SP	SP			SP	SP	
Connecticut	SP			SP	SP		
Delaware	SP			SP	SP		
Florida	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Georgia	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Hawaii		SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Idaho					SP		
Illinois				SP			
Indiana		P	P	P		P	
Iowa	SP				SP	SP	
Kansas	SP						
Kentucky	SP			SP	SP		
Louisiana	SP	SP	SP	SP		SP	
Maine	SP	SP		SP	SP		
Maryland	SP						SP
Massachusetts				SP			SP
Michigan	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Minnesota	SP	SP			SP	SP	
Mississippi	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Missouri				SP	SP	SP	

Montana								SP
Nebraska								SP
Nevada	SP							
New Hampshire	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP		
New Jersey	P	P	P	P	P	P		S
New Mexico			SP	SP	SP	SP		
New York								SP
North Carolina	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP		
North Dakota	SP					SP	SP	
Ohio	SP							
Oklahoma	SP		SP	SP	SP	SP		
Oregon								SP
Pennsylvania	SP					SP		
Rhode Island	SP							
South Carolina	SP		SP	SP	SP	SP		
South Dakota	SP					SP	SP	
Tennessee	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP		
Texas	SP				SP	SP	SP	
Utah		SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP	
Vermont	SP					SP	SP	
Virginia	SP					SP	SP	
Washington	SP	SP				SP		
West Virginia	SP					SP		
Wisconsin	SP	SP	SP	SP	SP		SP	
Wyoming	SP	SP						

^aKey: SP-For both superintendents and principals; S-For superintendents only;
P-For principals only.

Data were further analyzed to identify those states in which the departments of education assume different roles in providing professional development for superintendents than they do for principals. The department of education in Alaska provides professional development for superintendents but only regulates professional development for principals, the New Jersey state department of education does not provide professional development for superintendents but does for principals and, because of insufficient data, a comparison could not be made for Indiana. The remaining forty-seven state departments of education assume the same roles in providing professional development for superintendents as they do for principals. In order to emphasize this remarkable similarity, the total number and percentage of state departments of education assuming each role for both superintendents and principals are presented in Table 6. Table 6 shows that, as expected, most of the states not only regulate professional development but also provide technical assistance or consulting. Furthermore, most state departments of education actively provide professional development for both superintendents and principals.

Finally, to obtain additional information about how states are structured, states were asked the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) state department of education employees responsible for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. Forty-four states reported the FTE. Table 7 shows for each of these forty-four states the FTE for both certification and professional development of superintendents, of principals and, where the information was available, of superintendents and principals combined.

Table 6. Number and percentage of state departments assuming each role

Role	For superintendents	For principals
Regulatory	34(68%)	35(70%)
Provide funding	16(32%)	17(34%)
Provide trainers	16(32%)	17(34%)
Provide training program(s)	24(48%)	26(52%)
Provide technical assistance or consulting	35(70%)	35(70%)
Host/sponsor training provided by others	30(60%)	30(60%)
No active role	5(10%)	4 (8%)

Table 7. FTE for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

State	FTE for superintendents		FTE for principals		Combined FTE for superintendents and principals	
	Certification	Professional development	Certification	Professional development	Certification	Professional development
Alabama	10	4	10	4	20	8
Alaska	1		1		2	
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas					6	1
California					1	
Colorado	.5	.5	.5	.5	1	1
Connecticut	.1		.25		.35	
Delaware	0	2	0	2	0	4
Hawaii	0	1	2	2	2	3
Idaho	.2		.2		.4	
Illinois	.5	0	.5	0	1	0
Indiana			20	4	20	4
Iowa	3		3		6	1
Kansas					0	
Kentucky	3		3		6	
Louisiana					9	4
Maine	1.5		1.5		3	
Maryland	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	19	19
Michigan	2		2		4	
Minnesota	1		1		2	
Mississippi	.4	4	.4	4	.8	8
Missouri	1	3	1	3	2	6
Montana		0		0	1	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	0

Nevada	2	0	2	0	4	0
New Hampshire	4	1	4	1	8	2
New Jersey	2	.5	2	2	4	2.5
New Mexico	3	3	3	3	6	6
New York	.75	.25	.75	.25	1.5	.5
North Carolina	0	.5	0	12		12.5
North Dakota	1	1	1	1	2	2
Ohio	.2		.4		.6	
Oklahoma	6	1	6	1	12	2
Oregon		0		0	14	0
Pennsylvania	1	1	1	1	2	2
Rhode Island	1.5	0	1.5	0	3	0
South Carolina						11
South Dakota	.05	0	.05	0	.1	0
Tennessee	1	1	1	1	2	2
Texas	20		20		40	
Utah	2	1	2	1	4	2
Vermont	.2	.5	.2	.5	.4	1
Washington	.25	.25	.75	.75	1	1
Wyoming	2	0	2	0	4	0

While the FTE for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals provided some useful information, because of the difference between numbers of superintendents and principals in each state, the data could not be used to compare the FTE for superintendents with that for principals. Likewise, because of the varying numbers of superintendents and principals in each of the states, the data could not be used to compare differences between states. In anticipation of this, states were also asked to report the number of superintendents and principals practicing in their states. Only a few states provided the information necessary to compute ratios for comparative purposes. Therefore, the differences in FTE for superintendents and for principals and the differences in FTE between states are not reported.

5. What are the services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals for which the state departments of education have primary responsibility for administration, implementation and monitoring and which are primarily funded by state governments in each of the fifty states?

The services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals for which the state departments of education have primary responsibility and which are primarily funded by state governments were grouped into ten broad categories. The findings relative to these services and provisions were reported for each state

according to the broad categories. Table 8 shows the services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents while Table 9 shows the services and provisions for principals.

Table 8 shows that, for the professional development of superintendents, the department of education has primary responsibility for assessment centers in four states, for academies in twenty states, for leadership institutes in nineteen states, for professional development internships in six states, for mentoring programs in six states, for peer coaching/peer-assisted leadership networks in five states, for financial assistance in five states, for informational services in fifteen states, for enhancing leadership status in nine states and for communication networks in fifteen states. State agencies provide funding for assessment centers in four states, for academies in sixteen states, for leadership institutes in sixteen states, for professional development internships in four states, for mentoring programs in four states, peer coaching/peer-assisted leadership networks in three states, for financial assistance in five states, for informational services in thirteen states, for enhancing leadership status in seven states and for communication networks in eleven states. A total of thirty-eight state departments of education have primary responsibility for and a total of thirty state governments are the primary funding source for at least one service or provision for professional development of superintendents.

Table 9 shows that, for the professional development of principals, the department of education has primary responsibility for assessment centers in thirteen states, for academies in twenty-five states, for

Table 8. Services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents^a

States	Assessment centers	Academies	Institutes	Internships	Mentoring programs	Peer coaching/peer assistance
Alabama			R F			
Alaska						
Arizona		R				
Arkansas			F			
California			R			
Colorado		R F				
Connecticut	R F	R F	R F			
Delaware		R F	R F			
Florida		R F	R F	R F	R F	R F
Georgia		R F				
Hawaii		R F	R F	R F		
Idaho						
Illinois		F			R F	
Indiana						
Iowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky	R F	R F				
Louisiana		R F	R F			
Maine				R	R	R
Maryland						
Massachusetts						
Michigan						
Minnesota		F				
Mississippi	R F	R F	R F	R		R
Missouri	R	R	R		R	
Montana						
Nebraska						

Nevada						
New Hampshire			R F			
New Jersey		R				
New Mexico			R F			
New York		R				
North Carolina			R F			
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma		R F	F			
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island						
South Carolina		R F	R F	R F	R F	R F
South Dakota						
Tennessee		R	R			
Texas						
Utah		R F	R F	R F	R F	R F
Vermont		R	R			
Virginia			R			
Washington	F					
West Virginia		R F	R F			
Wisconsin		R F	R F			
Wyoming						
TOTAL	4 4	20 16	19 16	6 4	6 4	5 3

^aKey: R-Responsible for; F-Provides funding for.

Table 8. Continued

States	Financial assistance	Informational services	Activities for enhancing leadership status	Communication networks
Alabama		R F		R F
Alaska				R F
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California		F		
Colorado			R F	R F
Connecticut	R F			
Delaware		R F		
Florida	R F	R F	R F	R F
Georgia		R F		
Hawaii	R	R F	R F	R F
Idaho				
Illinois			R F	
Indiana				R F
Iowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana			F	
Maine	F	R F	R	R
Maryland				
Massachusetts		R		
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi		R	R	R F
Missouri		R	R	R
Montana				

Nebraska				R	
Nevada					
New Hampshire					
New Jersey		R F			
New Mexico					
New York		R		R	
North Carolina		R F		R F	
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma		F			
Oregon					
Pennsylvania		R F			
Rhode Island					
South Carolina		R F		R F	
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas	R			R F	
Utah	R F	R F	R F	R F	
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington	F				
West Virginia					
Wisconsin			R F		
Wyoming					
TOTAL	5 5	15 13	9 7	15 11	

Table 9. Services and provisions for the professional development of principals

States	Assessment centers	Academies	Institutes	Internships	Mentoring programs	Peer coaching/peer assistance
Alabama			R F			
Alaska		F				
Arizona		R				
Arkansas	R F		F			
California		R	R	R	R	
Colorado		R F				
Connecticut	R F	R F	R F		R F	R F
Delaware		R F	R F			
Florida	R F	R F	R F	R F		R F
Georgia		R F				
Hawaii		R F	R F	R F		
Idaho					R F	
Illinois		F				
Indiana		R F				R F
Iowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky	R F	R F		R F		
Louisiana	R F	R F	R F	R F	F	R F
Maine				R	R	R
Maryland	R F	R F				
Massachusetts						
Michigan						
Minnesota		F				
Mississippi	R F	R F	R F	R		R
Missouri	R	R	R		R	
Montana						
Nebraska						

Nevada						
New Hampshire			F			
New Jersey	R	R F		R	R	
New Mexico			R F			
New York		R				
North Carolina	R F	R F	R F	R F	R F	R F
North Dakota						
Ohio						
Oklahoma		R F	F			
Oregon						
Pennsylvania		R F	R F			
Rhode Island						
South Carolina	R F	R F	R F	R F	R F	R F
South Dakota						
Tennessee		R	R			
Texas						
Utah		R F	R F	R F	R F	R F
Vermont		R	R			
Virginia			R			
Washington	F					
West Virginia	R F	R F	R F			
Wisconsin	R F	R F	R F			R F
Wyoming						
TOTAL	13 12	25 22	19 17	11 7	9 6	10 8

^aKey: R-Responsible for; F-Provides funding for.

Table 9. Continued

States	Financial assistance	Informational services	Activities for enhancing leadership status	Communication networks
Alabama		R F		R F
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California		F		
Colorado			R F	R F
Connecticut	R F			
Delaware		R F		
Florida		R F	R F	R F
Georgia		R F	R F	
Hawaii	R	R F	R F	R F
Idaho				
Illinois			R F	
Indiana				R F
Iowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky				
Louisiana			F	
Maine	F	R F	R	R
Maryland				
Massachusetts				
Michigan				
Minnesota				
Mississippi		R	R	R F
Missouri		R	R	R
Montana				

Nebraska				R	
Nevada				R	
New Hampshire					
New Jersey		R F		R F	
New Mexico					
New York		R			R
North Carolina		R F		R F	R F
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma		F			
Oregon					
Pennsylvania		R F			
Rhode Island					
South Carolina		R F		R F	R F
South Dakota					
Tennessee					
Texas	R				R F
Utah	R F	R F		R F	R F
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington					
West Virginia				R F	
Wisconsin				R F	
Wyoming					
TOTAL	4 3	14 13		14 12	14 10

leadership institutes in nineteen states, for professional development internships in eleven states, for mentoring programs in nine states, for peer coaching/peer-assisted leadership networks in ten states, for financial assistance in four states, for informational services in fourteen states, for enhancing leadership status in fourteen states and for communication networks in fourteen states. State agencies provide funding for assessment centers in twelve states, for academies in twenty-two states, for leadership institutes in seventeen states, for professional development internships in seven states, for mentoring programs in six states, for peer coaching/peer-assisted leadership networks in eight states, for financial assistance in three states, for informational services in thirteen states, for enhancing leadership status in twelve states and for communication networks in ten states. A total of thirty-four state departments of education have primary responsibility for and a total of thirty-one state governments are the primary funding source for at least one service or provision for professional development of principals.

Data were organized to report the total number of state departments of education having primary responsibility for services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals in each of the ten broad categories and the total number of state agencies funding these services and provisions. Table 10 shows these numbers for each of the ten categories. More state departments of education are responsible for services and provisions for superintendents than for principals in only three categories, while the opposite is true in six categories.

Table 10. Number of states having responsibility for or providing funds for services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals according to broad categories

Services and provisions	<u>Having responsibility for</u>		<u>Providing funds for</u>	
	Superintendents	Principals	Superintendents	Principals
Assessment centers	4	13	4	12
Academies	20	25	16	22
Leadership institutes	19	19	16	17
Internships	6	11	4	7
Mentoring programs	6	9	4	6
Peer coaching/ peer assistance	6	10	3	8
Financial assistance	6	4	5	3
Informational services	15	14	13	13
Activities for enhancing leadership status	9	14	7	12
Communication networks	15	14	11	10

Also, more state governments fund services and provisions for superintendents than for principals in only two categories, while the opposite is true in seven categories.

Finally, in order to provide more detailed information about the services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals for which the state departments of education have primary responsibility and which are primarily funded by state governments, data have been organized by twenty specific services and provisions. Table 11 shows the states where the state departments of education have primary responsibility for services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals and Table 12 shows the states where the state governments are the primary source of funding for these services and provisions.

Data were organized to report the total number of state departments of education having primary responsibility for services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals in each of the twenty specific categories and the total number of state agencies funding these services and provisions. Table 13 shows for each of the twenty categories these numbers.

The services and provisions for which the most state departments of education have primary responsibility or which the most state governments primarily fund are the following: (1) academies for all administrators and academies for superintendents only or principals only, (2) leadership institutes, 1 to 4 days each, (3) assessment centers, (4) electronic networks and (5) specific activities for enhancing the status of women and

Table 11. States where departments of education have primary responsibility for services and provisions for superintendents and principals

Services and provisions	States		
	For both superintendents and principals	For superintendents only	For principals only
Assessment centers	CT, KY, MS, MO		AR, FL, LA, MD, NJ, NC, SC, WV, WI
Academies for all administrators	AZ, DE, FL, GA, HA, KY, LA, MS, MO, NJ, NY, OK, TN, WV	CT	MD, NC, SC
Academies for superintendents or principals only	AZ, CO, FL, GA, HA, KY, LA, MO, NY, TN, UT, VT, WV, WI	SC	CA, CT, IN, NC, PA
Leadership institutes, 1 to 4 days each	AL, CA, CT, DE, FL, HA, LA, MS, MO, NM, NC, SC, TN, UT, VA, WI	NH	PA
Leadership institutes, 5 to 9 days each	HA, LA, MS, NM, NC, SC, VT, WI	CT, NH, NC, WV	
Leadership institutes, 10 or more days each	HA, MS, MO		CA, WV
Business-sponsored training/workshops	AL, AR, GA, HA, LA, NJ, NC, SC	MS	
Professional development internships	FL, HA, ME, MS, SC, UT		CA, KY, LA, NJ, NC
Mentoring programs	ID, ME, MO, SC, UT	FL	CA, CT, NJ, NC
Peer coaching networks	ME, SC, UT		CT, IN, LA, NC
Peer-assisted leadership networks	FL, ME, MS, UT		CT, LA, SC

Fellowships/grants for pursuing advanced degrees	HA, TX, UT	
Financial incentives for professional development	CT, HA, TX, UT	FL
Clearinghouses for research and information about effective leadership	AL, DE, FL, GA, HA, MS, MO, NC, PA, SC, UT	
Registry and directory information for administrator recruitment and placement	AL, HA, ME, MS, NJ, NY, UT	MA
Specific activities for enhancing the status of women administrators	CO, FL, HA, IL, MS, MO, UT, WI	GA, NJ, NC, WV
Specific activities for enhancing the status of minority administrators	CO, FL, HA, IL, ME, UT, WI	GA, NJ, NC, SC
Electronic networks	AL, CO, FL, HA, IN, ME, MS, NE, NY, SC, UT	AK
State-wide telephone networks	HA, ME, MS, TX, UT	AK
State-wide satellite networks	FL, HA, MO, NC, UT	AK

Table 12. States where state governments are primary funding source of services and provisions for superintendents and principals

Services and provisions	States		
	For both superintendents and principals	For superintendents only	For principals only
Assessment centers	CT, KY, MS, WA		AR, FL, LA, MD, NC, SC, WV, WI
Academies for all administrators	DE, FL, GA, HA, IL, KY, LA, MN, MS, OK, WV	AK, CT	MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC
Academies for superintendents or principals only	CO, FL, GA, HA, KY, LA, MN, UT, WV, WI	SC	CT, IN, NC, OK
Leadership institutes, 1 to 4 days each	AL, AR, CT, DE, FL, LA, MS, NH, NM, NC, SC, UT, WI		PA
Leadership institutes, 5 to 9 days each	HA, LA, MS, NH, SC, WI	CT, NC, WV	
Leadership institutes, 10 or more days each	HA, MS, NC, OK		WV
Business-sponsored training/workshops	AL, AR, GA, HA, LA, NC, SC		
Professional development internships	FL, HA, SC, UT		KY, LA, NC
Mentoring programs	ID, SC, UT	FL	CT, LA, NC
Peer coaching networks	SC, UT		CT, IN, LA, NC
Peer-assisted leadership networks	FL, UT		CT, LA, SC, WI

Fellowships/grants for pursuing advanced degrees	UT	
Financial incentives for professional development	CT, ME, UT	FL, WA
Clearinghouses for research and information about effective leadership	AL, CA, DE, FL, GA, NC, OK, PA, SC, UT	
Registry and directory information for administrator recruitment and placement	AL, HA, ME, NJ, UT	
Specific activities for enhancing the status of women administrators	CO, FL, HA, IL, UT, WI	GA, LA, NJ, NC, WV
Specific activities for enhancing the status of minority administrators	CO, FL, HA, IL, UT, WI	GA, LA, NJ, NC, SC
Electronic networks	AL, CO, FL, HA, IN, MS, SC, TX, UT	AK
State-wide telephone networks	FL, HA, MS, TX, UT	AK
State-wide satellite networks	HA, NC, TX, UT	AK

Table 13. Number of states having responsibility for or providing funds for services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals according to specific categories^a

Services and provisions	Having responsibility for				Providing funds for			
	SP	S	P	Total	SP	S	P	Total
Assessment centers	4		9	13	4		8	12
Academies for all administrators	14	1	3	18	11	2	5	18
Academies for superintendents or principals only	14	1	1	16	10	1	5	16
Leadership institutes, 1 to 4 days each	16	1		17	13		1	14
Leadership institutes, 5 to 9 days each	7	4		11	6		3	9
Leadership institutes, 10 or more days each	3		2	5	4		1	5
Business-sponsored training/workshops	8	1		9	7			7
Professional development internships	6		5	11	4		3	7
Mentoring programs	5	1	4	10	3	1	3	7
Peer coaching networks	3		4	7	2		4	6
Peer-assisted leadership networks	4		3	7	2		4	6
Fellowships/grants for pursuing advanced degrees	3			3	1			1
Financial incentives for professional development	4	1		5	3	2		5
Clearinghouses for research and information about effective leadership	11			11	10			10

Registry and directory information for administrator recruitment and placement	7	1		8	5		5
Specific activities for enhancing the status of women administrators	8		4	12	6	5	11
Specific activities for enhancing the status of minority administrators	7		4	11	6	5	11
Electronic networks	11	1		12	9	1	10
State-wide telephone networks	5	1		6	5	1	6
State-wide satellite networks	5	1		6	4	1	5

^aKey: SP-For both superintendents and principals; S-For superintendents only;
P-For principals only.

minority administrators. The services and provisions for which the fewest state departments of education have primary responsibility or which the fewest state governments primarily fund are the following:

(1) fellowships/grants for pursuing advanced degrees, (2) financial incentives for professional development and (3) state-wide telephone networks. More state departments of education are responsible for and more state governments fund assessment centers, academies, internships, peer coaching and peer-assisted leadership networks and activities for enhancing the status of women and minority administrators for principals than for superintendents. There is remarkable similarity between the number of state departments of education responsible for these services and provisions and the number of state governments funding them.

6. What is the level of funding that each of the fifty state departments of education provides for professional development of superintendents and principals?

All fifty states were asked to report the dollars budgeted by the state department of education for Fiscal Year 1990 for the professional development of superintendents and principals. Eight states (Alabama, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Utah) reported that the state department of education budgets specify amounts for professional development of superintendents and principals. The information, however, was insufficient for analysis. In an effort to learn more about the funding provided by the states for professional development of superintendents and principals, all survey data related to

Table 14. Composite report of state funding provided for the professional development of superintendents and principals

States	State Department of Education			State Government
	Budgets dollars for certification and/or professional development	Provides funding for professional development	Provides trainers/training programs for professional development	Funding source for professional development
Alabama	X		X	X
Alaska			X	X
Arizona				
Arkansas			X	X
California	X		X	X
Colorado	X	X	X	X
Connecticut			X	X
Delaware			X	X
Florida		X	X	X
Georgia		X	X	X
Hawaii	X	X	X	X
Idaho				X
Illinois			X	X
Indiana		X	X	X
Iowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky			X	X
Louisiana	X	X	X	X
Maine		X	X	X
Maryland				X
Massachusetts			X	
Michigan		X	X	

Minnesota		X			X
Mississippi		X		X	X
Missouri				X	
Montana					
Nebraska					
Nevada					
New Hampshire		X		X	X
New Jersey		X		X	X
New Mexico				X	X
New York					
North Carolina	X	X		X	X
North Dakota					
Ohio					
Oklahoma	X			X	X
Oregon					
Pennsylvania					X
Rhode Island					
South Carolina				X	X
South Dakota				X	
Tennessee		X		X	
Texas				X	X
Utah	X	X		X	X
Vermont					
Virginia					
Washington		X			X
West Virginia				X	X
Wisconsin		X		X	X
Wyoming		X			
TOTAL	8	18		31	31

funding by states were reported in a summary table. Table 14 shows the composite report regarding state funding for the professional development of superintendents and principals. Eighteen state departments of education provide funding for professional development of either superintendents or principals or both and thirty-one provide trainers and/or training programs. Thirty-one state governments are the primary funding source for at least one service or provision utilized for the professional development of superintendents or principals or both. The composite data reveal that only thirteen states (Arizona, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont and Virginia) do not provide any funding for the professional development of superintendents and principals.

7. What are factors that influence practices across the fifty states related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals?

Eight categories were used to determine factors that might influence practices across the fifty states related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. These categories were derived from both the related literature and from the information received from telephone interviews with experts in the field. The eight categories were: (1) geographic region, (2) state population, (3) state wealth, (4) state revenue per pupil, (5) school success, (6) number of approved reforms, (7) administrator improvement initiatives and (8) state control. The six practices analyzed were: (1) the

requirement for superintendents to be certified, (2) reciprocity of certification, (3) the agency responsible for certification-related decisions, (4) roles assumed by the state department of education for the professional development of superintendents and principals, (5) state departments of education having primary responsibility for services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals and (6) state governments funding services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals. Tables 15 through 22 and the accompanying narratives present those practices of the six listed above that appear to have a possible association with each of the eight categories.

Geographic region

Regional categorizations used by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the National Assessment of Educational Progress and the National Education Association--Northeast, Central (Middle), Southeast and West (National Center for Education Statistics, 1989, p. 443)--provided the basis for categorizing states by geographic region. Practices of the states in each of the regions were compared to practices of the states in each of the other three regions.

Table 15 shows possible associations between geographic region and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. Of the six states not requiring certification for superintendents to practice, three are in the Southeast Region and three are in the West Region. Of the fourteen states reporting

Table 15. Possible associations between geographic region and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	Geographic region			
	Northeast (11 states)	Central (12 states)	Southeast (12 states)	West (15 states)
States not requiring superintendents to be certified	0	0	3	3
States having reciprocity of certification agreements	8	0	4	2
States having an agency other than the state department responsible for certification-related decisions	2	1	1	7
Level of state department responsibility for providing professional development for superintendents and principals	Medium	Medium	High	Medium
Level of state funding for professional development for superintendents and principals	Medium	Medium	High	Medium

reciprocity of certification, eight are in the Northeast Region, four are in the Southeast Region and two are in the West Region. Seven of the eleven states having an agency different from the state department of education responsible for certification-related decisions are in the West Region, two are in the Northeast Region, one is in the Central Region and one is in the Southeast Region. States in the Southeast Region are likely to have responsibility for and fund more services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals than states in any of the other three regions.

State population

The 1987 total resident population of the states (National Education Association, 1989, p. 7) was used as the basis for categorizing states by state population. The fifty states were listed in order from those states having the largest total resident population to those having the smallest total resident population and then they were organized into five groups of ten states each. Practices of the states in each of the state population groups were compared to practices of the states in each of the other four state population groups.

Table 16 shows possible associations between state population and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. The states in each of the three middle groups are likely to have responsibility for and fund more services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals than the states having either the largest or the smallest populations and

Table 16. Possible associations between state population and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	State population				
	Largest resident population			Smallest resident population	
	1	2	3	4	5
Level of state department responsibility for providing professional development for superintendents and principals	Medium	High	High	High	Low
Level of state funding for professional development for superintendents and principals	Medium	High	High	High	Low

the states with the largest populations are likely to have responsibility for and fund more services and provisions than the states with the smallest populations.

State wealth

The 1986 wealth per 5- to 17-year-olds (National Governors' Association, 1989, pp. 84-5) was used as the basis for categorizing states by state wealth. The fifty states were listed in order from those states having the greatest wealth to those having the least wealth and then they were organized into five groups of ten states each. Practices of the states in each of the state wealth groups were compared to practices of the states in each of the other four state wealth groups.

Table 17 shows possible associations between state wealth and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. The states with the least wealth are likely to have responsibility for and fund more services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals than the other states.

State revenue per pupil

The 1988-89 public school revenue per pupil in average daily attendance of the states (National Education Association, 1989, p. 38) was used as the basis for categorizing states by state revenue per pupil. The fifty states were listed in order from those having the highest state revenue per pupil to those having the lowest state revenue per pupil and

Table 17. Possible associations between state wealth and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	State wealth				
	Greatest wealth 1	2	3	4	Least wealth 5
Level of state department responsibility for providing professional development for superintendents and principals	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
Level of state funding for professional development for superintendents and principals	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	High

then they were organized into five groups of ten states each. Practices of the states in each of the state revenue per pupil groups were compared to practices of the states in each of the other four state revenue per pupil groups.

Table 18 shows possible associations between state revenue per pupil and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. There is remarkable similarity in all practices among the states in the four groups having the lowest state revenue per pupil. However, the states having the highest state revenue per pupil are likely to have responsibility for and fund fewer services and provisions for the professional development of superintendents and principals than the other states.

School success

The 1986-87 public high school graduation rate of the states (National Governors' Association, 1989, pp. 82-83) was used as the basis for categorizing states by school success. The fifty states were listed in order from those having the highest graduation rate to those having the lowest graduation rate and then they were organized into five groups of ten states each. Practices of the states in each of the graduation rate groups were compared to practices of the states in each of the other four graduation rate groups.

Table 19 shows possible associations between school success and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. All ten states having the highest

Table 18. Possible associations between state revenue per pupil and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	State revenue per pupil				
	Highest revenue			Lowest revenue	
	1	2	3	4	5
Level of state department responsibility for providing professional development for superintendents and principals	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Level of state funding for professional development for superintendents and principals	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium

Table 19. Possible associations between school success and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	School success				
	Highest graduation rate			Lowest graduation rate	
	1	2	3	4	5
States not requiring superintendents to be certified	0	1	2	2	1
States having reciprocity of certification agreements	0	5	3	5	1
States having no active role in providing professional development for superintendents and principals	2		1		1
Level of state department responsibility for providing professional development for superintendents and principals	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
Level of state funding for professional development for superintendents and principals	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium	High

graduation rate require certification for practice, whereas the other groups of states all have one or more states not requiring certification for superintendents. Of the fourteen states having certification reciprocity, none is in the highest graduation rate group, thirteen are evenly distributed in the three middle graduation rate groups and one is in the lowest graduation rate group. Of the four states taking no active role in the professional development of both superintendents and principals, two are in the highest graduation rate group. The states having the highest graduation rate are more likely to have responsibility for and fund fewer services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals than the other states. States are likely to have greater responsibility for and fund these services and provisions progressively more as the graduation rate decreases.

Number of approved reforms

The 1983-85 number of approved external reforms for the states (Plank, 1987) was used as the basis for categorizing states by number of approved reforms. The fifty states were listed in order from those having the largest number of approved reforms to those having the smallest number of approved reforms and then they were organized into four groups of approximately twelve states each. Practices of the states in each of the number of approved reforms groups were compared to practices of the states in each of the other three number of approved reforms groups.

Table 20 shows possible associations between number of approved reforms and practices related to certification and professional

Table 20. Possible associations between the number of approved reforms and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	Number of approved reforms			
	Largest number			Smallest number
	1 (14 states)	2 (11 states)	3 (12 states)	4 (13 states)
Level of state department responsibility for providing professional development for superintendents and principals	High	Medium	Medium	Low
Level of state funding for professional development for superintendents and principals	High	Medium	Medium	Low

development of superintendents and principals. The states having the largest number of reforms are likely to have responsibility for and fund more services and provisions than the other states. The number of services and provisions for which states have responsibility and provide funding is likely to decrease as the number of approved reforms decreases.

Administrator improvement initiatives

The number of administrator improvement initiatives for the combined categories of preservice preparation/initial entry and continuing professional development of states (Fielder, 1989, p. 96) was used as the basis for categorizing states by administrator improvement initiatives. The fifty states were listed in order from those having the largest number of administrator improvement initiatives to those having the smallest number of administrator improvement initiatives and then they were organized into five groups of approximately ten states each. Practices of the states in each of the number of administrator improvement initiatives groups were compared to practices of the states in each of the other four number of administrator improvement initiatives groups.

Table 21 shows possible associations between administrator improvement initiatives and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. All six states not requiring certification for superintendents are among the two groups with the most administrator improvement initiatives. None of the states in the group with the most administrator improvement initiatives have agencies different from the state department of education responsible for

Table 21. Possible associations between administrator improvement initiatives and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	Administrator improvement initiatives				
	Largest number of initiatives			Smallest number of initiatives	
	1 (9 states)	2 (10 states)	3 (8 states)	4 (11 states)	5 (12 states)
States not requiring superintendents to be certified	2	4	0	0	0
States having an agency other than the state department responsible for certification-related decisions	0	2	2	4	3
Level of state department responsibility for providing professional development for superintendents and principals	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
Level of state funding for professional development for superintendents and principals	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low

certification-related decisions. The states having the most administrator improvement initiatives are likely to have responsibility for and fund the most services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals. The number of services and provisions for which states have responsibility and provide funding is likely to decrease as the number of administrator improvement initiatives decreases.

State control

The listing of nine states having laws that authorize them to intervene in school districts that are failing for academic, political or fiscal reasons (Education Week, October 3, 1990) was used as the basis for categorizing states by high state control. Practices of the nine states included in the high state control group were compared to practices of the other forty-one states.

Table 22 shows possible associations between state control and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. Two of the six states not requiring certification for superintendents are among the high control states. Three of the eleven states having agencies different from the state department responsible for certification-related decisions are also among the high control states.

Table 22. Possible associations between state control and practices related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals

Practices	State control	
	High control states (9 states)	Other states (41 states)
States not requiring superintendents to be certified	2	4
States having an agency other than the state department responsible for certification-related decisions	3	8

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to examine how superintendents and principals across the nation are certified, to determine how states are structured to handle certification and professional development of administrators, to report the services and provisions utilized within the states for professional development of administrators and to determine the state funding levels for professional development of administrators. This chapter presents a summary of the findings, provides conclusions and discussion and offers recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Findings

Data were gathered from two sources, a survey and documents received from all fifty states. The detailed findings of the study were presented in the preceding chapter. A brief summary of these findings will be presented in the four following areas: (1) certification, (2) state structures for handling certification and professional development, (3) funding, services and provisions for professional development and (4) factors that influence certification and professional development practices.

Certification:

1. Forty-four states require certification for superintendents to practice in their states while all fifty states require certification for principals to practice in their states.
2. Twenty-seven states have provisions for levels of certification for superintendents or principals; of these twenty-seven, twenty-

five require levels of certification for both superintendents and principals and two require levels of certification for principals only.

3. Seventeen states provide temporary certification for superintendents or principals. Thirteen of these states provide temporary certification for both superintendents and principals, one provides temporary certification for superintendents only and three provide temporary certification for principals only.
4. Forty-one states require renewal of certification for superintendents and principals. Thirty-eight of these states require renewal of certification for both superintendents and principals and three require renewal of certification for principals only.
5. Fourteen states have written interstate certification agreements for superintendents and principals; twelve of these have agreements for both superintendents and principals while two have agreements for principals only.

State structures for handling certification and professional development:

1. In eleven states, there is an agency different from the state department of education responsible for certification-related decisions.
2. For professional development of superintendents, state departments of education in thirty-four states assume a regulatory role,

sixteen provide funding, sixteen provide trainers, twenty-four provide training programs, thirty-five provide technical assistance or consulting, thirty host or sponsor training provided by others and five do not actively provide professional development for superintendents.

3. For professional development of principals, state departments of education in thirty-five states assume a regulatory role, seventeen provide funding, seventeen provide trainers, twenty-five provide training programs, thirty-five provide technical assistance or consulting, thirty host or sponsor training provided by others and four do not actively provide professional development for principals.

Funding, services and provisions for professional development:

1. Thirty-eight state departments of education have primary responsibility for and thirty state governments are the primary funding source for at least one service or provision for professional development of superintendents.
2. Thirty-four state departments of education have primary responsibility for and thirty-one state governments are the primary funding source for at least one service or provision for professional development of principals.
3. Eight state departments of education specify budget amounts for professional development of superintendents and principals.

4. Eighteen state departments of education provide funding for professional development of either superintendents or principals or both.
5. Thirty-one state governments are the primary funding source for at least one service or provision utilized for the professional development of superintendents or principals or both.
6. Thirteen states do not provide any funding for the professional development of superintendents and principals.
7. Thirty-one state departments of education provide trainers and/or training programs for superintendents and principals.

Factors that might influence certification and professional development practices:

1. Of the six states not requiring certification for superintendents to practice, three are in the Southeast Region and three are in the West Region. Of the fourteen states reporting reciprocity of certification for administrators, eight are in the Northeast Region, four are in the Southeast Region and two are in the West Region. Seven of the eleven states having an agency different from the state department of education responsible for certification-related decisions are in the West Region, two are in the Northeast Region, one is in the Central Region and one is in the Southeast Region. States in the Southeast Region are more likely to provide and fund professional development of

superintendents and principals than states in any of the other three regions.

2. The states in each of the three middle state population groups are more likely to provide and fund professional development of superintendents and principals than the states having either the largest or the smallest populations and the states with the largest populations are more likely to provide and fund professional development of these administrators than the states with the smallest populations.
3. The states with the least wealth are more likely to provide and fund professional development of superintendents and principals than the other states.
4. There is remarkable similarity in all practices among the states in the four groups having the lowest state revenue per pupil. However, the states having the highest state revenue per pupil are less likely to provide and fund professional development of superintendents and principals than the other states.
5. All ten states having the highest graduation rate require certification for practice, whereas the other groups of states all have one or more states not requiring certification for superintendents. Of the fourteen states having certification reciprocity for administrators, none is in the highest graduation rate group, thirteen are evenly distributed in the three middle graduation rate groups and one is in the lowest graduation rate group. Of the four states taking no active role in the

professional development of both superintendents and principals, two are in the highest graduation rate group. The states having the highest graduation rate are less likely to provide and fund professional development of superintendents and principals than the other states. As the graduation rate decreases, states are progressively more likely to provide and fund professional development of administrators.

6. The states having the largest number of reforms are more likely to provide and fund professional development of superintendents and principals. As the number of approved reforms of states decreases, the extent to which states provide and fund professional development of administrators also decreases.
7. All six states not requiring certification for superintendents are among the two groups with the most administrator improvement initiatives. None of the states in the group with the most administrator improvement initiatives have agencies different from the state department of education responsible for certification-related decisions. The states having the most administrator improvement initiatives are the most likely to provide and fund professional development of superintendents and principals. As the number of administrator improvement initiatives of states decreases, the extent to which states provide and fund professional development of administrators also decreases.
8. Two of the six states not requiring certification for superintendents are among the high control states. Three of the

eleven states having agencies different from the state department responsible for certification-related decisions are also among the high control states.

Conclusions and Discussion

Presented below are conclusions based on the findings, discussion of these findings and implications for states' agencies, professional associations, preparation institutions and other parties involved in developing policies and guidelines for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.

It is encouraging that all states consider it important that principals have certain prescribed learning experiences prior to beginning practice. Why six states do not require a prescribed set of learning experiences prior to practice for superintendents is puzzling. One would hope that the policymakers in these six states would consider requiring certification for superintendents.

Of concern is the number of states (over one-third) that provide temporary certification for superintendents and principals. At a time when there is a nationwide emphasis on better preservice training of school leaders, it is alarming that states certify, on a temporary basis, persons who have not met the minimum state standards for administrator preparation.

It is commendable that most states recognize the need for continued professional growth of administrators by requiring renewal of certification of superintendents and principals and that over half the

states have levels of certification which promote continued professional development for administrators.. However, it is disappointing that all fifty states have not implemented levels of certification for administrators.

Few states have agreements for reciprocity of certification for superintendents and principals. Considering the educational reform efforts of states to improve their certification practices, it is not surprising that most states do not agree to blanket certification of administrators from other states but rather choose to evaluate the administrators' qualifications for certification on a case by case basis using their own criteria. Agreements for reciprocity of certification between the small, contiguous eastcoast states appear to exist for practical reasons. There are more opportunities for administrators educated or living in these states to be employed in or to move to other nearby states than for administrators from states that are much larger and not adjacent to as many states. One would hope, however, that states participating in agreements for reciprocity of certification have commonly agreed-upon criteria for granting reciprocity to administrators.

There is a growing number of states establishing separate administrative licensure boards to determine standards, examine candidates, issue licenses and have the authority to revoke licenses. This may be an artifact of a nationwide press for reform of preparation programs and activities related to professional development of administrators.

It is not clear how services and provisions for professional development of superintendents and principals are funded or if states provide funding for these. No one knows whether professional development for superintendents and principals in the fifty states is adequately funded or not.

As one might expect, states having the least wealth have the least financial resources available for educational purposes, including the provision and funding of professional development for superintendents and principals. National policymakers concerned with equity must find ways to provide additional financial assistance for those poor states most in need of money for improving administrator preparation and professional development.

States with large resident populations and those with small resident populations are less likely than other states to provide and fund professional development for administrators. It is possible that states with very large populations, in an effort to decentralize delivery of services to superintendents and principals concentrated in large districts, have relinquished responsibility for providing or funding professional development of administrators to local school districts or intermediate agencies. States with small populations may not have the resources to provide professional development to a relatively small number of administrators scattered throughout a sparsely-populated state. Therefore, it is imperative that sparsely-populated states consider collaborating with other agencies to meet the professional development needs of administrators in their states.

It is somewhat surprising that states having the highest degree of school success as measured by the state graduation rate, in fact, are less likely to provide and fund professional development of superintendents and principals. It is not clear whether these states are actually satisfied with their current educational systems and, therefore, do not see the need for any educational reform in their states, including reforms in certification and professional development of administrators.

This study shows that states that have the largest number of reforms and the most administrator improvement initiatives are, in fact, also more likely to provide and fund professional development for superintendents and principals than other states. It is suggested that national policymakers observe these states to obtain information about the furthest advances in preparation and professional development of administrators.

One might expect the nine states that have laws authorizing them to intervene in school districts failing for academic, political or fiscal reasons to also have more stringent requirements for certification of superintendents and principals than other states and to be more regulatory regarding the provision of professional development for administrators. Surprisingly, this is not the case.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study contributed much useful information related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. The study utilized a more detailed survey instrument than previous studies. Information was collected regarding certification and

professional development for both superintendents and principals in the same instrument. The study included findings from all fifty states.

Nevertheless, there is a need for further research in the areas of certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. It is recommended that a study be undertaken to determine the basis of requirements across the fifty states for issuing initial certification and renewal of certification for both superintendents and principals. It is also recommended that a study be conducted to report for each of the fifty states the agencies providing professional development for superintendents and principals and the funding sources for the professional development of these administrators.

A formidable problem for researchers and policymakers is the lack of common definitions of terms and uniform methods of reporting information in the areas of certification and professional development. A number of states appeared to have poorly designed systems for maintaining and reporting information concerning certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. Obtaining and analyzing this information from all fifty states is difficult, time-consuming and expensive. Therefore, researchers may be deterred from conducting greatly needed studies of policies and practices in certification and professional development across the fifty states. Also, the wide range of response time by states may impede the efforts of state policy developers who rely on such information. It is recommended, therefore, that a model for conducting nationwide studies of educational issues and policymaking be developed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators. (1979). Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- American Association of School Administrators. (1989a). The 1989 handbook of the American Association of School Administrators. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- American Association of School Administrators. (1989b). Clinical training called a "sham." Leadership News, 1-2.
- Baptist, June Elizabeth Jones. (1989). Public school superintendents' certification requirements. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.
- Borg, Walter R. and Gall, Meredith Damien. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction, Fifth Edition. White Plains, New York: Longman Inc.
- Bowles, B. Dean. (1989). Educational leadership faces "silentcrisis." Education Week, 8(40), 40.
- Bradley, Ann (1989). Board reaffirms plans to reform administration. Education Week, 9(13), 1, 9.
- Bray, Judy. (1985). 50-state survey of academies, institutes and inservice programs for administrators. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Burks, Mary Paxton. (1988). Requirements for Certification for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools, Junior Colleges: Teachers, Counselors, Librarians, Administrators, Fifty-third Edition, 1988-89. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Clinton, Bill. (1986). Chairman's summary. Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education Task Force on Leadership and Management. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.
- Crowson, Robert L. (1987). The local school district superintendency: A puzzling administrative role. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23(3), 49-69.
- Fielder, Ronald Scott. (1989). State Initiatives Directed toward the Improvement of Practicing School Administrators: A Study of Policies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.
- Firestone, William A. (1989). Educational policy as an ecology of games. Educational Researcher, 18(7), 18-24.

- Firestone, William A., Susan H. Fuhrman and Michael W. Kirst. (1989). The Progress of Reform: An Appraisal of State Education Initiatives. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Policy Research in Education.
- Glasman, Naftaly S. and Lynette Diamond Glasman. (1988). Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(4), 438-445.
- Gousha, Richard P., Peter L. LoPresti and Alan H. Jones. (1985). Report on first annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators. Ann Arbor, MI: Prakken Publications, Inc.
- Gousha, Richard P., Peter L. LoPresti and Alan H. Jones. (1986). Mapping a dynamic field: Results from the second annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators. Ann Arbor, MI: Prakken Publications, Inc.
- Gousha, Richard P., Peter L. LoPresti and Alan H. Jones. (1988). Continuing change: Results from the third annual survey of certification and employment standards for educational administrators. Ann Arbor, MI: Prakken Publications, Inc.
- Griffiths, Daniel E., Robert T. Stout, and Patrick B. Forsyth, eds. (1988). Leaders for America's Schools: The Report and Papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Guba, Egon G. (1984). The effect of definitions of policy on the nature and outcomes of policy analysis. Educational Leadership, 42(2), 63-70.
- Guba, Egon G. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. (1981). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Harper, Brent. University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. Personal telephone interview. July, 1990.
- Hazi, Helen M. (1986). The third wave: Competency tests for administrators. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Hoyle, John R. (1989). Preparing the 21st century superintendent. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(5), 376-379.
- Ippolito, Dennis S. and Thomas G. Walker. (1980). Political Parties, Interest Groups, and Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kirst, Michael W. (1985). Sustaining State Education Reform Momentum: The Linkage between Assessment and Financial Support. Stanford, CA: IFG/SEPI Publications.

- Knezevich, Stephen J. (1975). Administration of Public Education. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- LoPresti, Peter L., Alan H. Jones, Richard P. Gousha and Wilfrid L. Blanchet. (1990). Rapid change calls for collaboration: Survey results on preparation, certification, and employment of educational administrators. Teacher Education Quarterly, 17(3), 5-23.
- Mastain, Richard K., ed. (1988). The NASDTEC MANUAL: Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States. Sacramento, CA: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.
- Miller, Edythe A. (1987). A new balance: Reshaping the principalship. A special report to the profession. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1986). Proficiencies for principals. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (1985). Performance-based preparation of principals. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. (1988). Directory. Salt Lake City, UT: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1989). Digest of Education Statistics, 1989. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Education Association. (1989). Rankings of the states, 1989. West Haven, CT: National Education Association.
- National Governors' Association. (1986a). Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.
- National Governors' Association. (1986b). Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Supporting Works. Task Force on Leadership and Management. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.
- National Governors' Association. (1989). The Governors' 1991 Report on Education Results in Education: 1989. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.

- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform. Fairfax, VA: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1990). The Preparation of School Administrators. Fairfax, VA: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- Olson, Lynn. (1990). One year after takeover by state, cautious optimism in Jersey City. Education Week, 10(5), 1.
- Plank, David N. (1987). Why school reform doesn't change schools: Political and organizational perspectives. Unpublished paper for the Department of Administrative and Policy Studies, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Schmidt, Peter. (1989). Governors stress curricular reforms as linchpin of restructuring efforts. Education Week, 9(4), 10.
- Splawn, Robert E. (1987). Secondary principal certification requirements--a state-by-state review. NASSP Bulletin, 89-98.
- Swanson, Austin D. (1989). Restructuring educational governance: A challenge of the 1990s. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(3), 268-93.
- Sykes, Gary. (1989). Examining the Contradictions of Licensure. Education Week, 8(27), 32.
- Thomson, Scott D. (1990). Alternative certification for school leaders. A working paper. Fairfax, VA: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- Vance, Nancy. University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia. Personal telephone interview. March, 1990.
- Walberg, Herbert J. and Geneva D. Haertel. (1984). Community influences on learning. Evaluation in Education, 8, 1-82.
- Wiles, Jon and Joseph Bondi. (1983). Principals of School Administration: The Real World of Leadership in Schools. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Wise, Arthur E. (1989). States must create teaching standards boards. Education Week, 8(16), 48.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sometimes the road may be lonesome, often we may lose our way;
take courage and always remember love isn't just for a day.
Gary Ault, © 1969 by Damean Music

My dream is a never-ending road--an enterprise of lifelong learning, eternal love and limitless laughter. I extend my gratitude and love to the many persons who have shared with me generously and deeply their gifts of wisdom, courage and joy as I traveled the road toward the dissertation mountaintop.

I treasure my family. First and foremost, my husband Dale J. Silhanek made the journey possible by his undaunted belief in me; we traveled each step of the shared dream together over terrain both magnificent and rugged. My young sons Virgil James Silhanek, Roy Edward Silhanek and Raymond John Silhanek worked very hard to help me finish "The Book" and waited patiently many long days and nights for me to be a "Doctor of Thinking." Gene and Ruth Helfter, my father and mother, nourished and cultivated my childhood educational dreams.

I cherish my friends. Dan Lawler blessed me with gifts of courage and faith. Karen Willis bestowed passions and metaphors. Pearl Jefferson, Linda Munger and Tim Taylor shared warm and supportive companionship demonstrating that nothing can daunt the cooperative dissertation endeavor. Kristine Benyshek, Jamie Blomgren, Jill Shannon and Marjorie Smith smoothed many rough spots along the road with their assistance, encouragement and laughter. Barb Lickliger, Jacquie Mitchell and Shirley Stow blazed the trail ahead and beckoned me with personal and professional excellence to follow in their footsteps.

I appreciate the many others who also helped and inspired me. Numerous colleagues, teachers, members of the panel of expert judges, state officials, certification officers and employees of the state departments of education provided substantial advice, support and information. Allan Green and Dave Black assisted with technical expertise, Bonnie Trede prepared the manuscript with tremendous skill and efficiency and Mrs. Bishop ensured high quality of format and style. My committee members Dr. Charles Mulford, Dr. Anton J. Netusil, Dr. Charles Railsback and Dr. John Van Ast contributed extensive expertise and unlimited encouragement. My major professor Dr. Jim Sweeney--a man with big ideas and an enormous heart--not only kept the fire burning but held high the torch lighting the path from the first step to the last.

As I continue to journey far beyond mountaintops, I carry with me appreciation and affection for these and the countless other persons who have graced my life.

APPENDIX A.
LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Personal and Telephone Interviews

Robert Ross, Political Science, University of Northern Iowa
Jerry Stubben, Political Science, Iowa State University
Dick Mastain, Editor, the NASDTEC Manual
Cheryl R. Clark, Educational Research Service
Scott Thomson, Executive Director, National Policy Board
for Educational Administration
Michael Cohen, Education Program Director, National
Governors' Association
Susan Traiman, National Governors' Association
Assistant Director of Membership, National Association of
Elementary School Principals
Kathy Christie, Education Commission of the States
Ron Fielder, Administrator, Grant Wood Education
Agency, Cedar Rapids
Brent Harper, University of Oklahoma
Wayne Worner, Professor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Bill Russell, American Educational Research Association
Terry Astuto, National Policy Board for Educational
Administration
Polly Liss, Research Specialist, American Association of
School Administrators
Paul Hersey, Director of Assessment Centers, National
Association of Secondary School Administrators
Ed Bartenbo, National Education Association
Alan Jones, Professor, University of Michigan
Richard Gousha, Professor, University of Indiana
Orrin Nearhoof, Director, Iowa Board of Educational
Examiners
Lew Walter, OERI
U.S. Department of Education Library
Ramsey Selbon, Chief State Officers' Association
James Keefe, Director of Research, National Association of
Secondary School Administrators
Nancy Vance, University of Virginia
Beth Jones Baptist, Martinsville, Virginia
Bill Anderson, Chairman, AASA National Executive
Development Center Advisory Committee
Gaylord Tryon, Executive Director, School Administrators
of Iowa

- Ted Stilwill, Administrator, Division of Professional and Administrative Support, Iowa Department of Education**
- Merrill D. Halter, Susan Miller, David Schreur, Tim Taylor, Jane Yaeger, Consultants, Bureau of Practitioner Preparation and Licensure, Iowa Department of Education**
- B. Dean Bowles, Professor, University of Wisconsin**
- Jim Sutton, Educational Policy Expert, Iowa State Education Agency**
- Norman Boyles, Professor of Educational Policy, Iowa State University**
- Gwen Ingraham, Informational Specialist, American Association of School Administrators**
- Rosemary Poppalewis, Professor, California State University**
- Edwin Marsh, Chairman, Interstate Certification Contract Administrators Association**
- Mary Lou Finney, ERIC Clearinghouse**
- Susan Furhman, Center on State and Local Policy Development**
- Roger Mauritson, Utah State Office of Education**
- Donald Hare, Executive Director of NASDTEC, Seattle, Washington**
- Anne Lewis, National Education Writers Association, Washington, D.C.**
- Gary Marx, Associate Executive Director, American Association of School Administrators**

APPENDIX B.

LETTER TO PANEL OF EXPERT JUDGES, RESPONSE FORM
AND INITIAL SURVEY AND ACCOMPANYING COVER LETTER

I-LEAD

IOWA LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT

113

Iowa State University • N225 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011 • (515) 294-4375
Dr. James E. Sweeney, Director

April 6, 1990

Dr. Wayne Worner
Virginia Tech
University City Office Building
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302

Dr. Worner:

Recently, you indicated that you would be willing to assist me with a research study related to certification and professional development of superintendents and principals across the fifty states by critiquing the survey instrument to be used in the study. This study is designed to provide state agencies, professional associations, preparation agencies and other interested parties with information that will be helpful in developing policies and guidelines for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. Enclosed is a copy of the survey. Please 1) evaluate the survey in terms of its clarity and the extent to which it will yield useful information, 2) make editorial comments on the survey or provide on the enclosed response form comments or suggestions for improving the instrument and 3) return both as soon as possible in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

As I indicated when I contacted you, I will report the findings of this study to the Iowa Governor's Office, the Iowa Department of Education and the Iowa LEAD Policy Board this summer and, therefore, am working on a very tight time schedule. Your timely response and assistance are greatly appreciated and will make a significant contribution in a very important area. Thank you.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me (515-294-2917).

Sincerely,



Beth Silhanek
Research Associate
Iowa State University

Enclosures

I-LEAD

114

IOWA LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT

Iowa State University • N225 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011 • (515) 294-4375
Dr. James E. Sweeney, Director

To: State Certification Officer

In response to a request for information from the Iowa Leadership in Educational Administration Development (I-LEAD) Policy Board regarding administrator certification requirements and professional development of superintendents and principals and subsequent conversations with representatives from School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) and other state agencies, I am conducting a national study to gather information that will be helpful to these state agencies and others interested in administrator certification and professional development. This effort is also supported by the office of Terry Branstad, Governor of Iowa. The survey instrument has been developed with the advice and support of Dr. Richard Mastain, NASDTEC, critiqued by experts across the country and field-tested by Dr. Orrin Nearhoof, Chief of the Iowa Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification. The survey is brief. For a number of items you need only to send relevant materials for analysis.

Part I of the enclosed survey primarily asks for information relative to professional development of superintendents and principals. Part II of the enclosed survey primarily asks that you send all relevant information in four categories related to certification for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal: 1) initial certification requirements, 2) renewal of certification requirements, 3) levels of certification requirements and 4) interstate reciprocity.

Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your use in returning the completed survey and the requested materials. Please mail both the survey and the materials as soon as possible.

Your cooperation and prompt response in this study are greatly appreciated and will make a significant contribution in a very important area. I hope that the study will also benefit you and your state as well. A copy of the findings of the study will be sent to you upon request.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me (515-294-2917).

Sincerely,



Beth Silhanek
Research Associate
Iowa State University

Enclosures

CERTIFICATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
OF
SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS
A Survey of the Fifty States



Project Supported by:

Dr. Jim Sweeney, Iowa State University
Dr. William Lepley, Iowa Department of Education
Governor Terry Branstad, Iowa

Study Conducted by
Beth Silhanek, Research Associate
Iowa State University

**A NATIONAL SURVEY OF CERTIFICATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
OF
SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS**

116

State: _____

Certification Agency: _____

Chief Certification Officer: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____

PART I

A. This portion of the survey is designed to collect information relative to certification and professional development for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

1. What role does the state department of education assume in the provision of professional development for

superintendents?

principals?

(Circle the letter that applies.)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. no active role | a | a |
| b. regulatory | b | b |
| c. provide funding | c | c |
| d. provide trainers | d | d |
| e. provide training program(s) | e | e |
| f. provide technical assistance or consulting | f | f |
| g. host/sponsor training provided by others | g | g |
| h. other (specify) | h | h |

2. Please identify below the commission, board, or other agency (excluding the legislature) in your state - if different than the state department of education - that has primary responsibility for certification-related decisions, such as setting certification standards, determining requirements, issuing certificates and taking disciplinary action for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

117

Agency: _____

Contact Person: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: (____) _____

- | | <u>superintendent(s)?</u> | <u>principal(s)?</u> |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|
| 3. If 1.0 F.T.E. equals one full-time person, how many F.T.E. state department of education employees are assigned responsibility for the certification of | ___ F.T.E. | ___ F.T.E. |
| 4. If 1.0 F.T.E. equals one full-time person, how many F.T.E. state department of education employees are assigned responsibility for the professional development of | ___ F.T.E. | ___ F.T.E. |
| 5. What was the 1989-90 budgeted per pupil expenditure of the state department for the professional development of | \$___/pupil | \$___/pupil |
| 6. What was the 1989-90 budgeted per capita expenditure of the state department for the professional development of | \$___/capita | \$___/capita |
| 7. What was the 1989-90 budgeted expenditure of the state department of education per superintendent and principal for the professional development of | \$___/superintendent | \$___/principal |
| 8. How many of the state's practicing school administrators are | ___ | ___ |
| 9. Is certification required in your state to practice as a | ___ Yes ___ No | ___ Yes ___ No |
| 10. Does your state have a written interstate certification agreement for | ___ Yes ___ No | ___ Yes ___ No |

If yes, please complete Form A on Page 3. If no, please skip to Page 4 .

FORM A: INTERSTATE CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

118

Please place an "X" on the line(s) for each of the following states with which your state has an Interstate Certification Agreement Contract for

superintendents

- _____ Alabama
- _____ Alaska
- _____ Arizona
- _____ Arkansas
- _____ California
- _____ Colorado
- _____ Connecticut
- _____ Delaware
- _____ Florida
- _____ Georgia
- _____ Hawaii
- _____ Idaho
- _____ Illinois
- _____ Indiana
- _____ Iowa
- _____ Kansas
- _____ Kentucky
- _____ Louisiana
- _____ Maine
- _____ Maryland
- _____ Massachusetts
- _____ Michigan
- _____ Minnesota
- _____ Mississippi
- _____ Missouri
- _____ Montana
- _____ Nebraska
- _____ Nevada
- _____ New Hampshire
- _____ New Jersey
- _____ New Mexico
- _____ New York
- _____ North Carolina
- _____ North Dakota
- _____ Ohio
- _____ Oklahoma
- _____ Oregon
- _____ Pennsylvania
- _____ Rhode Island
- _____ South Carolina
- _____ South Dakota
- _____ Tennessee
- _____ Texas
- _____ Utah
- _____ Vermont
- _____ Virginia
- _____ Washington
- _____ West Virginia
- _____ Wisconsin
- _____ Wyoming

principals

- _____ Alabama
- _____ Alaska
- _____ Arizona
- _____ Arkansas
- _____ California
- _____ Colorado
- _____ Connecticut
- _____ Delaware
- _____ Florida
- _____ Georgia
- _____ Hawaii
- _____ Idaho
- _____ Illinois
- _____ Indiana
- _____ Iowa
- _____ Kansas
- _____ Kentucky
- _____ Louisiana
- _____ Maine
- _____ Maryland
- _____ Massachusetts
- _____ Michigan
- _____ Minnesota
- _____ Mississippi
- _____ Missouri
- _____ Montana
- _____ Nebraska
- _____ Nevada
- _____ New Hampshire
- _____ New Jersey
- _____ New Mexico
- _____ New York
- _____ North Carolina
- _____ North Dakota
- _____ Ohio
- _____ Oklahoma
- _____ Oregon
- _____ Pennsylvania
- _____ Rhode Island
- _____ South Carolina
- _____ South Dakota
- _____ Tennessee
- _____ Texas
- _____ Utah
- _____ Vermont
- _____ Virginia
- _____ Washington
- _____ West Virginia
- _____ Wisconsin
- _____ Wyoming

- B. The purposes of this portion of the survey are to 1) collect data regarding services and programs utilized within your state for the professional development of superintendents and principals, 2) determine the agency having primary responsibility for the administration, implementation and monitoring of these services and programs and 3) identify the agencies primarily responsible for funding these services and programs.

119

Please complete the items on the next page according to the following directions:

- Determine which of the services or programs on Page 5 are utilized within your state for the professional development of superintendents and principals. For each service or program utilized, place an "X" on the appropriate line in Column S-1 and Column P-1.
- For each item marked in Column S-1 and Column P-1, identify the one agency in your state which has the primary responsibility for administration, implementation, and monitoring that professional development service or program. Using the AGENCY PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE categories, put the number that represents the responsible agency on the appropriate line in Column S-2 and Column P-2.

AGENCY PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE

1. LEAD
 2. state department of education
 3. intermediate education agency
 4. local education agency
 5. state professional association
 6. university
 7. other
- For each item marked in Column S-1 and Column P-1, identify the one agency which is the primary funding source for that professional development service or program. Using the PRIMARY FUNDING SOURCE categories, put the number that represents the funding source on the appropriate line in Column S-3 and Column P-3.

PRIMARY FUNDING SOURCE

1. LEAD
 2. state government
 3. intermediate education agency
 4. local education agency
 5. national professional association
 6. state professional association
 7. individual administrator
 8. private foundation
 9. business
 10. university
 11. other
- For any response marked "other" please attach a written description or explanation.

Superintendents

Principals

120

	Column S-1	Column S-2	Column S-3	Column P-1	Column P-2	Column P-3
	Utilized	Agency Primarily Responsible	Primary Funding Source	Utilized	Agency Primarily Responsible	Primary Funding Source
• assessment centers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• academies for all administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• academies for superintendents or principals only	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• leadership institutes, 1 to 4 days each	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• leadership institutes, 5 to 9 days each	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• leadership institutes, 10 or more days each	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• business-sponsored training/workshops	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• professional development internships	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• mentoring programs	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• peer coaching networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• peer-assisted leadership networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• fellowships/grants for pursuing advanced degrees	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• financial incentives for professional development	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• clearinghouses for research and information about effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• registry and directory information for administrator recruitment and placement	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• specific activities for enhancing the status of women administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• specific activities for enhancing the status of minority administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• electronic networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• state-wide telephone networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• state-wide satellite networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• other	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PART II

121

Please attach a copy of the requirements and any other written information that you consider helpful in understanding your state's certification requirements in each of the following four categories related to certification A) for the position of superintendent and B) for the position of principal :

1. **initial certification requirements** - the certification requirements for the first, regular administrative certification issued in your state for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

Enclosed Not applicable

- a) Please provide the alternative requirements, if any, for initial certification for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal if not described nor explained in the materials you are sending.

Enclosed Not applicable

- b) Please provide the requirements, if any, for temporary certification for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal if not described nor explained in the materials you are sending.

Enclosed Not applicable

2. **renewal of certification requirements** - the certification requirements, if any, in your state to continue the validity of the initial certificate for the position of superintendent and the position of principal.

Enclosed Not applicable

3. **levels of certification requirements** - the certification requirements in your state for one or more stages, levels, or tiers of certification issued after the initial certification (not the renewal of first stage, level, or tier certification) for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

Enclosed Not applicable

4. **reciprocity** - either an agreement by a formal Interstate Certificate Agreement Contract or a written set of state requirements whereby superintendents and principals educated, experienced, or certified in another state are certified on that basis in your state

Enclosed Not applicable

Do you wish a copy of the results of this study? No Yes

Your cooperation and assistance in completing this survey are deeply appreciated.

RESPONSE FORM
122

Your cooperation and assistance in critiquing the enclosed survey instrument are deeply appreciated. Please respond to each of the following:

- Indicate the directions or questions, if any, that are unclear or need revision for any other reason and provide suggestions for revision.

Page #	Question #	Suggestion

- Indicate the requests for information or the questions, if any, that may be of limited use either because the information requested is not available or will be difficult to use for analysis.

Page #	Question #	Concern

- Suggest questions, if any, that appear to be trivial or inappropriate in the survey and, therefore, may need to be deleted and provide a brief explanation as to why.

Page #	Question #	Concern

- Suggest additional questions, if any, that should be included in the survey and provide a brief explanation as to why.

Question	Rationale

- Provide suggestions for improving any aspect of the format of the survey.

Thank you for your assistance.

I-LEAD

IOWA LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT 126

Iowa State University • N225 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011 • (515) 294-4375
Dr. James E. Sweeney, Director

April 6, 1990

Dr. Orrin Nearhoof
Iowa Department of Education
Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319

Dr. Nearhoof:

During our recent visit, you indicated that you would support and assist me with my study regarding certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. You can assist me by 1) evaluating the enclosed survey in terms of its clarity and the extent to which it will provide useful information, 2) completing the survey and returning it with all requested materials and 3) providing on the enclosed form comments and suggestions for improving the instrument. I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your use. As I indicated when I contacted you previously, I will report the findings of this study to your bureau, the Iowa Governor's Office and the I-LEAD Policy Board this summer and, therefore, am working on a very tight time schedule. Your timely response will be most helpful. It is possible that suggestions and comments received from you and members of the panel critiquing the survey instrument will alter the final survey somewhat. In that event, it may be necessary to contact you at a later date for additional survey information.

Dr. Nearhoof, your help is greatly appreciated. With your assistance we can provide states, professional associations, preparation institutions and other agencies with very important information in the area of administrator certification and professional development.

If you have any questions or need of additional information, please contact me (515-294-2917).

Sincerely,



Beth Silhanek
Research Associate
Iowa State University

Enclosures

RESPONSE FORM

127

Your cooperation and assistance in critiquing the enclosed survey instrument are deeply appreciated. Please respond to each of the following:

- Indicate the directions or questions, if any, that are unclear or need revision for any other reason and provide suggestions for revision.

Page #	Question #	Suggestion

- Indicate the requests for information or the questions, if any, that may be of limited use either because the information requested is not available or will be difficult to use for analysis.

Page #	Question #	Concern

- Suggest questions, if any, that appear to be trivial or inappropriate in the survey and, therefore, may need to be deleted and provide a brief explanation as to why.

Page #	Question #	Concern

- Suggest additional questions, if any, that should be included in the survey and provide a brief explanation as to why.

Question	Rationale

- Provide suggestions for improving any aspect of the format of the survey.

- Indicate how long it took to complete the survey.
- Indicate portions of the survey, if any, that required an unusually long time to complete.
- Provide suggestions, if any, for improving the return rate.

Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX C.

FINAL SURVEY AND ACCOMPANYING COVER LETTER

I-LEAD

IOWA LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT

133

Iowa State University • N225 Lagomarcino Hall

Ames, Iowa 50011 • (515) 294-4375

Dr. James E. Sweeney, Director

April 30, 1990

Dear

In response to a request for information from the Iowa Leadership in Educational Administration Development (I-LEAD) Policy Board regarding administrator certification requirements and professional development of superintendents and principals and subsequent conversations with representatives from School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) and other state agencies, I am conducting a national study to gather information that will be helpful to these state agencies and others interested in administrator certification and professional development. This effort is also endorsed by the office of Terry Branstad, Governor of Iowa. The survey instrument has been critiqued by experts across the country and field-tested by Dr. Orrin Nearhoof, Chief of the Iowa Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification.

Part I of the enclosed survey primarily asks for information relative to professional development of superintendents and principals. Part II of the enclosed survey primarily asks that you send all relevant information in four categories related to certification for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal: 1) initial certification requirements, 2) renewal of certification requirements, 3) levels of certification requirements and 4) interstate reciprocity.

Enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your use in returning the completed survey and the requested materials. Please mail both the survey and the materials as soon as possible.

Your cooperation and prompt response in this study are greatly appreciated and will make a significant contribution in a very important area. I hope that the study will also benefit you and your state as well. A copy of the findings of the study will be sent to you upon request.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me (515-294-2917).

Sincerely,



Beth Silhanek
Research Associate
Iowa State University

Enclosures

CERTIFICATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
OF
SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS
A Survey of the Fifty States



Project Endorsed by:

Dr. Jim Sweeney, Iowa State University
Dr. William Lepley, Iowa Department of Education
Governor Terry Branstad, Iowa

Study Conducted by
Beth Silhanek, Research Associate
Iowa State University

**A NATIONAL SURVEY OF CERTIFICATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
OF
SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS**

135

State: _____

Certification Agency: _____

Chief Certification Officer: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____

DEFINITIONS

Professional Development - any program of learning opportunities that a superintendent or principal undertakes individually or with others for the purpose of improving professional knowledge, skills and performance after being initially certified (not pre-service training nor initial preparation)

Superintendents- chief administrative officer of a public school division.

Principal - building-level administrator of a public school (excluding assistant principal, associate principal and other)

PART I

A. This portion of the survey is designed to collect information relative to certification and professional development for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

1. What role(s) does(do) the state department of education assume in the provision of professional development for

superintendents?

principals?

Circle the letter(s) that applies(apply).

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. no active role | a | a |
| b. regulatory | b | b |
| c. provide funding | c | c |
| d. provide trainers | d | d |
| e. provide training program(s) | e | e |
| f. provide technical assistance or consulting | f | f |
| g. host/sponsor training provided by others | g | g |
| h. other (specify) | h | h |

2. Please identify below the commission, board or other agency (excluding the legislature) in your state - if different than the state department of education - that has primary responsibility for certification-related decisions such as setting certification standards, determining requirements, issuing certificates and taking disciplinary action for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal.

136

Agency: _____
 Contact Person: _____
 Title: _____
 Address: _____

 Telephone: (____) _____

- | | <u>superintendent(s)?</u> | <u>principal(s)?</u> |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|
| 3. If 1.0 F.T.E. equals one full-time person, for F.Y. 90 how many F.T.E. state department of education employees are assigned responsibility for the certification of | ___ F.T.E. | ___ F.T.E. |
| 4. If 1.0 F.T.E. equals one full-time person, for F.Y. 90 how many F.T.E. state department of education employees are assigned responsibility for the professional development of | ___ F.T.E. | ___ F.T.E. |
| 5. What was the F.Y. 90 budgeted per pupil (K-12 public) expenditure of the state department for the professional development of | \$___/pupil | \$___/pupil |
| 6. What was the F.Y. 90 budgeted per capita (state population) expenditure of the state department for the professional development of | \$___/capita | \$___/capita |
| 7. What was the F.Y. 90 budgeted expenditure of the state department of education per superintendent and principal (currently practicing) for the professional development of | \$___/superintendent | \$___/principal |
| 8. As of 9/1/89, how many of the state's currently practicing school administrators are | ___ | ___ |
| 9. As of 9/1/89, is certification required in your state to practice as a | ___ Yes ___ No | ___ Yes ___ No |
| 10. As of 9/1/89, does your state have a written interstate certification agreement for | ___ Yes ___ No | ___ Yes ___ No |

If yes, please complete Form A on Page 3. If no, please skip to Page 4 .

FORM A: INTERSTATE CERTIFICATION AGREEMENTS

137

Please place an "X" on the line(s) for each of the following states with which your state as of 9/1/89 has an Interstate Certification Agreement Contract for

superintendents

- _____ Alabama
- _____ Alaska
- _____ Arizona
- _____ Arkansas
- _____ California
- _____ Colorado
- _____ Connecticut
- _____ Delaware
- _____ Florida
- _____ Georgia
- _____ Hawaii
- _____ Idaho
- _____ Illinois
- _____ Indiana
- _____ Iowa
- _____ Kansas
- _____ Kentucky
- _____ Louisiana
- _____ Maine
- _____ Maryland
- _____ Massachusetts
- _____ Michigan
- _____ Minnesota
- _____ Mississippi
- _____ Missouri
- _____ Montana
- _____ Nebraska
- _____ Nevada
- _____ New Hampshire
- _____ New Jersey
- _____ New Mexico
- _____ New York
- _____ North Carolina
- _____ North Dakota
- _____ Ohio
- _____ Oklahoma
- _____ Oregon
- _____ Pennsylvania
- _____ Rhode Island
- _____ South Carolina
- _____ South Dakota
- _____ Tennessee
- _____ Texas
- _____ Utah
- _____ Vermont
- _____ Virginia
- _____ Washington
- _____ West Virginia
- _____ Wisconsin
- _____ Wyoming

principals

- _____ Alabama
- _____ Alaska
- _____ Arizona
- _____ Arkansas
- _____ California
- _____ Colorado
- _____ Connecticut
- _____ Delaware
- _____ Florida
- _____ Georgia
- _____ Hawaii
- _____ Idaho
- _____ Illinois
- _____ Indiana
- _____ Iowa
- _____ Kansas
- _____ Kentucky
- _____ Louisiana
- _____ Maine
- _____ Maryland
- _____ Massachusetts
- _____ Michigan
- _____ Minnesota
- _____ Mississippi
- _____ Missouri
- _____ Montana
- _____ Nebraska
- _____ Nevada
- _____ New Hampshire
- _____ New Jersey
- _____ New Mexico
- _____ New York
- _____ North Carolina
- _____ North Dakota
- _____ Ohio
- _____ Oklahoma
- _____ Oregon
- _____ Pennsylvania
- _____ Rhode Island
- _____ South Carolina
- _____ South Dakota
- _____ Tennessee
- _____ Texas
- _____ Utah
- _____ Vermont
- _____ Virginia
- _____ Washington
- _____ West Virginia
- _____ Wisconsin
- _____ Wyoming

- B. The purposes of this portion of the survey are to 1) collect data regarding services and provisions utilized within your state for the professional development of superintendents and principals, 2) determine the agency having primary responsibility for the administration, implementation and monitoring of these services and provisions and 3) identify the agencies primarily responsible for funding these services and provisions.

138

Please complete the items on Page 5 according to the following directions:

- Determine which of the services or provisions on Page 5 are utilized within your state for the professional development of superintendents and principals. For each service or provision utilized, place an "X" on the appropriate line in Column S-1 and in Column P-1.
- For each item marked in Column S-1 and Column P-1, identify the one agency in your state which has the primary responsibility for administration, implementation and monitoring of that professional development service or provision. Using the AGENCY PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE categories, put the number that represents the responsible agency on the appropriate line in Column S-2 and in Column P-2.

AGENCY PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE

1. state department of education
 2. intermediate education agency
 3. local education agency
 4. state professional association
 5. university
 6. LEAD project
 7. Principal academy/center
 8. other
- For each item marked in Column S-1 and in Column P-1, identify the one agency which is the primary funding source for that professional development service or provision. Using the PRIMARY FUNDING SOURCE categories, put the number that represents the funding source on the appropriate line in Column S-3 and in Column P-3.

PRIMARY FUNDING SOURCE

1. state government
 2. intermediate education agency
 3. local education agency
 4. national professional association
 5. state professional association
 6. individual administrator
 7. private foundation
 8. business
 9. university
 10. LEAD project
 11. other
- For any response marked "other," please attach a written description or explanation.

Superintendents

Principals

139

SERVICE OR PROVISION	Column S-1	Column S-2	Column S-3	Column P-1	Column P-2	Column P-3
	Utilized	Agency Primarily Responsible	Primary Funding Source	Utilized	Agency Primarily Responsible	Primary Funding Source
• assessment centers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• academies for all administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• academies for superintendents or principals only	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• leadership institutes, 1 to 4 days each	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• leadership institutes, 5 to 9 days each	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• leadership institutes, 10 or more days each	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• business-sponsored training/workshops	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• professional development internships	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• mentoring programs	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• peer coaching networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• peer-assisted leadership networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• fellowships/grants for pursuing advanced degrees	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• financial incentives for professional development	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• clearinghouses for research and information about effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• registry and directory information for administrator recruitment and placement	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• specific activities for enhancing the status of women administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• specific activities for enhancing the status of minority administrators	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• electronic networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• state-wide telephone networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• state-wide satellite networks	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
• other	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PART II

140

Please attach a copy of the requirements and any other written information that you consider helpful in understanding your state's certification requirements in each of the following four categories related to certification A) for the position of superintendent and B) for the position of principal:

1. initial certification requirements - the certification requirements for the first, regular administrative certification issued in your state for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal

Enclosed Not applicable

- a) Please provide the alternative requirements, if any, for initial certification for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal if not described nor explained in the materials you are sending.

Enclosed Not applicable

- b) Please provide the requirements, if any, for temporary certification for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal if not described nor explained in the materials you are sending.

Enclosed Not applicable

2. renewal of certification requirements - the certification requirements, if any, in your state to continue the validity of the initial certificate for the position of superintendent and the position of principal

Enclosed Not applicable

3. levels of certification requirements - the certification requirements in your state for one or more stages, levels or tiers of certification issued after the initial certification (not the renewal of first stage, level or tier certification) for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal

Enclosed Not applicable

4. reciprocity - either an agreement by a formal Interstate Certificate Agreement Contract or a written set of state requirements whereby superintendents and principals educated, experienced or certified in another state are certified on that basis in your state

Enclosed Not applicable

Do you wish a copy of the results of this study? No Yes

Your cooperation and assistance in completing this survey are deeply appreciated.

APPENDIX D.
LETTER TO IOWA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

I-LEAD

IOWA LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT

142

Iowa State University • N225 Lagomarcino Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011 • (515) 294-4375
Dr. James E. Sweeney, Director

April 23, 1990

Mr. Phil Dunshee
Administrative Assistant
Governor's Office
State Capitol Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Mr. Dunshee:

Earlier this year Dr. Jim Sweeney shared with you information regarding a national study being conducted at the request of the I-LEAD Policy Board related to administrator certification and professional development across the fifty states and he invited the Iowa Governor's Office, along with the Iowa Department of Education and the I-LEAD Policy Board, to endorse this study. I have designed the study to provide state agencies, professional associations, preparation agencies and other interested parties with information that will be helpful in developing policies and guidelines for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals.

As Dr. Sweeney indicated to you, I will keep you informed as to the process and progress of the study. Following a review of the literature and numerous telephone contacts with experts in administrator certification and professional development, I have developed a proposed survey instrument. The instrument has been mailed to eleven persons nationally who had indicated a willingness to review the instrument and provide suggestions for revision. A list of those eleven persons is enclosed. Also, Dr. Orrin Nearhoof has agreed to complete the survey for the Iowa Department of Education and to provide comments and suggestions for improving the survey instrument. Within the next week I will make the revisions and mail the survey to each of the state departments of education. This summer I will report the findings to the I-LEAD Policy Board, the Iowa Department of Education, the Iowa Governor's Office and to other interested parties.

With the support of the Iowa Governor's Office, we can provide states, professional associations, preparation institutions and other agencies with very important information in the area of administrator certification and professional development.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at 515-294-2917. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,



Beth Silhanek
Research Associate, I-LEAD
Iowa State University

Enclosure

APPENDIX E.

LETTER FROM DR. WILLIAM L. LEPLEY,
IOWA CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER,
TO OTHER CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS



TERRY E. BRANSTAD, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WILLIAM L. LEPLEY, Ed.D., DIRECTOR

May 24, 1990

Dear Dr.

The Iowa Department of Education is currently seeking information regarding certification requirements and professional development of superintendents and principals across the fifty states. This effort is endorsed by the office of Terry Branstad, Governor of Iowa. Beth Silhanek, an Iowa State University Research Associate and staff member of the Iowa Leadership in Educational Administration Development (I-LEAD) Project, is assisting in this effort by conducting a national study to gather information that will be helpful to our state and other agencies interested in administrator certification and professional development. She recently mailed a copy of a survey and directions to the Chief Certification Officer of each state.

Enclosed is a copy of the survey. Also enclosed is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for use in returning the completed survey and the requested materials. Part I of the survey asks primarily for information relative to the professional development of superintendents and principals. Part II of the survey asks that the state certification officer send all relevant information in four categories related to certification for the position of superintendent and for the position of principal: 1) initial certification requirements, 2) renewal of certification requirements, 3) levels of certification requirements and 4) interstate reciprocity.

As of this date, there has not been a response from your state. I ask that you support our study by passing the survey on to the appropriate person in your agency and by requesting that both the completed survey and the materials are mailed as soon as possible.

With your cooperation and prompt response, we can provide states, professional associations, preparation institutions and other agencies very important information that will be helpful in developing policies and guidelines for certification and professional development of superintendents and principals. I hope that the study will also be of benefit to you and to your state. A copy of the findings of the study will be sent to you upon request.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

William L. Lepley, Ed.D., Director
Iowa Department of Education

Enclosures